

# Report

**Subject** : Draft Master Plan and Development Brief for Land at Porton Down  
**Report to** : The Cabinet  
**Date** : Wednesday 28 February 2007  
**Authors** : John Meeker - Principal (Forward) Planning Officer  
Elizabeth Burt - Forward Planning Officer

**Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development** : Cllr Mrs Brown

---

## 1.0 Summary:

1.1 This report presents to members the results of the public consultation exercise which was held in respect of the Porton Down Masterplan and Porton BioScience and Technology Centre Development Brief which ran from the 21<sup>st</sup> September to 2<sup>nd</sup> November. Cabinet are asked to consider the issues raised, agree the changes considered necessary by officers and ultimately adopt the two documents as Supplementary Planning Guidance.

## 2.0 Introduction:

- 2.1 Porton Down provides one of the most significant employment opportunities in the district. Already the home of world class research facilities at DSTL (Defence Science and Technology Laboratory) and the HPA (Health Protection Agency) new growth and the development of a private sector science park will make the site as a whole one of the largest employers in South Wiltshire. This investment in the site secures long term commitment to research and development in the district and diversifies the economic base of the area.
- 2.2 Hence, the economic opportunities at Porton Down are welcomed by the District Council. However given the relatively isolated location of the site, within an open downland setting and adjacent to a EU designated nature reserve, it has been essential for the District Council, particularly given the removal of circular 18/84 crown immunity, to ensure that future development demands are balanced against the impact on the surrounding environment and the nearby communities. It is from this base that the Porton Down Masterplan was conceived and its primary aim has been to balance benefits and impacts.



Awarded in:  
Housing Services  
Waste and Recycling Services



- 2.3 In 2004, Officers were asked to draw together a comprehensive planning framework which would enable members to have a greater understanding of the development needs likely to emerge at Porton Down, primarily in response to the rationalisation of activity by DSTL. During the process of preparing the Masterplan for the site the longer term intentions of the Health Protection Agency's Centre for Emergency Preparedness and Response and the emerging needs of the land allocated for a Science Park were also taken on board. Combining the aims and aspirations of these organisations, as well as understanding and responding to the impacts likely to result from future development on the site, has been a complex task and has involved a long series of meetings and negotiations with stakeholders.
- 2.4 During the same period, Porton Bioscience and Technology Centre Ltd. - the company set up to establish a private sector science park on land allocated in the Salisbury District Local Plan - have been working towards securing investment in the site with the primary hurdle being to secure outline planning consent. Prior to submission of any planning application, an adopted development brief was required to be put in place to ensure that the site is comprehensively planned. It must be emphasised that whilst the Development Brief is required to be in accordance with the overarching Masterplan, it is a separate document in its own right and is key to the delivery of the Science Park.

### **3.0 The Role and Function of the Porton Down Masterplan:**

- 3.1 As stated previously, the Porton Down Masterplan process is concerned with promoting high quality economic development whilst putting in place measures to minimise impacts on the environment and surrounding communities. The following objectives have driven the process.
- Understanding the needs of an expanded presence of governmental scientific organisations at Porton Down
  - Promoting a synergistic private sector R&D (Research and Development) presence at Porton Down, which has the potential to encourage diverse economic development activity in the district and its surrounding area.
  - To manage the impacts that a more intensive land use at Porton Down might bring to its landscape setting, protected natural habitats and, critically the residents of the Bourne Valley.
  - To promote a more cohesive form of development between the three organisations in terms of addressing common issues and finding shared solutions.
  - To promote a positive planning framework following the removal of crown immunity provided under circular 18/84
  - To provide a means for the special planning demands of the site to be identified, discussed and then addressed in a comprehensive manner, particularly through enabling:
    - local people to have an input about the issues they consider should be taken into account
    - the organisations on site to provide a greater context about their aspirations in order that the council can better understand individual proposals coming forward
    - the council, in light of the views of local people and other sources of advice, to highlight the requirements which it will expect from the Porton Down organisations when they make applications for new development.
- 3.2 In essence, The Master Plan sets out a site wide vision for the pattern of future development as a means to promote its potential as a centre of excellence in technological development and bioscience research. The document will look 10 years ahead and provide a range of agreed objectives that future development of the site will aim to address and deliver.

### **4.0 The Porton BioScience and Technology Centre Development Brief:**

- 4.1 The adopted Salisbury District Local Plan includes an allocation of 5ha of land for the development of a science park at Porton Down under policy E8B. Subject to approval through the LDF, a further 5ha is set aside for future growth. The release of this land was made to encourage private research and development investment on the site in order that scientific knowledge being developed by the Public Sector organisations (DSTL and Health Protection Agency) can be developed for commercial

purposes. PBTC Ltd, the company behind the proposal, already makes space available to small businesses developing these new technologies. The development proposals published in the document provide scope for those businesses to flourish and multiply in new purpose built premises.

- 4.2 The Brief sets out the long term development strategy for the site, which will be achieved through a series of planned phases, as part of the long term strategy to create a new Porton Down BioScience and Technology Centre. It contains a set of development principles, which any future applications for the site will be assessed against.
- 4.3 As in the case of the Masterplan, if fully adopted, the brief will have the status of Supplementary Planning Guidance in relation to the Local Plan and will thus carry significant weight as a material consideration in the determination of a subsequent planning application(s) on the site. It will provide guidance to developers, members of the public and other interested parties on the aspirations and requirements of the Local Planning Authority in respect of this site.
- 4.4 An important issue for members to note is that the Development Brief is very much tied to the Masterplan's overall intentions. The proposals within the brief are informed and guided by the principles and obligations of the masterplan. In bringing the development brief forward at this time, (alongside the masterplan) the developers of the BioScience and Technology Centre scheme aim to illustrate how the elements of the masterplan can be applied. Hence, aspects of section 4 make direct reference to the masterplan in many instances.

## **5.0 Public Consultation:**

- 5.1 In developing the content of the Masterplan, a number of opportunities were provided to both give and receive information to inform the process. This involved meetings with statutory agencies, local representatives and the general public. However, in line with normal procedures, prior to seeking adoption of the two documents a formal 6 week public consultation period was held between Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> September and 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2006.
- 5.2 The consultation exercise undertaken involved,
  - Direct notification of statutory consultees, local stakeholders and the public.
  - Advertising in the local press
  - Two public exhibitions.
    - 9<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup> October 2006 - Salisbury Library
    - 16<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> October 2006 - Amesbury library.
  - Information leaflets were delivered to local residents in the area and to employees on the Porton Down site.
  - Posters have been displayed in local shops and other community buildings in the area and stocks of leaflets were also left in these locations. Leaflets and posters have also been used to raise awareness amongst Porton Down employees.
  - A stakeholder meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2006 involving Parish Councils, Councillors and organisations from Porton Down.
- 5.3 In all, 30 representations were received, 6 in support of the documents, 16 in objection and 8 neutral comments. The table at appendix A sets out a digest of all the issues raised, the responses given and changes that have resulted. The issues raised have led to some additional commitments being agreed in both the Development Brief and Masterplan, notably
  - Renewable Energy – added commitments to appropriate on site provision
  - Archaeology - additional requirements for archaeological assessments
  - Sustainable buildings – signup to bespoke BREEAM building standards
  - Flooding and Drainage – clearer recognition of new requirements set out in PPS25
  - Biodiversity – recognition of Biodiversity Action Plan priority species

5.4 Altered versions of the Masterplan and Development Brief, updated in light of consultation responses set out in Appendix A, are set out in Appendices B and C respectively.

**6.0 Transport and Access**

6.1 The consultation process raised a number of issues, however the most significant by far was that of transport and access to the Porton Down site. It is accepted that any future growth on the site is likely to lead to an increase in traffic on local roads. The aim of the Masterplan in addressing this concern is to put in place mechanisms to properly manage traffic and ensure that access to the site in the long term is less imposing on the surrounding communities.

The issues raised by consultees can be grouped into 2 main areas

**A. Issues relating to the current traffic position (including the impact of the DSTL ilab project) which are able to be addressed through actions by the highway authority and other agencies.**

6.2 In addressing the first group of issues, officers have consulted with Wiltshire County Highways to determine what issues can be addressed which relate to the current position. The table below sets out these issues and considers responses which can be made outside of the Masterplan exercise.

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Suitability of Church Road to accommodate large volumes of traffic is not good</li> </ul>	<p><i>In light of DSTLs Project Inspire proposals, WCC are keeping the position with regard to Church Road under review. Additional restrictions, agreed prior to occupation of the new building, will be imposed if there is a deterioration of safety.</i></p> <p><i>This matter is adequately noted in 6.3.5 and 6.3.6 of the masterplan</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Opening hours of Idmiston Arch exceeds agreed times</li> </ul>	<p><i>Variations to the terms of use of the Idmiston Arch have not been agreed. Enforcement action may be required if this fact is substantiated.</i></p> <p><i>Action: Highway and Planning Enforcement</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Oversized vehicles using Church Road can cause access difficulties</li> </ul>	<p><i>Improved signage would appear to be the easiest solution for the Highway Authority to put in place.</i></p> <p><i>Action: Highways Authority</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Improve access signage for goods vehicles and impose a 7.5t weight limit on Church Road.</li> </ul>	<p><i>As previous response. The issue of a weight restriction on Church Road could be considered as part of the access arrangements to be agreed through the travel plan for the site.</i></p> <p><i>Action: Highways Authority and Travel Plan</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Traffic speeds add to the danger for pedestrians - especially for school children</li> <li>○ Impose a 20mph limit on Church Road</li> </ul>	<p><i>Traffic speeds need to be monitored in this vicinity to catch offenders or to provide an evidence base to justify installing traffic calming measures including better provision for pedestrians or revised speed limits.</i></p> <p><i>Action: Local Police and Highway Authority</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If the road infrastructure isn't going to be improved, how are traffic levels going to be managed</li> </ul>	<p><i>The Pheasant Road will be improved as part of the DSTL application already approved and this includes signalisation of the Winterslow arch. The A30 will be treated as the primary access and staff will be encouraged to use this route. If, after monitoring, it is required the A30/Pheasant Road junction will be signalised.</i></p> <p><i>Action: Highway Authority and DSTL</i></p> <p><i>Further management of traffic volumes will be put in place through green Travel Planning measures.</i></p>

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Response</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Could traffic lights at Porton Tunnel be made to work to respond to changing traffic flows (am and pm)</li> </ul>	<p><i>Any signalisation will take account of am/pm peak traffic flows whilst also ensuring that traffic travelling against the flow is given opportunity to proceed without undue delay.</i></p> <p><i>Action: Highway Authority and DSTL as part of existing proposals</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Heavy vehicles must be routed via the A30</li> </ul>	<p><i>Construction traffic is already directed towards the A30/Pheasant Road access. Improved signage on Church Road/ Winterslow Road (and approaches) could be provided to limit access from the west of the site via the A338.</i></p> <p><i>Action: Highway Authority and DSTL</i></p> <p><i>Further progress in managing commercial vehicle access could be an issue to be picked up in the travel planning process.</i></p>

6.3 In response to these issues it is proposed that the list above is agreed by members for action by the named agencies outside of the masterplan exercise. Some are already in progress (e.g. Pheasant Road improvements, signalisation of Winterslow Road Arch) and where issues have longer term consequences or longer term means of resolution these are also referred to in the following section.

6.4 One key issue raised by members of Northern Area Committee was the apparent lack of information about the movement of DSTL staff from Farnborough and other sites on the completion of the ilab project in 2008. Appendix D of this report sets out information about the number of employees being relocated as well as indications of likely travel patterns that may result. This information is derived from the 2005 travel plan report which accompanied the ilab planning application considered in 2006.

**B. Issues relating to the potential long term growth on the site which the Masterplan should be seeking to address.**

6.5 Respondents to the consultation exercise also highlighted long term issues which need to be tackled through the Masterplan exercise. The majority of these were already set out in the document as areas for further work in coming years within section 6.3.8 of the Masterplan.

6.6 Following on from the consultation, the three organisations on site have agreed to advance the preparation of the joint Travel Plan for the site for completion by March 2008. In terms of process, it is proposed that the Travel Plan is informed by issues raised by the local community at an early stage in order that solutions proposed are responsive – where this is reasonable.

6.7 As set out in section 6.3.8 the Travel Plan will investigate and address:

- Measures to promote and facilitate public transport use (inc. routes, stops and incentives)
- The provision of shuttle bus services to viable pick up and drop off points, including opportunities to provide a relay service to meet train services to Grateley and/or Salisbury railway stations
- Dedicated car sharing schemes to reduce single occupancy car travel
- Provision of pool cars and bikes
- Changes to parking to prioritise car sharers and the introduction of permits/parking management
- Facilities for pedestrian and cyclists.
- Improved access and alternative access points
- The rerouting of all traffic that can be feasibly access the site via the A30/Pheasant Road approach, particularly commercial vehicles
- Road/junction improvements
- Possible reopening of Porton railway station
- Alternative working practices – home working, videoconferencing
- Provision of on site facilities to reduce off site trips for basic needs
- Clear information for staff to enable the best travel choices to be made

- Locally known concerns about issues arising from transport and traffic to and from the Porton Down site

6.7 It is proposed that work on the joint travel plan commences in March and April 2007 with preliminary meetings between WCC, the Porton Down organisations and SDC. It is proposed that issues raised during this consultation process, as agreed with local parish council representatives, are clearly identified for discussion throughout the process of preparing the travel plan.

## 7.0 Conclusions:

7.1 Without any formal planning framework there is a risk that the piecemeal approach to development at Porton Down of the past will continue which can only incrementally exacerbate the existing problems. The Masterplan is therefore a valuable mechanism for all parties. In the case of the Development Brief, it is critical for the private sector investment that the planning context is agreed to enable planning consent to be sought and bring into reality the exciting opportunities for the local economy.

7.2 Since the consultation exercise was held, much progress has been made through discussion enabling agreement on landscaping, building design criteria, the nature conservation interests, shared infrastructure and to some degree in respect of shared facilities. Furthermore, in principle, the parties have agreed to work together within a tighter time frame to drawing up a joint travel plan for the site whose role will be to reduce the movement of vehicles, of all types, which remains as one of the key issues to be tackled in accommodating further economic development over the long term.

## 8.0 Recommendation:

That Cabinet:

- Note the consultation responses and proposed changes set out in Appendix A
- Note the list of local highway issues set out in the table at section 6.2 of this report which will be brought to the attention of the organisations listed for appropriate attention.
- Adopt the amended Porton Down Masterplan (attached at Appendix B) and Porton BioScience and Technology Centre Development Brief (attached at Appendix C) as Supplementary Planning Guidance.

## 9.0 Background Papers:

Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003) - available at [www.salisbury.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.salisbury.gov.uk/localplan)

## 10.0 Implications:

**Financial** : None at this stage

**Legal** : Supplementary Planning Guidance can still be adopted under the new development planning legislation. As policies related to the Porton Down site begin to emerge within the new LDF, the council will need to consider the conversion of SPG to SPD (Supplementary Planning Document) status to maintain its weight as a material consideration. Given that all parties have committed to regular review of the Porton Down Masterplan, its next version should be directed through the SPD process.

**Human Rights:** Article 6 (the right to a fair hearing) may apply. The consultation process contributes to compliance with this.

**Personnel** : None at this stage

**ICT** : None

**Community Safety:** None at this stage

**Council's Core Values:** Excellent service, thriving economy, fairness & equality, open council & willing partner, communicating with the public, supporting the disadvantaged, protecting the environment.

**Parishes Affected:** Idmiston

Democratic Services Unit  
Salisbury District Council  
PO Box 2117  
Salisbury, Wiltshire SP2 2DS

**Officer to contact:** Arabella Davies  
**direct line:** 01722 434250  
**email:** [adavies@salisbury.gov.uk](mailto:adavies@salisbury.gov.uk)  
**web:** [www.salisbury.gov.uk](http://www.salisbury.gov.uk)

## Extract Minute

**Meeting of** : Special Northern Area Committee  
**Meeting held in** : Glebe Hall, Vicarage Road, Winterbourne Earls  
**Date** : Thursday 8 February 2007  
**Commencing at** : 4.30 pm

---

### 674. Draft Master Plan and Development Brief for land at Porton Down:

The Committee considered the previously circulated joint report of the Principal (Forward) Planning Officer and Forward Planning Officer.

The Chairman then invited questions and statements from the members of the public, allowing fifteen minutes each for both objectors and supporters to submit their comments to the Committee for consideration.

#### Recommended to Cabinet –

- (1) That the consultation responses and proposed changes as set out in the previously circulated Appendix A to the report, be noted.
- (2) That the information provided at Appendix D (previously circulated) in respect of staff relocation matters related to the Dstl ilab project be noted.
- (3) That the list of local highway issues set out in the table at section 6.2 of the previously circulated report be brought to the attention of the organizations listed for appropriate attention.
- (4) That the amended Porton Down Masterplan (attached as appendix B to the previously circulated report) and Porton BioScience and Technology Centre Development Brief (attached at Appendix C and previously circulated) be adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance, subject to the following caveats:-
  - (a) In respect of third resolution (detailed above), Officers together with the relevant agencies, identify immediately steps to minimize the impact of current and future traffic levels, and
  - (b) Officers be requested to investigate the implications of the housing impact as a result of this development.

(NOTE: Councillor Spencer requested that his dissent to the above decision be recorded)



Awarded in:  
Housing Services  
Waste and Recycling Services



Draft Porton Down Masterplan and Porton BioScience and Technology Centre Development Brief, Porton Down  
 Summary of consultation and resultant amendments.

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
1	Mrs A Case	Object to Masterplan  Object to Development Brief	<p><u>Masterplan</u> No energy creation incorporated in buildings. All the latest techniques for generation of energy must be incorporated and wind turbines should be used on higher land.</p> <p><u>Development Brief</u> In paras 40.8, 4.41-4.50 no provision for energy generation and for solar water heating panels. Large amounts of hot water are needed in laboratory facilities. Techniques for generation of energy must be incorporated.</p>	<p>In chapter 5.4 the Masterplan does state that design criteria considerations of the proposed developments will need to include sustainable design features and energy management. 6.4.3 also elaborates on this and explains that all new development will have to incorporate sustainable design features. The exact features to be installed and added to development will be agreed at the application stage.</p> <p>There is no para 40.8. Para 4.44 does state that 'New development at PBTC should seek to utilise environmentally sensitive construction methods, materials and strategies'. The Brief will be amended to ensure that appropriate renewable energy technology will be considered in the design of the site. This will include such as technology Solar photovoltaic panels. The exact design features to be used will form part of any planning application submitted.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>In para 4.39 of the Development Brief a new bullet will be added to the list to state 'Appropriate renewable energy technology'.</p>
2	Mr T D Flint	Object to Masterplan	<p>Masterplan lacks a clear statement concerning the use of the Secondary Access at Idmiston Arch via Church Road. Unless adequate restrictions are in place, each development is likely to lead to more traffic using Church Road. Text should read that measures will be taken to ensure that each development will not lead to an increase in traffic on Church Road beyond the measures/restriction currently being considered for the planned Dstl development. Para 6.6.6 only considers taking measures 'if an increase in traffic is of considerable concern to the locals' in Gomeldon and Idmiston.</p>	<p>The Masterplan acknowledges the concerns over the suitability of Church Road to accommodate larger volumes of traffic and discussions are ongoing concerning the level of use at this point of access by Dstl staff. The three organisations have committed to the production of a joint travel plan which will investigate – in light of prevailing circumstances – opportunities for "improved access and alternative access points" (para. 6.3.8). On this basis, the flow of traffic at Idmiston Arch/Church Road will be kept under review beyond the regime currently being considered.</p>	<p>Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p>



Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
3	Richard Harvey	Support  Objection	<p>Supports the approach taken in seeking to rationalise and develop the three existing facilities and assess their future impact on the local environment, transport, energy and water supplies.</p> <p>Animals – Since the intended role of PBTC is life science research, animal procedures are likely to be entailed. Demonstrators concerned over such uses are likely to target Porton Down. Neither documents address the rights of animals.</p> <p>Energy – Electrical and heat energy could be provided by wind turbines and solar panels. This should be included in the documents.</p> <p>Climate change – the organisations on the site should direct their studies to climate and environmental change. The issues have not been addressed by the documents.</p>	<p>The support of the respondent is noted</p> <p>It is understood that the Porton BioScience and Technology Centre will not be carrying out any animal testing procedures</p> <p>In chapter 5.4 the Masterplan does state that design criteria considerations of the proposed developments will need to include sustainable design features and energy management. 6.4.3 also elaborates on this and explains that all new development will have to incorporate sustainable design features.</p> <p>Para 4.44 of the Development Brief does state that 'New development at PBTC should seek to utilise environmentally sensitive construction methods, materials and strategies'. The Brief will be amended to ensure that appropriate renewable energy technology will be considered in the design of the site. This will include such as technology as solar photovoltaic panels. The exact design features to be used will form part of any planning application submitted.</p> <p>Neither document is concerned with the detail of the uses to be undertaken on site. The exercise comes from the standpoint that the site provides, and has the potential to extend, research facilities for both public and private sector uses.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>In para 4.39 of the Development Brief a new bullet will be included in the list to state 'Appropriate renewable energy technology'.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>
4	G. Gallacher Highways Agency	No comment			NO CHANGE

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
5	Roy Gould	Objection	<p>1. Objection to the use of Church Road, Idmiston as one of the designated vehicular thoroughfares for the whole Porton Down complex.</p> <p>2. The security gate on the south side of Idmiston railway arch was given permission to open for restricted hours in the day. Despite this, the length of time the gates are open has lengthened. There is a continuous flow of all manner of motor vehicle.</p> <p>3. Further problems are caused by oversized vehicles having to turn round or reverse back to the A338.</p> <p>4. Church road is a country lane with sharp bends and no footpath along its length. The volume of traffic presents safety issues for pedestrians. None of the improvements proposed by the Senior Area Highways Surveyor of WCC when the gates were agreed to be opened, has even been discussed, let alone implemented. The plan contains no improvements towards the safety of church road pedestrians. There should be the provision of a footway between the arch and church sections of Church Road Idmiston and the imposition of a 20mph speed limit through the village of Idmiston. If this is not done, the closure of Church Road at Idmiston Railway Arch to vehicular traffic is recommended.</p> <p>5. Building works must not interfere with rights of way across Porton Down.</p>	<p>The Masterplan acknowledges the concerns over the suitability of Church Road to accommodate larger volumes of traffic and discussions are ongoing concerning the level of use at this point of access by Dstl staff. The Masterplan document does set out the commitment to a site wide Travel Plan which will investigate – in light of prevailing circumstances – opportunities for “improved access and alternative access points” (para. 6.3.8). On this basis, the flow of traffic at Idmiston Arch/Church Road will be kept under review beyond the regime currently being considered. If there is access via the gates outside of conditioned hours, this is an enforcement issue which will need to be investigated</p> <p>On the issue of heavy lorries, it is considered that the best solution would be improved signage to restrict oversized traffic.</p> <p>Traffic speeds need to be monitored in this vicinity to provide a justification for installing traffic calming measures (or a 20mph limit) including better provision for pedestrians.</p> <p>Current rights of way are set out on the Definitive map held by WCC and alterations to rights of way will be subject to a due process involving separate consultation. The Masterplan does not propose any alterations to rights of way, although given the need for security on the site and in order to protect public safety there will always be a balance to strike.</p>	<p>1. Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p> <p>2. This is an issue for Highways and Planning enforcement. Assessment of the access hours is required to determine whether previous agreements are being breached.</p> <p>3. The issue of signage is for the Highways Authority to deal with. They have been requested to investigate this issue.</p> <p>4. This is an issue for the Local Police and the Highways Authority who have been informed.</p> <p>5. NO CHANGE</p>
6	Paul Hayward Wessex Water	Observation	<p>Development Brief - Believe the developer intends to continue use of the private drainage system. Should the developer wish to discharge foul flows to the public system, we recommend that they discuss their drainage proposals with Wessex Water. The use of soakaways may be feasible.</p> <p>With regard to water supply there are capacity issues with our network and it is again</p>	Points noted.	NO CHANGE

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			recommend that the developer contact Wessex Water to discuss. Contributions to the cost of any reinforcements would be expected from the developer.		
7	T C Lodge Chairman of Winterbourne Parish Council	Support Masterplan  Support Development Brief	One of the two closed stations should be reopened to serve the establishments. British Rail, Railtrack and Wiltshire County Council should be lobbied to pursue and fund this provision, which could also be used by locals.	The support of the respondent is noted.  According to Wiltshire County Council, Network Rail have made it clear on a number of occasions that they would not welcome the reopening of a station in this vicinity on account of impacts to mainline service timetables. Furthermore the cost-estimated at in excess of £6m is prohibitive. It is considered that this response fails to acknowledge the potential of the site to make use of rail as a sustainable means of transport, or the benefits to the surrounding communities. Therefore ongoing discussions will be promoted to examine this further.  The District Council has indicated that it is willing to enter into a contract arrangement with parties to provide a shuttle bus service from the park and ride sites. It is also considered that a shuttle bus could run from Grateley station. Studies will be required to demonstrate whether the reopening of the rail station is viable. Furthermore the three organisations have committed to the production of a joint travel plan, which will include assessing the viability of the station.	NO CHANGE  Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008
8	Alice Ordidge South West of England Regional Development Agency	Support	<u>Masterplan</u> The SWRDA supports the employment element of the Masterplan for Porton Down. It is considered that this could contribute significantly to the provision of employment space for bioscience and technology in the Region. This employment land provision will need to be complemented by service and infrastructure provision to secure investment by these sectors.	The support of the respondent is noted.	NO CHANGE

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<u>Development Brief</u> The development of the Porton BioScience and Technology Centre is fundamental to provide grow-on space for companies moving away from the area once they outgrow existing premises at PDSP and to attract related companies to Salisbury and the Region.		
9	Jennifer Potheary	Objection	<p>Porton village could not cope with a big influx of personnel. Is it intended that Porton will become part of Swindon? Will there be a compulsory purchase of local farms to build estates? Can the grammar schools cope with the children of Porton employees?</p> <p>Are roads going to be widened and services expanded?</p> <p>Rather than expand Porton, the place should be dismantled.</p>	<p>There are no plans to build housing around the Porton Down site. Housing will be focused into the main towns (Salisbury and Amesbury). As new housing is delivered, the need for new schools and facilities will be assessed and delivered in line with that housing. Future reviews of the Masterplan will aim to quantify potential as it emerges and this work will help to inform any future housing allocations and service delivery funding.</p> <p>The three organisations have committed to the production of a joint travel plan for the site which will address access, transport and infrastructure issues. As part of the Forward Planning team's work on the emerging Local Development Framework, the need for new schools and facilities will be assessed. If there are needs resulting from development on the Porton Down site, the applicant will be required to make a contribution towards these facilities. Future reviews of the Masterplan will aim to quantify potential as it emerges and this work will help to inform any future housing allocations and service delivery funding.</p> <p>This request is unreasonable. The site performs a national function in specialised research. The private sector Science Park has the potential to be a significant asset to the local and regional economy.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			Start by a public meeting in the Guild Hall.	A public/stakeholder meeting was held on 24 <sup>th</sup> October where residents and Councillors attended to raise issues. These were fed back to the council by attendees as part of this consultation exercise. The public will have another chance to raise issues at the Northern Area Committee meeting on 8 <sup>th</sup> February 2007.	NO CHANGE
10	Helena Cave-Penney Assistant Archaeologist		<p><u>Development Brief</u> Section 3.11 mentions a desktop study of the site being carried out by Wessex Archaeology at the time of the last Local Plan. I am not aware of this or its conclusions that a watching brief was required when development takes place. The Porton Down range contains a significant number of well-preserved archaeological sites. A large number are Scheduled Monuments. Recommend that an archaeological evaluation needs to take place prior to the determining of any application, in accordance with PPG16. This needs to be set out in the brief in section 4.32.</p> <p><u>Masterplan</u> Section 4.3.2 of the Masterplan refers to there being an archaeological evaluation. This did take place on part of the site and only one archaeological feature was identified. Depending on the nature and size of the proposals for the area that has not been evaluated on this northern site it is appropriate to require further evaluation prior to determining of any application.</p>	<p>It is agreed that an archaeological evaluation should take place on undeveloped land prior to the determining of any application. New text will be added to reflect this. PBTC will also be required to carry out an Environmental Impact Assessment, which will also have to investigate this issue.</p> <p>It is agreed that the Masterplan should state that development proposals on the site will require an archaeological evaluation to be carried out on undeveloped land prior to determining any application.</p>	<p>New text will be added to under para 4.32 of the Development Brief to state 'An archaeological assessment will need to be carried out before any application for the site can be determined, in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning. If any archaeological remains are found, the applicant must demonstrate how these will be dealt with.'</p> <p>New text will be added to the end of para 6.2.3 in the Masterplan to state 'It is recognised that the site could contain features of archaeological significance. Therefore an archaeological assessment will need to be carried out on any undeveloped land before any application for the site can be determined, in accordance with planning Policy Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning. If any archaeological remains are found, the</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<p>Section 4.3.2 refers to possible redevelopment of the Dstl site. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century two Bronze Age barrows were identified by Colt-Hoare close to the railway line and there is no record that they were excavated. Depending on the nature and location of proposed developments on these sites it is appropriate to require archaeological evaluations prior to the determining of any applications.</p> <p>Para 6.2.7 – the Masterplan refers only to the CEPR and not the Dstl areas, as being subject to the Areas of Special Archaeological Significance (ASAS). On this basis, the area identified on plan C as HPA possible new development contains new ditches identified from aerial photographs and two Iron Age pits. An archaeological evaluation of this site prior to the determining of an application is required.</p> <p>There is no recognition of the importance of the archaeological features on Porton Down in either document or any map showing know archaeological features on the site. There is a</p>	<p>The Masterplan needs to make reference to these if they have not been excavated. It will also need to state that an archaeological evaluation on these sites will need to be carried out prior to determining any application.</p> <p>The Masterplan does state in para 6.2.3 that the Dstl area lies within an Area of Special Archaeological Significance. This will mean that an Archaeological evaluation will need to be carried out prior to the determining of any application.</p> <p>It is agreed that there needs to be a statement in the Masterplan requiring an archaeological evaluation to be carried out before any application can be determined.</p>	<p>applicant must demonstrate how these will be dealt with.'</p> <p>New text will be added to the end of para 6.2.3 in the Masterplan to state 'Two Bronze age barrows have been identified close to the railway line and there is no record that they have been excavated. If development will affect these, an archaeological evaluation will be required.'</p> <p>New text will be added to the end of para 6.2.3 in the Masterplan to state 'It is recognised that the site could contain features of archaeological significance. Therefore an archaeological assessment will need to be carried out on any undeveloped land before any application for the site can be determined, in accordance with planning Policy Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning. If any archaeological remains are found, the applicant must demonstrate how these will be dealt with.'</p> <p>New text will be added to the end of para 6.2.3 in the Masterplan to state 'It is recognised that the site</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<p>lack of understanding that an archaeological evaluation will be required for many of the developments in accordance with PPG16 and if any significant archaeological features are found, this will require excavation prior to construction.</p>		<p>could contain features of archaeological significance. Therefore an archaeological assessment will need to be carried out on any undeveloped land before any application for the site can be determined, in accordance with planning Policy Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning. If any archaeological remains are found, the applicant must demonstrate how these will be dealt with.'</p>
11	Brian Elliot	<p>Objection to Masterplan</p> <p>Objection to Development Brief</p>	<p><u>Masterplan</u> Sustainability issues – Section 6 whole site issues – Paras 6.5.1 and 2 notes there is currently no electricity or gas for PBTC site. Must be scope for investigating the use of a CHP system.</p> <p><u>Development Brief</u> Section 4 development principles – Para 4.8 notes the building design will pay attention to sustainable energy and resource footprints. Para 4.39 should be reworded to state that BREEAM standards will be applied.</p>	<p>The Masterplan does not go into any precise detail about the types of energy efficiency designs to be used, as this will form part of any planning application submitted.</p> <p>The development Brief is correct in stating that BREEAM standards are not generally applicable to laboratory buildings, but similar standards can be applied. This is done using 'Bespoke BREEAM' ratings, which have been introduced by BREEAM.</p> <p>Text will be inserted into the Brief to state that Bespoke BREEAM ratings will be required for new buildings to ensure that the highest standards of sustainability are met. The emerging Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West 2006-2026 states in policy G that plans must achieve best practice in sustainable construction by requiring that all new buildings achieve the requirements of BREEAM very good standard.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>Add new text in para 4.39 of the Development Brief to state that 'New buildings will be required to meet a Bespoke BREEAM rating to ensure that the highest standards of sustainability are met. Where applicable buildings will also be required to meet a BREEAM standard of very good'.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			Brief states that energy management may be used; this should be reworded to 'will be used'. There is no mention of the use of PVCs to generate solar power for the site. This should be considered.	Para 4.39 of the development brief does state that 'A range of sustainable design and energy management features will need to be employed as part of the development.' The Brief will be amended to ensure that appropriate renewable energy technology will be considered in the design of the site. This will include such technology as solar photovoltaic panels. The Brief does not go into any precise detail about the types of energy efficiency designs to be used, as this will form part of any planning application submitted.	In para 4.39 of the development brief add a new bullet point to the list to state 'Appropriate renewable energy technology'.
12	Mr C J Pude	Objection	<p><u>Masterplan</u> The document needs a definite commitment to provide alternative routes in and out instead of increased traffic along Winterslow Road. All heavy vehicles to be routed from A30.</p> <p><u>Development Brief</u> Increase incentives to use improved public transport. If buses are provided and not used they will be withdrawn thus choking Winterslow and surrounding area with the increased traffic.</p>	<p>The Masterplan does commit to the preparation of a joint travel plan, which will include the investigation of new and improved access points to the site. Construction traffic is already directed towards the A30/Pheasant Road access. Improved signage on Church Road/ Winterslow Road (and approaches) could be provided to limit access from the west of the site via the A338.</p> <p>As part of any planning application submitted the applicant will be required to provide a transport assessment.</p>	<p>This is an issue for the Highways Authority who have been requested to investigate the need for signage.</p> <p>Inclusion within the list at 6.3.8 of the Masterplan a statement to read 'All traffic, including commercial vehicles, will be encouraged to access the Porton Down sites via the A30/Winterslow Road approach.'</p> <p>Add new text after para 4.20 and para 6.6 in the Development Brief to state 'Any planning application for the site will have to be accompanied by a transport assessment, the scope of which will be agreed with the Local Highways Authority.'</p>



Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
13	Andre Menache, Animal Aid	Objection	Most animal experiments are taking place at Porton Down and expansion could bring more animal suffering. The new Porton facilities will provide a secure cover for researchers to conduct animal experiments. A lack of information about the nature of work to be carried out means it is not possible for the public to make an informed decision. How can the public be sure that the new facilities won't be making biological weapons?	It is not the role of planning to get involved with the work the organisations on the site carry out. The purpose of the two documents are to set out the planning policies and requirements which any future development on the site will have to be in accordance with.	NO CHANGE
14	Margaret Willmot, Salisbury Transport 2000	Objection	<p>Neither document is capable of delivering the sustainable transport provision, especially due to its relatively inaccessible location.</p> <p><u>The Planning Policy framework</u> Section 2.0 gives a selective overview of planning policy and omits several key policies, which contain strong guidance against development such as this. Examples include PPS1, section 2.3, PPS7, section 2.3, Regional Spatial Strategy Policy SD1, SD2, SD3, SD4 and development policies A to C.</p> <p><u>Travel and transport issues</u> Little definite commitment to sustainable transport provision in either document. Para 4.17 of Development Brief and para 6.3.8 of the Masterplan does not provide the step change in transport usage required for sustainable development.</p> <p>The following should be required as a minimum: Reopened or new railway station must be a condition of future development. Stations at Porton and Idmiston should be considered. The history of the site in the Masterplan fails to mention the military light railway. Villages of Porton and Idmiston must not be</p>	<p>The points related to the inaccessibility of the site are fully accepted. The role of the Masterplan is to recognise the threats to sustainability and point the organisations on site towards a more sustainable course of action.</p> <p>The points raised in the Masterplan related to the planning policy framework are noted although it is not the role of this document to undertake a full critique. Porton Down has grown, and will continue to evolve where it has on account of the 'specialist' activities it performs which do not naturally sit within a more sustainable urban environment.</p> <p>The three organisations have committed to the production of a joint travel plan with commitments to reduce car use and increase sustainable modes of transport. The Masterplan and development brief make it clear that future development on the site will be dependent upon introducing measures to reduce the volume of car borne commuting. In relation to the minimum requirements set out by the respondent –</p> <p>1. According to Wiltshire County Council, Network Rail have made it clear on a number of occasions that they would not welcome the reopening of a station in this vicinity on account of impacts to mainline service timetables. Furthermore the cost- estimated at in excess of £6m is prohibitive. It is considered that this</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<p>made to suffer from an increase of cars or car parking at the rail station.  The station should have a shuttle bus stop and covered, lockable cycle parking.  Sticks and carrots to encourage worker to use non-car modes of transport.  Firm agreement for bus service provision at the outset.  More definite information about cycle and pedestrian routes to be provided and must be in place before new development opens.  Site should be car free with minimal parking and walking/cycling paths across the site.  Targets which are promised in a green travel plan should be guaranteed by bond - developer pays a penalty if it fails to deliver the plan.  Travel plan needs to provide more in the way of definite proposals, which will encourage a modal shift.</p>	<p>response fails to acknowledge the potential of the site to make use of rail as a sustainable means of transport, or the benefits to the surrounding communities. Therefore ongoing discussions will be promoted to examine this further.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Noted</li> <li>3. Parking and public transport to any reopened station will be a consideration in any proposal brought forward.</li> <li>4. With regard to a shuttle bus, the District Council has indicated that it is willing to enter into a contract arrangement with parties to provide for this service from park and ride sites. This option could also extend to picking people up from Grateley train station. DSTL have been looking at the potential of running regular shuttle bus services. It is considered that a joint scheme involving all organisations is likely to be more cost effective and the use of shuttle buses will be investigated as part of the travel plan for the site.</li> <li>5. The travel planning exercise will be required to build in incentives to encourage public transport and penalties to control car use.</li> <li>6. The three organisations are committed to the production of a joint travel plan and this will include agreements for bus service provision.</li> <li>7. Cycle and foot access to the site will make use of existing access points. On site provision is less of an issue, but will be planned for to reduce the incidence of car use within the site.</li> <li>8. See 7.</li> <li>9. See 5.</li> <li>10. Agreed – the three organisations have committed to the production of a joint travel plan which will include commitments to more sustainable modes of transport. These commitments will become binding upon any planning application for the science park site</li> </ol>	<p>NO CHANGE  NO CHANGE</p> <p>Additional bullet point to be added into 6.3.8 of the Masterplan to state that ‘The use of Park and Ride sites to run shuttle buses’.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE  NO CHANGE</p> <p>Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
15	Madeline Fairweather	Object	Lacks sustainable energy generation, should have wind power generators and solar panels in roof and south wall.	<p>In chapter 5.4 the Masterplan does state that design criteria considerations of the proposed developments will need to include sustainable design features and energy management. 6.4.3 also elaborates on this and explains that all new development will have to incorporate sustainable design features.</p> <p>Para 4.44 of the Development Brief does state that 'New development at PBTC should seek to utilise environmentally sensitive construction methods, materials and strategies'. The Brief will be amended to ensure that appropriate renewable energy technology will be considered in the design of the site. This will include such technology Solar photovoltaic panels.</p> <p>The exact design features to be used will form part of any planning application submitted.</p>	<p>Council by March 2008.</p> <p>In para 4.39 of the Development Brief a new bullet will be added to the list to state 'Appropriate renewable energy technology'.</p>
16	David Rapley Wiltshire County Council	Object	<p><u>Development Brief</u> There should be more renewable energy power, to follow guidelines set out in the Wiltshire Renewable Energy Action Plan and policy RE1 of the draft RSS.</p> <p><u>Masterplan</u> More research is needed to prevent a lack of facilities such as housing, for the potential 2,500 extra jobs. Research should also be conducted on possible future developments at the site beyond 2016. This development should also be viewed in a wider context, including the developments in Amesbury, Boscombe Down &amp; Solstice Business Park. New workers may end up commuting from Salisbury, increasing house prices; therefore</p>	<p>Para 4.44 of the Development Brief does state that 'New development at PBTC should seek to utilise environmentally sensitive construction methods, materials and strategies'. The Brief will be amended to ensure that appropriate renewable energy technology will be considered in the design of the site. This will include such technology Solar photovoltaic panels.</p> <p>The exact design features to be used will form part of any planning application submitted.</p> <p>The emerging Regional Spatial Strategy requires 460 houses per year to be provided in the district. In allocating the Science Park at the time of the last Local Plan it was accepted that a balance between jobs and housing had been struck. In the intervening period the demands from the new Dstl iLab development have been taken on board in the preparation of RSS housing levels. In terms of outstanding supply of housing (and associated services to be delivered alongside that housing) the uncertainty over phase 3 of the science park and possible consolidation at the HPA will be fed</p>	<p>In para 4.39 of the Development Brief a new bullet will be added to the list to state 'Appropriate renewable energy technology'.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<p>high volume of additional housing in the District is required.</p> <p>The provision of services and infrastructure needs to be commensurate.</p> <p>Porton Down is in countryside (away from homes) so a 'green' travel plan is essential.</p>	<p>into subsequent RSS processes alongside demands derived from other economic activity in the Amesbury area. Future reviews of the Masterplan will aim to quantify potential as it emerges and this work will help to inform any future housing allocations and service delivery funding.</p> <p>The Masterplan states that a joint working group will be set up to discuss potential sharing issues. As the employee numbers expand on the site, the facilities to support this will be provided. Before firm commitments can be made on facilities, the organisations will have to investigate whether they are economically viable and whether a site is available for them. As part of the Forward Planning team's work on the emerging Local Development Framework, the need for new schools and facilities will also be assessed. If there are needs resulting from development on the Porton Down site, the applicant will be required to make a contribution towards these facilities.</p> <p>The three organisations have committed to the production of a travel plan, which will include commitments to sustainable transport provision and a reduction in car use.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p>
17	Mrs Irene Gould	Object	<p>Insufficient and sketchy information, particularly transport details, improved plans and details required.</p> <p>Use of Church Rd, Idmiston as entrance/exit to Porton Down, when Manor Farm Rd was</p>	<p>Agreed – details of a commitment to the production of a joint travel plan will be set out in the Masterplan. The travel plan will contain firm commitments to sustainable transport provision and a reduction in car use.</p> <p>The Masterplan acknowledges the concerns over the suitability of Church Road to accommodate</p>	<p>Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p> <p>Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<p>constructed for Porton Down. Church Rd should be closed to traffic for Porton Down.</p> <p>No consideration given to improving pedestrian road safety on Church Rd. - If Church Rd is not closed there should be a footway between Idmiston Church and Arch, the road should be widened and straightened and a 20mph speed limit imposed.</p>	<p>larger volumes of traffic and discussions are ongoing concerning the level of use at this point of access by Dstl staff. The three organisations have committed to the production of a joint travel plan which will investigate – in light of prevailing circumstances – opportunities for "improved access and alternative access points" (para. 6.3.8). On this basis, the flow of traffic at Idmiston Arch/Church Road will be kept under review beyond the regime currently being considered.</p> <p>Traffic speeds need to be monitored to provide an evidence base to justify installing traffic calming measures (or a 20mph zone) including better provision for pedestrians.</p>	<p>commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p> <p>This is an issue for the Local Police and the Highways Authority who have been informed. The Highways Authority have been requested to investigate traffic speed and pedestrian safety issues on the main approaches through Porton and Idmiston and where appropriate employ measures to improve public safety.</p>
18	Graham Gould Head of Marketing, Economic Development & Tourism, SDC	Support	Development at Porton Down will strengthen the research presence in South Wiltshire. It will contribute in terms of employment, spend and international reputation, contributing to the local economy. It will enhance job opportunities and incomes, increase demand for professional services, promote higher retail spending and relocate families – boosting the workforce and bringing additional skills. Porton Down will be one of the foremost research and science sub regions in the country, attracting other companies and industries and retaining the specialist knowledge and skills. The Salisbury Research Triangle and support for advanced technologies are priorities of the Wiltshire and Swindon Economic Strategy 2003-2008.	The support of the respondent is noted	NO CHANGE

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
19	Dr Gill M Anlezark	Object	<p><u>Masterplan</u> Stronger words should be used regarding 'preparing' a travel plan, 'considering' &amp; 'encouraging' alternative transport, 'considering' sustainable design and energy management.</p> <p>Implementing a Travel Plan should be a condition to an application and not watered down.</p> <p>Design features do not include energy generation or (rain) water conservation. Sustainable design and energy management must be obligatory. Design features must include photovoltaic, solar thermal, wind power and rainwater collection and usage.</p> <p>Large developments need to be sited near centres of population. Alternative sites nearer Salisbury or Amesbury should be investigated.</p> <p>Infrastructure for sustainable transport should be in place before the development, and the application to be made on condition of this. Bus service is inadequate, car sharing is not reinforced, cycle routes are non-existent, pedestrian access difficult &amp; train station at Porton is not open.</p>	<p>The three organisations have committed to the production of a joint travel plan, which will include firm commitments to sustainable travel and transport improvements.</p> <p>The three organisations have committed to the production of a joint travel plan with commitments to car reduction and sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>In chapter 5.4 the Masterplan does state that design criteria considerations of the proposed developments will need to include sustainable design features and energy management. Para 6.4.3 also elaborates on this and explains that all new development will have to incorporate sustainable design features. The Masterplan does not go into detail about the types of design features required, as this will form part of any planning application submitted.</p> <p>Porton Down has grown, and will continue to evolve where it has on account of the 'specialist' activities it performs which do not naturally sit within a more sustainable urban environment.</p> <p>The Masterplan exercise is concerned with recognising the impacts, which the site has on its surroundings and transportation has emerged as the biggest issue. The lack of attention to this matter, by the Dstl/MOD in particular, has created the current situation. Travel planning measures and ongoing dialogue over public transport services, other access points and a rail service</p>	<p>Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p> <p>Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<p>Traffic movements through local villages will be 'kept under review' will not changes things, planning in advance is more effective. Gomeldon School is already dangerously congested between 8:45 and 9:15am, this may get worse. Idmiston School is likely to have increased traffic if drivers avoid narrow bridge in Porton.</p> <p>A lack of speed restrictions prevents most cyclists and a shortage of pavements prevents people walking.</p> <p>You could access the CEPR site via a small gate near Idmiston railway arch, this was closed 10yrs ago for security, and it could be reopened.</p> <p><u>Development Brief</u> Does not say how PPG13 will be complied with by reducing the length &amp; number of motorised journeys. PPG13 should be enforced as a condition to application.</p>	<p>are being promoted as part of this exercise.</p> <p>WCC highways have indicated that they will keep road access via Church Road "under review" on the basis that they will intervene if travel demands from the iLab development exacerbate the existing concerns. Travel planning is aimed at reducing pressure on this access point and so as the measures are introduced the situation is likely to improve.</p> <p>Consultation has revealed that there is a real issue of highway safety related to speed of employees accessing the site based on current conditions (i.e. without considering future impacts) which enforcement and intervention measures should be able to tackle. Traffic speeds need to be monitored to provide an evidence base to justify installing traffic calming measures (or a 20mph zone) including better provision for pedestrians.</p> <p>The Masterplan document does set out the commitment to a site wide Travel Plan which will investigate – in light of prevailing circumstances – opportunities for "improved access and alternative access points". (Para. 6.3.8).</p> <p>Any application on the site will be required to submit a transport assessment detailing how sustainable modes of transport will be used and how present and predicted transport issues will be dealt with.</p>	<p>Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p> <p>This is an issue for the highways Authority and local police. The Highways Authority have been requested to investigate traffic speed and pedestrian safety issues on the main approaches through Porton and Idmiston and where appropriate employ measures to improve public safety.</p> <p>Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p> <p>Add new text after para 4.20 and para 6.6 in the Development Brief to state 'Any planning application for the site will have to be accompanied by a transport assessment, the scope of which will be agreed with the Local Highways</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<p>Proposal is not compatible with PPG4 and stated environmental objectives. PPG4 should be enforced as obligatory to application.</p> <p>Only requires 'development' of a Green Commuter Plan, not 'implementation', this should be an obligation.</p> <p>Access and highway improvement only seemed directed to motorised transport. It should help sustainable modes of transport too.</p>	<p>The main aim of PPG4 is to take a positive approach to the location of new business developments. The main message is that economic growth and a high-quality environment have to be pursued together. It is considered that the Brief is in accordance with this guidance and does ensure that environmental considerations will be part of any development. The Brief identifies that there is a range of ecology and wildlife on the site as well as protected areas of landscape. The Brief does propose a number of measures to ensure that these are protected and where possible, enhanced. At the application stage, the applicant will be required to demonstrate that environmental impacts are minimal and where necessary mitigation measures will be put in place.</p> <p>The three organisations have committed to the production of a joint travel plan for the whole site Which will include firm commitments to sustainable travel and transport improvements. The Development Brief must be in accordance with the Masterplan objectives including the travel plan commitments.</p> <p>The three organisations have committed to the production of a joint travel plan for the site and this will include firm commitments to sustainable travel and transport improvements. Measures to increase sustainable modes of transport, such as shuttle buses to the site, will be assessed as part of the travel plan. The Development Brief and future development proposals will have to accord with this.</p>	<p>Authority.'</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p> <p>Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p>
20	Pam Butler, Network Rail	Observation	At this stage Network Rail is not planning a reopening of Porton Station, it may affect timetabling and potential service to other stations. Therefore if the idea develops further it	Points noted and if necessary the respondent will be contacted at the appropriate time.	NO CHANGE



Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			would be beneficial to discuss the issues relating to this. The rail line towards Exeter will be enhanced enabling the hourly Waterloo-Salisbury service to continue to Exeter. It would be appropriate to consider using developer contributions towards the enhancement of parking and/or facilities at Grateley Station.		
21	Guy B Brushfield	Object	<p>There was no representation from senior management of Porton Down or members of WCC or SDC at the presentation on 24 October. Therefore there were no authoritative answers to the unacceptable level of traffic through Idmiston and Porton. Measures to improve accessibility are not spelt out in the Brief or Masterplan. The SDC requirement for a Joint Travel Plan lacks detail in the Brief. These problems should be sorted before proceeding with plans.</p> <p>The Masterplan omits rail travel via the reopening of Porton Station, which would benefit community.</p> <p>A further presentation should be arranged with representatives from DSTL, HPA, PBTC, QinetiQ, SDC and WCC present so the existing problems can be included in the Masterplan.</p>	<p>Key people from Porton Down and SDC were in attendance and were able to address all concerns aside from those related to some aspects of traffic and transport at the presentation. It was indeed unfortunate that WCC Highways could not attend, however at the Northern Area Committee meeting on 2/11/06 they were able to attend and provided some clear input regarding the current position and measures for future consideration. The three organisations have committed to the production of a joint travel plan on the site, which will include targets for car reduction and sustainable transport use. Furthermore any applications for the site will also be required to submit a transport assessment and this will need to take on board suppression of car use.</p> <p>The establishment of a railway services cannot be identified as a firm commitment, as Network Rail have yet to agree its suitability. There appears to be broad agreement that a station here would provide a realistic and sustainable alternative to car use. As part of the joint travel plan, review of a previous viability study will be undertaken in terms of imposing future conditions related to this facility.</p> <p>This consultation exercise has flagged up the key issues, which the council will aim to address through the delivery of future development on the site. Furthermore the exercise has provided a great deal of information, which will be fed to WCC Highways in order that public safety issues</p>	<p>Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p> <p>Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
				can be examined in respect of current conditions. On this basis a further event would not be of benefit.	
22	Peter Le Count, Chairman of SWEP	Support	<p>Development of a science park is a key requirement. Biotechnology and high tech industry sector is vital to the future economic prosperity of the region and will help build south Wiltshire's reputation as a centre of excellence.</p> <p>Space should be provided to accommodate 'spin-out' companies, retaining skills, encouraging new investment and job opportunities.</p> <p>It will increase the number of skilled professionals in the area and increase local spending. Furthermore families will relocate and bring additional skills to the local workforce.</p> <p>Potential impact of DSTL and future HPA expansion must be taken into account with regional and local housing allocations. Low cost housing must be provided for low paid sectors of the workforce.</p> <p>The size of units is appropriate to such a development.</p> <p>There would be real benefit to the local economy and reputation of the area, if a flagship tenant to the new PBTC could be attracted.</p>	<p>The support of the respondent is noted</p> <p>The aim of the science park development is to provide exactly the type of space the respondent is referring to. The exact type of space to be provided on the site will be agreed at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The support of the respondent is noted</p> <p>The housing demands of the first 2 phases of the science park and the Dstl expansion have been addressed through the current Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) process and existing Local Plan. Consolidation of HPA activity and Phase 3 of the science park – if they occur- will be planned for in the next RSS review which will commence in 2008-09. In terms of housing mix, the district level Local Development Framework is already being informed by the need to provide small and affordable housing types.</p> <p>All developments on the site will have to meet a number of design criteria, which is set out in both documents. Unit size will be aligned to the business needs on the site but should be flexible in terms of format to enable easy re-letting.</p> <p>The aim of the science park is to develop new businesses as a spin off from the existing organisations – not to act as a site where existing</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			Space should be flexible to attract this sort of company with an appropriate flagship building.	business can relocate to.	
23	Dr Jimmy Walker	Object	<p>The respondent raises a number of points regarding recent performance of travel planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In 2003 HPA formed a Green Travel Plan and created the post of an Environmental Officer. However little has been done to encourage sustainable transport.</li> <li>- A bus to bring employees from local towns never materialised.</li> <li>- The car-share system is a joke with employees left to their own devices and to contact Human Resources. No incentive schemes materialised. The introduction of flexi-time reduces car sharing. Priority spaces for car-sharers are pretty meaningless with the buildings different access points.</li> <li>- Some schemes have already been rejected: A shuttle bus was turned down; a cash machine on-site was removed because it was too expensive to operate.</li> <li>- Current walking and cycling paths across site are abysmal with 'unsafe zebra' crossings.</li> <li>- There is no identified access through Winterbourne, Porton and Idmiston for pedestrians/cyclists.</li> <li>- There is no dedicated footway from the village of Porton to Idmiston and up to the Porton site. And though cyclists use the road, the road surface is appalling. Additional staff will increase traffic on quiet roads and discourage pedestrians and cyclists.</li> </ul> <p><u>Suggestions for changes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Further details are needed such as by when, whom and how much will sustainable transport modes be implemented by, i.e. who will pay the discount bus tickets?</li> <li>- Minimal car parking available.</li> <li>- An agreement for a bus service provision before development starts.</li> </ul>	<p>The issues raised are noted.</p> <p>The three organisations are working together to produce a joint travel plan and the issues highlighted will be looked into. Where reasonable and practicable, measures for road improvements and sustainable transport measures will be put in place.</p> <p>It is already accepted that there is a need to ensure that the implementation of travel plans are monitored and enforced where required. The three organisations will agree to a travel plan and will have to stick to its targets and commitments. At the application stage transport and highways improvements related to the development can be negotiated with the applicant as a Section 106 Agreement, which will ensure that the improvements will be carried out. With regard to a shuttle bus, the District Council has indicated that it is willing to enter into a contract arrangement with parties to provide for this service. This option could also extend to picking people up from Grateley train station. DSTL have been looking at the potential of running regular shuttle bus services. It is considered that a joint scheme involving all organisations is likely to be more cost effective and the use of shuttle buses will be investigated as part of the travel plan for the site. Furthermore any application will have to submit a travel plan, which will include assessing the sustainable forms of transport available on the site.</p>	<p>Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p> <p>Additional bullet points to be added into 6.3.8 of the Masterplan to state that 'The use of Park and Ride sites to run shuttle buses' and 'Shuttle bus and drop off bays (for use by all 3 organisations) to viable pick up and drop off points, including opportunities to provide a relay service to meet train services at local railway stations such as Grateley, Salisbury and/or Andover.'</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staff members are informed of all transport options.</li> <li>- New/ improved routes for pedestrians and cyclists in Porton, Idmiston and on the site. These changes should be detailed and be in place before the new development opens.</li> <li>- If reopened, Porton Station will need a shuttle bus to transport people to the site.</li> <li>- Through section 106 developers must pay for the new transport schemes.</li> <li>- Plan should have caveats to ensure commitment, such as fines for not implementing the schemes.</li> </ul>		
24	W R Symmonds	<p>Object to Masterplan</p> <p>Support Development Brief</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Plan will increase traffic in Church Rd, Idmiston. Concerns regarding this problem have already been voiced at consultation meetings and a petition on 21 Feb 2006.</li> <li>- Car sharing, coach movements and park and ride will not prevent people driving.</li> <li>- Church Rd is a narrow road with blind corners, potentially dangerous junctions and no footpath. Vehicles park unavoidably on the roadside and the local farmer uses it with tractors and large machinery. These uses, plus the traffic to Porton Down, the residents and the 30mph speed limit already creates a safety hazard to pedestrians including children walking to and from the bus stop.</li> </ul>	The Masterplan acknowledges the concerns over the suitability of Church Road to accommodate larger volumes of traffic and discussions are ongoing concerning the level of use at this point of access by Dstl staff. The Masterplan document does set out the commitment to a site wide Travel Plan which will investigate – in light of prevailing circumstances – opportunities for “improved access and alternative access points” (para. 6.3.8). On this basis, the flow of traffic at Idmiston Arch/Church Road will be kept under review beyond the regime currently being considered. Due to the site’s location there is a limited choice of transport methods. The travel plan will propose targets for a reduction in car travel and will promote sustainable modes of transport. Traffic speeds need to be monitored to provide an evidence base to justify installing traffic calming measures (or a 20mph zone) including better provision for pedestrians.	<p>Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p> <p>Traffic speeds are an issue for the Local Police and Highways Authority.</p>
25	Mr J A Osmond	Observations	<p>The government would support this development because some of the companies are a part of government agencies (MOD, HPA).</p> <p>Sufficient services and facilities will be needed for the new employees.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>As part of the Forward Planning team’s work on the emerging Local Development Framework, the need for new facilities and services will be</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<p>There could be a weight restriction of 7.5 tonnes on the road from A338 to the security gates at the turning to Porton Down. There could be a weight restriction on road leading from Policemans Corner, Winterbourne Gunner and from Idmiston Hairpin (on A338) both to Chapman's Corner, Porton.</p> <p>The road currently owned by the MOD running from A30 (Pheasant turn) to the security gates, should remain in the MOD's control to enable closure for exercises and to prevent it being used as a 'rat-run'.</p> <p>The proposed traffic lights at Porton Tunnel will give priority to traffic from Porton, could the priority be reversed at finishing times at Porton Down?</p> <p>The height restriction at Porton Tunnel could be further reduced, but this might cause a problem with Network Rail and the double-decker buses parked at Porton Down.</p> <p>A shuttle bus could pick up people dropped off at the cross roads at Chapman's Corner as buses stop here from Salisbury &amp; Tidworth.</p>	<p>assessed. If there are needs resulting from development on the Porton Down site, the applicant will be required to make a contribution towards these facilities.</p> <p>The most viable solution for the Highways Authority appears to be the installation of improved signage The three organisations have committed to the production of a joint travel plan and this will include the investigation of improved traffic flow and restrictions on the roads around the site.</p> <p>The road will remain as MOD property and improvements will be carried out when necessary to ensure the road remains safe and accessible.</p> <p>Traffic lights at Porton Tunnel are part of the planned transport improvements. The best form of traffic control to enable fair access to traffic from both directions will be implemented.</p> <p>It is considered that the current height of the tunnel is satisfactory as it already limits vehicle heights. Further reducing the height would present problems for Network Rail and any buses.</p> <p>This solution appears to provide a realistic option and could also extend to picking people up from Grateley train station. DSTL have been looking at the potential of running regular shuttle bus services. It is considered that a joint scheme involving all organisations is likely to be more cost effective and the use of shuttle buses will be investigated as part of the travel plan for the site. Furthermore any application will have to submit a</p>	<p>Implementation of signage is an action for the highways Authority. Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>Additional bullet point to be added into 6.3.8 of the Masterplan to state that 'The use of Park and Ride sites to run shuttle buses'. Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			Employees could use the park & ride site on London Rd, and use a bus to get to Porton Down via A30. The park & ride could be expanded.	<p>travel plan, which will include assessing the sustainable forms of transport available on the site.</p> <p>This option has been highlighted previously and the district council has indicated that it is willing to enter into a contract arrangement with parties to provide for this service. Expansion of the park and ride would only occur if there was a proven demand.</p>	<p>Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p> <p>Additional bullet point will be added into 6.3.8 of the Masterplan to state that 'The use of Park and Ride sites to run shuttle buses'</p>
26	Julie Horne, Idmiston Parish Council	Object	<p>Documents lack detail and specific proposals. Staff numbers have not been addressed.</p> <p><u>Travel and transport</u> New staff will need to commute to the site. This will cause delay upon local roads. Use of roads via Porton and Idmiston would be inappropriate. The Winterslow Road/Tidworth Road junction experiences heavy traffic and this should be addressed. Upgrade road over Battery Hill or the A30 being the only entrance into Porton Down for non-local traffic with appropriate traffic management.</p>	<p>The three organisations have details of current staff members on the site and the numbers on all sites. Section 4.0 of the Development Brief includes figures on the proposed number of employees expected as a result of development and this will be the same for each phase of development. Dstl and HPA are unable to provide accurate future numbers of staff expected on the site, as they do not know their future development intentions. When development proposals come forward, the applicant will have to provide details of staff numbers and where they are relocating from.</p> <p>There are already proposals in place to address the traffic flow in a recent development granted planning permission. The three organisations have committed to the production of a joint travel plan by March 2008 and this will include targets for car reduction and sustainable modes of transport. Furthermore each application on the site will be required to submit their own detailed travel plan to address how employees and visitors will gain access to the site.</p>	<p>Current staff numbers and where possible, future predicted employees numbers will be included section 5.1 of the Masterplan. Staff numbers in section 4.0 of the Development Brief will be made clearer.</p> <p>Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p> <p>Inclusion within the list at 6.3.8 of the Masterplan a statement to read 'All traffic, including commercial vehicles, will be encouraged to access the Porton Down sites via the A30/Winterslow Road approach.'</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<p>HGV use Church Road and have to reverse back as they cannot fit. This results in them driving along Winterslow Road, which is contrary to the agreement made, by Dstl and HPA. This problem has to be addressed. Signage was discussed at the meeting on 24/10/06.</p> <p>Expansion at Porton Down should only be permissible when the reopening of Porton Station has been properly considered. Local road and traffic management upgrades have not been included in the documents.</p> <p>Note that a Green Travel Plan will be produced but this must be followed by appropriate actions.</p> <p><u>Road safety</u> There is a lack of pavements and vehicle speeds, which make the road unsafe. Therefore the documents must ensure protection is provided.</p> <p><u>Pollution</u></p>	<p>Improved signage appears to be the most viable solution for the Highways Authority to put in place. The three organisations are working together to agree a joint travel plan, which will address traffic and travel problems.</p> <p>According to Wiltshire County Council, Network Rail have made it clear on a number of occasions that they would not welcome the reopening of a station in this vicinity on account of impacts to mainline service timetables. Furthermore the cost-estimated at in excess of £6m is prohibitive. It is considered that this response fails to acknowledge the potential of the site to make use of rail as a sustainable means of transport, or the benefits to the surrounding communities. Therefore ongoing discussions will be promoted to examine this further, particularly given the direct governmental involvement via the MOD and the Department of Health.</p> <p>The travel plan will include targets, which must be met by the organisations. Any application for development will be required to submit a travel plan to address any transport issues. This will be a binding agreement and a condition of any development being permitted.</p> <p>Traffic speeds need to be monitored to provide an evidence base to justify installing traffic calming measures (or a 20mph zone) including better provision for pedestrians.</p> <p>The three organisations are working together to</p>	<p>Signage is an issue for the Highways Authority. Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p> <p>This matter is adequately noted in 6.3.8 of the Masterplan.</p> <p>Update 6.3.9 of the Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p> <p>This is an issue for the local police and the Highway Authority.</p> <p>Update 6.3.9 of the</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<p>Increased use of roads will increase noise and air pollution and ways need to be found to reduce this.</p> <p>The issue of light pollution has not been addressed in the Development Brief.</p> <p><u>Housing</u> Housing development must be insufficient for the proposed developments. Development of Solstice Park and Project Inspire will drain local resources of staff and housing. Development at Porton Down will require the transfer of staff who will also move home. Further housing areas need to be identified.</p> <p><u>On-site Nursery/Crèche facilities</u> Support expansion of facilities but when will they will be provided? A timescale must be included within the Masterplan to ensure it is</p>	<p>agree a joint travel plan for the site, which will be produced within the first year of the Masterplan being adopted. The most potent means to secure commitment appears to be the imposition of a top level target and timescale within the Masterplan. Applications for development will have to demonstrate that it would not have a detrimental affect on the area in terms of pollution and noise.</p> <p>PBTC is currently carrying out an Environmental Impact Assessment, which will investigate the potential effects light will have on the site. If any negative impacts are identified the organisation will have to implement mitigation measures.</p> <p>The emerging Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West requires 460 houses per year to be provided in the district. In allocating the Science Park at the time of the last Local Plan it was accepted that a balance between jobs and housing had been struck. In the intervening period the demands from the new Dstl iLab development have been taken on board in the preparation of RSS housing levels. In terms of outstanding supply of housing (and associated services to be delivered alongside that housing); the uncertainty over phase 3 of the science park and possible consolidation at the HPA will be fed into subsequent RSS processes alongside demands derived from other economic activity in the Amesbury area. Future reviews of the Masterplan will aim to quantify potential as it emerges and this work will help to inform any future housing allocations and service delivery funding.</p> <p>The Masterplan states that a joint working group will be set up to discuss potential sharing issues. As the employee numbers expand on the site, the facilities to support this will be provided. Before</p>	<p>Masterplan to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008. This will include targets for car reduction and sustainable methods of transport.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>



Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<p>provided in line with demand.</p> <p><u>Education</u> Proposed development means people will live locally and this needs to be addressed at this time.</p> <p><u>Recreational facilities</u> Difficulty is that facilities are within the secure area and need to relocate outside this area to maintain public usage.</p> <p>Imperative that no development be permitted which would encroach or affect Rights of Way. Refer to letter RFA/SC/ENV/HY.459, dated 08/02/1978.</p> <p><u>Water abstraction</u> Environment Agency has been involved in discussion and note that an increase in abstraction will not be permissible. Important to the maintenance of the local environment and the River Bourne.</p> <p><u>Foul drainage</u> Note that it is proposed to continue to use and expand existing on-site facilities. This is</p>	<p>firm commitments can be made on facilities, the organisations will have to investigate whether they are economically viable and whether a site is available for them. As part of any application, conditions requiring the provision of facilities to support the growth may be included as a requirement of development.</p> <p>As part of the Forward Planning team's work on the emerging Local Development Framework, the need for new schools and facilities will be assessed. If there are needs resulting from development on the Porton Down site, the applicant will be required to make a contribution towards these facilities.</p> <p>This difficulty is identified in para 6.6.3 of the Masterplan and where possible areas where shared facilities and infrastructure can go will be identified.</p> <p>Current rights of way are set out on the Definitive map held by Wiltshire County Council and alterations to rights of way will be subject to a due process involving separate consultation. The Masterplan does not propose any alterations to rights of way, although given the sensitive landscape setting, the need for security on the site and in the interest of public safety, there will always be a balance to strike.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has advised that the organisations should discuss proposal with them to ensure that the issue of water abstraction is resolved.</p> <p>The support of the respondent is noted.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<p>supported.</p> <p><u>Rainwater drainage</u> Rainwater gets into Church Road, Idmiston and Winterslow Road. This must be addressed before any further development.</p> <p><u>Screening of buildings</u> Support for inclusion of screening within the Development Brief.</p>	<p>Future development will be required to identify potential problems including flooding, and where necessary propose mitigation measures. New text will be added to the development brief to ensure that planning guidance on flooding is a consideration.</p> <p>The support of the respondent is noted</p>	<p>In para 2.3 of the Development Brief add 'PPS25 Development and Flood risk: It is recognised that development will increase runoff and this must be fully addressed as part of any future development.'</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>
27	Charlotte Rose Wiltshire Wildlife Trust		<p><u>Masterplan</u> Masterplan was comprehensive document but did appear vague in parts, as there is no fixed plan for the site.</p> <p>Dstl farm and CEPR White Hut site proposed for demolition. These buildings could harbour bats as well as other protected species. Natural England should be consulted on these issues. The main Dstl site and CEPR 15ha Greenfield site may also be redeveloped and a survey would be required here.</p> <p>Support for measures to address transport problems including car sharing, shuttle buses and possible reopening of railway station.</p> <p>No mention of green infrastructure throughout document. This needs to be included. It is crucial that the landscape maintains its connectivity and habitats do not become</p>	<p>The purpose of the Masterplan is to identify the future development area of the site. It is not intended to be overly detailed or descriptive, as this detail will be provided in subsequent development briefs and applications. As development intentions for the site become known, the Masterplan will be updated.</p> <p>Before any application can be determined, the Local Planning Authority will require that any necessary studies be carried out and for parts of the site this will include a bat survey and/or assessment of protected species. This could be carried out as part of an Environmental Impact Assessment.</p> <p>The support of the respondent is noted</p> <p>The organisations are aware of the designations on the landscape and this will have to be addressed as part of any planning application. This will also involve consultations with such</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<p>fragmented.</p> <p>More could be done to incorporate sustainable design. SUDS ensure that runoff could be channelled into several ponds. The bat/bird/bug boxes and native planting mentioned would act to enhance the site for wildlife. Important that energy consumption is minimised. Install energy efficient equipment. Replace incinerators with combined heat and power plant.</p> <p>Support for use of renewable energy fuels. More mention is needed of renewable fuels such as solar cells and small wind turbines. The trust would like to see a 'commitment' to using some form of renewable power.</p> <p>Would like to be consulted on issues of protected sites.</p> <p>Part of the site affected by the plans is inhabited by UK Biodiversity Action Plan priority species. There is nothing proposed to enhance the habitat for these species. This should be included.</p>	<p>bodies as the Environment Agency and Natural England.</p> <p>In chapter 5.4 the Masterplan does state that design criteria considerations of the proposed developments will need to include sustainable design features and energy management. 6.4.3 also elaborates on this and explains that all new development will have to incorporate sustainable design features. The exact features to be installed and added to development will be set out in development briefs and at the application stage when the details of the development are known.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>This is agreed and text will be inserted to ensure development protects and enhances these species.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>Insert new para after 6.1.3 in the Masterplan to state 'It is recognised that part of the site affected by the plans is inhabited by UK Biodiversity Action Plan priority species. Where these species are identified, it must be ensured that development protects and where possible enhances these species and their habitats.'  Insert new para after 4.28 in the Development Brief to state: 'It is recognised that the site affected by the Development Brief is inhabited by UK Biodiversity Action Plan</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<p><u>Development Brief</u> Trust would like to see brief widened to include sustainability principles.</p> <p>Recommend that a survey for reptiles be completed and mitigation identified if necessary. There is mention of partridge using the site and if rare species was seen, a further survey and mitigation strategy may be required.</p> <p>Support acknowledgement that an Appropriate Assessment will be required, and would like to be consulted during this process.</p> <p>Note that the landscape management has not been finalised and wish to be consulted during the process.</p> <p>Intention to plant only native species and promoting wildlife corridors is supported.</p> <p>Support for attention paid to sensitive lighting. Likely that bats use the area and light should therefore face downward.</p> <p>Disappointed to see that PPS7 and PPS1 have not been included.</p>	<p>Para 4.39 of the Brief sets out Sustainability Principles for the site which development should aim to achieve.</p> <p>Any application on the site will be required to address wildlife issues before it can be determined. The applicants are in the process of carrying out an Environmental Impact Assessment and these issues will be considered as part of it and if appropriate, mitigation measures will be proposed.</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>The support of the respondent is noted</p> <p>The support of the respondent is noted</p> <p>It is agreed that PPS7 and PPS1 should be included in the Development Brief.</p>	<p>priority species. Where these species are identified, it must be ensured that development protects and where possible enhances these species and their habitats.”</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>Add text to section 2.3 of the Development Brief to state: ‘PPS7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas: This sets out planning policies to ensure</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<p>Term sustainable energy needs to be defined.</p> <p>Support measures to reduce energy consumption, such as buildings orientated to the south. More mention of sustainable design features needed. Could include provision of SUDS or green roofs.</p> <p>Sourcing of sustainable materials for building is supported. PBTC could request that all suppliers have some form of green credentials.</p> <p>Supports the use of Waste Hierarchy and wants this promoted throughout the development.</p> <p>Inaccurate to state that CFCs and halons cause global warming. They destroy the ozone layer and cause thinning and holes in the ozone. Brief needs to be amended to state that CFCs and halons must not be used at all.</p>	<p>This term cannot be located in the document. The term 'sustainable energy management' is mentioned on page 17 and examples are given of what this term applies to.</p> <p>Para 4.44 of the Development Brief does state that 'New development at PBTC should seek to utilise environmentally sensitive construction methods, materials and strategies'. The Brief will be amended to ensure that appropriate renewable energy technology will be considered in the design of the site. This will include technology as solar photovoltaic panels. The exact design features to be used will form part of any planning application submitted.</p> <p>The support of the respondent is noted. Para 4.52 of the Development Brief states that 'The use of timber in developments should be limited to those species sourced from managed sustainable forests and plantations...All timber used should, where possible, have a certificate provided by an organisation (such as the Forest Stewardship Council).' It is considered that this section ensures that PBTC will require sustainable sourcing of materials for buildings.</p> <p>The support of the respondent is noted</p> <p>The Development Brief does recognise that CFCs, HFCs and halons damage the ozone layer. In order to stop confusion, para 4.51 will be removed.</p>	<p>that development in rural areas is sustainable with enhanced economic development and services.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>A new bullet will be inserted into para 4.39 of the Development Brief to state 'Appropriate renewable energy technology'.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>Remove para 4.51 in the Development Brief and retitle the section 'Sustainable materials'.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
28	Robert Lloyd Natural England	Support	<p>Not opposed in principle to the proposals as long as they do not adversely affect the statutory designations of Porton Down SSSI/SAC/SPA and the River Avon system SSSI/SAC.</p> <p><u>Development Brief</u> Aware that PBTC will be submitting an Environmental Statement as part of the EIA and this will inform whether there may be potential effects. Natural England will await the production on the ES before commenting further.</p>	<p>All applications for development will have to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impacts on statutory designations. PBTC are currently undertaking an Environmental Impact Assessment of part of the site which will include assessing whether development will impact on any statutory designations and if so, mitigation measures will be proposed.</p> <p>Comments noted</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>
29	Northern Area Committee	Neutral	<p>Economic benefits of expansion welcomed</p> <p>Volume and speed of traffic in Idmiston problem and controls need to be in place.</p> <p>Concern expressed over efficacy of green travel plan for the site.</p> <p>Masterplan needs to demonstrate what benefits the development of the site could bring to</p>	<p>The support of the respondent is noted.</p> <p>A joint travel plan will be produced by the three organisations on the site with firm commitments to sustainable travel and transport improvements. The most recent permission for development makes a number of commitments to transport improvements. Traffic speeds need to be monitored in Idmiston to provide an evidence base to justify installing traffic calming measures (or a 20mph zone) including better provision for pedestrians.</p> <p>A joint travel plan capable of delivery by all parties on the site will be prepared within the first year of the Masterplan being adopted. This will include targets and proposed methods of sustainable travel to and from the site. By enshrining targets into the Masterplan it will ensure that all development in the future contributes to reducing car travel to the site and promotes the use of other modes of transport.</p> <p>It is considered that future development at Porton Down will bring wide ranging benefits to the</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>Update 6.3.9 to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008. Speeding is an issue for the Local Police and the Highways Authority.</p> <p>Update 6.3.9 to include a commitment to agree a site wide travel plan with Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council by March 2008.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<p>Salisbury District</p> <p>Future development intentions of HPA are not clear</p> <p>Organisations at Porton Down need to liaise to provide a coherent and organised plan for future expansion.</p> <p>New bullet point on p41 of Masterplan should be added stating 'Local concerns about issues arising from transport and traffic should be addressed.'</p>	<p>district. The Masterplan shows that there will be many benefits to the area including job creation, transport and highways improvements and the creation of shared facilities for public use.</p> <p>The future development intentions of HPA are not clear, as they are not proposing to develop for a number of years. The Masterplan will be revised and updated as plans and proposals for development on the site emerge. It is not possible to set out exact development requirements for far in the future as circumstances can change.</p> <p>The three organisations meet regularly to discuss future plan and agree commitments. As new development proposals come forward, the Masterplan will be revised accordingly.</p> <p>It is agreed that a new bullet point should be inserted to deal with the public's concerns</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>Additional bullet point to be added into 6.3.8 of the Masterplan to state 'Whenever and wherever possible, address locally known concerns about issues arising from transport and traffic to and from the Porton Down site in association with the local highways authorities.'</p>
30	Ellie Challans Environment Agency	Support	<p><u>Masterplan</u> Section 6.4.3: 'Surface water drainage' should be added as an additional bullet point</p> <p>Section 6.5.3: Appropriate precautions necessary to protect controlled waters against derogation of quality or quantity. Provision of additional water likely to be subject to restrictions and appropriate consents and permits will be necessary together with discussion with Environment Agency.</p>	<p>Due to the nature of the site, this will always be a consideration anyway It is agreed that this should be added to the list.</p> <p>Point noted</p>	<p>Add 'Surface water drainage' to list of bullet points in para 6.4.3 of the Masterplan.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<p>Section 6.5.4: Suggest including 'Opportunity shall be taken to implement a sustainable drainage system to improve water quality and minimise flood risk.'</p> <p>Scope to separate clean surface water from roofs of buildings from the foul drainage system. Discharge to groundwater would help recharge aquifer.</p> <p>Any further private drainage installation will be regulated through the use of Consents to Discharge. Future applications should be aware of this.</p> <p><u>Development Brief</u> Section 2.3: Include the following: Planning Policy Statement 23- Planning and Pollution Control (PPS23). After development and use the land should not be capable of being determined as Contaminated land. Planning Policy Guidance 25- Development and Flood Risk (PPG25 and PPS25). A flood risk assessment will be required which should address the issues of surface water run-off.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> The documents do not refer to the investigation and remediation of contaminated land. Recommend that developers follow the risk management framework provided in CLR11, 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination' when dealing with the land affected by contamination.</p>	<p>Due to the nature of the site, this will always be a consideration anyway. It is agreed that this text should be added to the Masterplan.</p> <p>Precise design features will be agreed at the application stage.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>It is agreed that PPS23 and PPS25 should be added to the list of National Guidance.</p> <p>The issue of contamination will be dealt with in the Environmental Impact Statement, which is currently being carried out by PBTC. Comments noted</p>	<p>Add 'Surface water drainage' to list of bullet points in para 6.4.3 of the Masterplan.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>Add text to the Development Brief to state 'PPS23 Planning and Pollution Control: This sets out planning policies on ensuring development considers impacts from pollution.' Add 'PPS25 Development and Flood risk: Where it is recognised that development may increase runoff this will be fully addressed as part of any future development proposal.</p> <p>NO CHANGE</p>



Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<p><u>Pollution prevention</u>  Risks associated with construction phase should be assessed, and appropriate mitigation proposed. Safeguards should be implemented during the construction phase to minimise risk of pollution and detrimental effects to water. This should cover: use of plant machinery, oil/chemicals and materials, the use and routing of heavy plant and vehicles, location and form of work, storage areas and compounds, control and removal of spoil and wastes and location and disturbance of contaminated land.</p>	<p>This is agreed and PBTC are currently undertaking an Environmental Impact Assessment, which will deal with these issues and propose mitigation measures if necessary.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p>