

WILTSHIRE COUNCIL

REPORT TO THE STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

AGENDA ITEM NO 7

Date of Meeting	22 nd September 2009		
Application Number	S/2009/0794		
Site Address	Solstice Park, Porton Road, Amesbury, Salisbury, SP4 7LJ		
Proposal	Proposed Construction of Regional Distribution Centre and Associated Infrastructure Works including Roads, Parking Areas, Drainage and Landscape Planting.		
Applicant	Kenmore Capital Portfolio LTD c/o Pegasus Planning Group		
Town/Parish Council	Amesbury		
Electoral Division	Amesbury East	Unitary Member:	Cllr J Noeken
Grid Ref	Eastings: 417168 Northings: 141591		
Type of application	FULL / Major Development		
Case Officer	Andrew Bidwell	Principal Planning Officer	

Reason for the application being considered by Committee

The Director EDPH does not consider it prudent to exercise delegated powers due to:

This application as submitted is a material departure from the adopted SDC Local Plan policy E8A.

The impact of the proposal would result in the bringing forward of a significantly larger area of land for development than is provided for before the expiration of the life of the Local Plan. Members should note that should the council support the officer recommendation the application would need to be referred to the Secretary of State for his determination because it is a material departure from policy E8A.

In addition this proposal is considered to meet criteria for referring planning applications to the Secretary of State for the Environment as set out in Circular 02/2009, Consultation (England) Direction 2009 in so far as the proposal (amongst other things) :

- Is to be carried out on land which is edge of centre, out of centre or out of town; and
- Is not in accordance with one or more provisions of the development plan in force in relation to the area in which the development is to be carried out; and
- Consists of or includes the provision of a building or buildings where the floor space created by the development is: 5,000 square metres or more

Purpose of Report

1. To consider the above application and to recommend that conditional planning permission be granted.

To consider the above application and to recommend that planning permission be

GRANTED subject to conditions following completion of a legal agreement in respect of the following matters:

1. To apply the provisions of the section 106 Agreement dated 20th January 2000 (as varied) to this application.
2. To vary the section 106 as follows-
 - a. To increase the limit of land to be developed before 2011
 - b. To vary the areas of open space / Strategic Landscape areas, to take account of this application and any consequential amendments to the landscape management plan.
 - c. To vary the location of the main Off road / Cycle way
 - d. To remove the local centre provision
 - e. To enhance the Travel Plan
 - f. To amend the approved Landscape Management Plan
3. To secure the Lorry Routeing Agreement provisions under the following Heads of Terms;
 - a. To prevent Lorries using the C11, C32 (north of the A303) the B390, B3083, B3086 and London Road, Amesbury.
 - b. To restrict the number of lorries using the A345, North of Countess Road Junction and South of Stock Bottom junction.
 - c. Traffic Regulations on local roads where considered necessary by the Highways Authority.
 - d. Establishing a Local Forum for dealing with concerns and issues raised by local people regarding lorry movements as a direct result of the development.
 - e. To set up a data scheme to enable lorry movements to be recorded and monitored.
 - f. To develop an effective means of enforcing the restrictions placed upon lorry movements.
 - g. To make a payment to ensure the delivery of a Toucan Crossing
4. To make any further consequential amendments found to be necessary.

and following confirmation that the Secretary of State does not wish to call in this application for his own determination,

following completion of the above legal agreement by 31 March 2010 the Director of Development (Development Control and Heritage) be authorised to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

Main Issues

2. The main issues in respect of the proposal are considered to be:
 1. Planning Policy Context
 2. Principle of Development
 3. Environmental Statement (ES) issues including;
 - Socio Economic Issues
 - Landscape and Visual Issues
 - Transport
 - Noise and Vibration
 - Air Quality
 - Hydrology and Drainage
 - Archaeology
 4. Whether the reasons for refusal of S/2007/2518 have been overcome

In this part of the report the following issues included in the refusal reason for the previous scheme will be addressed:

- Design
- Materials
- Scale Layout
- Residential amenity
- Disturbance from noise
- Environmental / highway impact

Additionally main planning issues in this case centre on, inter alia, a consideration of whether the proposal will provide the same, or a very similar, number of employment opportunities that the site is capable of providing / achieving with a mix of smaller employment uses. This proposal must also be capable of providing jobs that meet the skills of the likely employee base in the Amesbury Area. Clearly with a proposal such as this additional material planning considerations will also centre on the likely demonstrable wider environmental impacts of the proposal.

3. Site Description

3.1 Solstice Park is located to the south of the A303, on the north eastern fringe of Amesbury. The site slopes gently from the north to lower areas in the south, with a higher area of ground in the south eastern corner. The site is located within development Zone D and comprises 27.09 ha of the (65 ha) that constitutes Solstice Park in its entirety. The site comprises an open area of mostly rough grassland. There is an area of recently planted native trees and shrubs on the southern corner of the site which forms part of the approved strategic landscaping.

3.1.2 The Zones are set out in the approved Solstice Park Master Plan as Special Development Area (SDA) and Local centre (LC), to the north, Public Open space (POS3) and Employment Office land (E02) to the north east. Future Development Areas and further land allocations for Employment Industrial (E12) and Mixed Employment (E11/E01) lies to the west

3.1.3 This surrounding land comprises a mix of existing built development areas for which development has been consented and other areas that are awaiting applications to be submitted (refer to planning history).

3.1.4 To the north of the A303, and to the east of the site, land is in mainly agricultural uses and further to the south east is Boscombe Down Airfield and complex.

3.1.5 Solstice Park is bounded on the north side by the A303 with the main Solstice Park junction located at the North West and northeast corners of the Park. From the Solstice Park junction, London Road links westwards to Amesbury, Porton Road passes south to residential areas and Boscombe Down and hence to Salisbury via the A345 and Stock Bottom, and Salisbury Road leads north to Bulford and Durrington. The Countess Roundabout junction of the A303 and the A345 is approximately 1.5km to the west of Solstice Park.

3.1.6 Amesbury Road (Byway AMES1) defines the eastern boundary of the park and a further link eastwards from Amesbury Road is provided by bridleway AMES3A. This link skirts the edge of Boscombe Down Airfield, partly utilizing the alignment of the dismantled railway line.

3.1.7 Bridleway AMES29 crosses the site from Amesbury Road from a point on the eastern boundary close to Ratfyn Barrows. To the north of the A303, and within the wider landscape, public rights of way provide a network of recreational routes in the area.

3.1.8 The south and south - west of the site is bounded by a mixture of residential development including (in part on the boundary itself) the extensive Beverly Hills Mobile Home Park and the Stonehenge Estate, comprising several residential closes accessed from Raleigh Crescent.

4. Location and site plans are attached at **Appendices 1 and 2.**

5. Relevant Planning History

5.1 07/2518: application for the proposed construction of a Regional Distribution centre & associated infrastructure including roads, parking areas, drainage landscaping & planting. This application was refused at the Planning & Regulatory committee (of the old Salisbury district council), at its meeting held 9/12/08, (refer to section 11 of this report for reasons)

5.1.2 Solstice Park is allocated for employment and leisure purposes in the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan by policy E8A. This allocation relates to the whole site, which amounts to 65 hectares of open land for which a master plan was approved in 1999 by the Northern Area committee.

5.1.3 The master plan together with its implementation plan is set out to provide; the broad disposition and implementation of land uses proposed, including development “cells”, roads, Strategic landscaping and open space. This has been subsequently amended through developments in terms of design, layout although it follows the same principles.

5.1.4 S/1999/0721, O/L planning permission for comprehensive development of the whole site for employment and leisure purposes (including within use class B1 B2 B8 C1) together with roads, footpaths, cycle way, landscaping, sewers, alteration of ground levels and associated works generally in accordance with the principles illustrated within the above approved development brief and master plan. Approved S106 26/01/200

5.1.6 The following list of relevant planning history is provided showing those implemented to date

Application number	Proposal	Decision
02/485	Section 73 application to vary condition No 3, 4, 14 and 20 on consent No. S/1999/721 to provide: (1) Specified dates for the approval of reserved matters (2) To permit commencement of any approved earth works and landscaping scheme before works have commenced on the Folly Bottom Junction (3) To permit earth works and landscaping on land in excess of 22.75 hectares	A S 106 30/07/02
02/1714	Reserved matters application to address planning conditions 7 & 8 on consent S/02/485 (structural landscaping)	AC 03.02.03

03/2481	Variation to planning condition 9 on consent ref s/2002/485 to permit commencement of built development in advance of the implementation of the structural landscape planting	A S 106 01.06.04
<i>and on the remainder of Solstice Park:</i>		
03/0029	Approval of Reserved Matters Proposed development of B1 uses together with detailed drainage proposals and associated parking, landscaping and access roads at Solstice Park. Not built	AC 02.04.03
03/0030	Approval of Reserved Matters Proposed development of B2 and B8 and ancillary B1 uses together with detailed drainage proposals and associated parking, landscaping and access roads at Solstice Park	AC 02.04.03
Superseded by :-		
04/0755	Approval of Reserved Matters Proposed development of B2 and B8 and ancillary B1 uses together With detailed drainage proposals and associated parking, landscaping And access roads at Solstice Park. Implemented in part only	AC 01/06/04
04/777	Proposed 149 bed hotel (c1) PFS,) family pub and restaurant (2) (A3) assoc parking, landscaping and access ways with detailed drainage proposals. All built.	AC 18.10.04
04/2203	Reserved matters – Proposed development of B2 and B8 and ancillary B1 uses with detailed drainage, Associated parking and landscaping	AC 14.01.05
04/2424	Approval of reserved matters. Proposed development of part zone A including access road for B1, B1c, B2 and B8 uses. Substantially built and partly occupied	AC 01/02/05

04/2603	Revised strategic landscape planting to southern boundary of Solstice Park	AC 15/3/05
05/909	Proposed restaurant a3 (and ancillary A5 use to serve roadside service area. Built and operating	AS106 9.12.05
05/1430	Application for extension to hotel and variation to condition 2 of previous application S/04/777	AC 08.09.05 (+S 106)
05/2062	Offices C2. Partly built and substantially vacant	AS106 05/01/06
06/2118	Variation to condition 7 of s/2005/2062 to permit phasing of landscaping implementation	AC 11/12/06
06/2326	New leisure development to include new leisure building outdoor courts, parking and landscaping at plot bw 2/3. Not implemented	AC 02/02/07
07/0518	New leisure centre development to include amended leisure impact assessment additional pedestrian access and relocation of cycle parking. Not implemented	AS106 26/07/07
08/0147	Change of use from b1, b2 and b8 to ambulance station (sui generis) Implemented	AC 13/03/08
08/1988	Proposed construction of a Regional Distribution Centre and associated Infrastructure works, including roads, parking areas, drainage and landscape planting (revision to design of buildings app under S/2008/1113) Under construction	AC 24/02/09
08/1661	New build development of 92 no. place, single storey children's nursery with Parking. Not implemented	AC 31/03/09

6. Proposal

61 This application will result in the construction of 2 new “state of the art” Regional Distribution Centre buildings together with ancillary 3 storey offices, lorry hard standings, access roads, car parking, servicing and landscaping.

6.1.2 The total development will consist of approximately 94,000 sqm split between two buildings referred to as DC1 and DC2. DC1 will be the bigger of the two with a Gross External floor area of circa 57,000 sqm. This will include 5% for main office space and associated warehouse offices. Space will be provided for segregated car and lorry parking together with lorry loading and unloading facilities.

6.1.3 There will be 50m wide service yards to either side of DC1 and full vehicular access around the perimeter. Similarly, there will also be 5% of main office space and an associated warehouse office to serve DC2. A 50m wide yard will serve one side of the building and perimeter access will be for fire tender only.

6.1.4 Members attention is drawn to the following;

The application has been subject to a range of reassessments to demonstrate the way in which the proposal seeks to mitigate the concerns raised with the previous refused application. The actual changes to the scheme are set out as follows:

- Location of Plot 2 further to the north
- Extension of plot 2 offices to articulate the building and provide a visual and acoustic screen to the delivery yard from residential areas to the south.
- Inclusion of a 3 metre acoustic fence on the southern boundary.
- Reassessment of landscape planting strategy on the southern boundary
- including an integrated landscape treatment of the acoustic fence referred to above.
- Updated landscape planting strategy and identification of locations where existing screen planting will be supplemented.
- Inclusion of lighting strategy plan and details for the RDC and immediate surroundings.
- An updated planning statement incorporating commentary about the previous decision, the nature of an RDC, need for RDC's, progress of development on Solstice Park, planning policy interpretation and introduction to employment issues in socio economic report.
- Updated Socio – economic assessment including details about the employment provision, the nature of job opportunities available in RDC's,
- examples of job generation in other RDC's and balance of jobs/housing in the Amesbury Community Area and wider South Wiltshire.
- Noise and vibration assessment – retesting noise sensitive receptors and advising on noise attenuation measures to be incorporated into the scheme in liaison with the Council's EHO.
- Traffic – reappraisal of traffic flows and capacity (in liaison with Wilts council Highway Officers and the HAg) – dealing with the wider and local road network.
- Inclusion in Traffic Assessment of traffic management measures on road network.
- Hydrology and Drainage – Revised drainage report to deal with changes to the RDC building. (not previously an issue).
- Updated air quality report taking into account the findings of the revised traffic assessment. (not previously an issue).
- Updated Waste and waste management plan.
- Updated Archaeology report.

6.1.5 This application is subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and as such the headings contained within the resultant 3 volumes “Environmental Statement” form the basis of the main material planning considerations / planning issues. This provides a very extensive and detailed analysis of the likely immediate and wider environmental impacts of the proposal. As such The ES should be read in conjunction with this report.

7. Planning Policy

7.1 The following Development Plan policies are considered relevant to the determination of this planning application:

Saved policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan June 2003 – particularly policy E8A

Other Material Planning Considerations include;

- The emerging Salisbury District Local Development Framework
- The approved Development Brief for Solstice Park
- The Amesbury Market Towns Partnership “Community Action Plan”

7.1.2 All relevant planning policies are set out in attached **Appendix 3**.

7.3 National Land Use Policy

PPS 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development

PPG 4 – Industrial and Commercial Development and Small Firms

PPG 13 - Transport

PPS 10 – Sustainable Waste Management

8. Consultations

8.1 Town Council

Amesbury Town Council agreed to no objection to this proposal, but wished that the following conditions be applied:

1. Vehicles left on the site overnight are not permitted to have engines and any attached refrigeration units left running whilst parked up.
2. A pedestrian Crossing is installed on Underwood Drive at a point close to the Archers Gate Estate entrance roundabout.

8.1.1 That parking restrictions be imposed either side of the above roundabout

8.2 Wiltshire Council Highways

8.2.1 The outline planning application for Solstice Park assumed a higher level of traffic for this portion of the site than would be generated by the subject use, so the impact of the general traffic is judged to be acceptable. The key concern is the level and routing of the HGVs which would operate from the site, which are forecast to be in the order of 1,500 movements per day.

8.2.3 Extensive discussions have been held between ourselves, PFA (the transport planning consultants acting on behalf of the applicant) and the applicant to seek agreement about how the

routeing of these vehicles could be managed. We have reached agreement in principle as to the level of HGVs that would be permitted on particular routes of concern and an outline mechanism for monitoring these levels.

8.2.4 Following our meeting at the Solstice Park Offices on 24th June 2008, when the proposed split of requirements between a planning agreement and conditions was provisionally agreed with the developers and their representatives, I can set out the following requirements of the highway authority.

8.2.5 It was agreed that the following general heads of terms should be covered in a planning agreement to be completed between the local planning authority and the developer prior to permission being granted:

- 1 Defined routes to be barred to lorry traffic associated with the development site.
- 2 Specific restrictions to be applied to the number and timing of lorries using the A345, both south and north of Amesbury.
- 3 Specific restrictions (e.g. by TRO) to be applied to defined local roads within Amesbury town, to prevent local rat-running of traffic between the site and the A345.
- 4 Scheme required enabling all lorry traffic using the site to be identified and the data recorded for monitoring purposes. Data to include, but not be restricted to, information about routes used, driver names etc
- 5 The developer to take specific actions to ensure that routeing arrangements are made clear to all lorry traffic visiting the site
- 6 Measures to ensure that agreed routeing arrangements are enforceable, with appropriate sanctions against errant drivers
- 7 Initiation of a local forum (liaison meeting) to facilitate discussion/debate of concerns arising from site operations.
- 8 Provision for annual reporting on operations.
- 9 Provision to fund construction of Toucan crossing on Porton Road

8.2.6 Conditions are sought for:

Provision of New Offsite Road Infrastructure

Travel Plan

8.2.7 Servicing and Parking

8.3. *Highways Agency*

8.3.1 Make the following comments which are in line with the DfT Document Guidance on Transport Assessment March 2007 and the DfT Circular 02 07 Planning and the Strategic Road Network

8.3.2 Development Proposal

8.3.3 The Transport Assessment has been submitted with reference to a revised planning application for a Regional Distribution Centre RDC

8.3.4 As with the original submission the Agency accepts that the planned 94 144 sq m of B8 development will have a smaller impact on the Strategic Road Network than the B1 B2 B8 development on a similar scale for which the land in question is designated and that the proposed B8 use will have no material impact on the A303 at the Countess Roundabout Therefore The Agency has no objection to the proposed development subject to the production of a Construction Management Plan and Travel Plan

8.4. *Environment Agency*

8.4.1 No objection to the proposed development subject to planning conditions and informatives being included on any permission granted covering the following issues:-

Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage

Pollution Prevention

Water Efficiency

Waste Management

8.5. *Environmental Health*

8.5.1 Further to the above application I would make the following observations and recommendation should you be minded to grant consent:.

8.5.1 Construction Noise

8.5.2 There are a number of residential premises in proximity to the development site. I would recommend that the conditions be applied to avoid excessive disturbance and causing nuisance to the occupiers of these residential premises (see conditions)

8.5.2 Dust control during construction

8.5.3. There have been complaints received in the response to issues associated with dust generated in the past. I would recommend that a condition be attached to this application requiring a scheme to control and eliminate as far as possible dust emissions from the site. Section 7.8 of the Environmental Statement (Mitigation of effects – Construction Phase) contains measures that are acceptable to this end.

8.5.4 Noise control from operations

8.5.5 I note under the previous application relating to this site concerns were raised over the adequacy of the noise assessment. As a way of mitigating the impact of the site on the neighbouring residential properties a scheme of mitigation was recommended in the form of an acoustic barrier.

8.5.6 Under the current application this has been put forward as a measure that the developer is prepared to take however details of this are lacking and if it is present on the plans of the site it is not annotated. As such I would recommend that a condition be imposed to secure the details (see conditions).

8.5.7 In addition to this, the facility to allow HGVs to connect to a mains power supply at the RDC was also recommended as a condition so that HGVs need not keep their engines turning over to keep the refrigeration units operative. The predicted increase in night time noise of +4dB is considered to be of marginal significance and not below marginal significance as is stated in section 6.7.23 of the Environmental Statement. BS 4142 is not this specific and states “A difference of around +5 dB is of marginal significance”.

8.5.8 It is not clear in the application whether these connections will be available and whether the expected increase in noise is due to engines turning over and the noise of refrigeration units or simply the latter. All reasonable steps should be taken to keep the increases in noise as low as possible which includes the facility for HGVs to connect to mains power in the loading bays.

It is recommended that a condition be imposed to cover this issue (see conditions) following issues:

8.5.9 Plant and machinery:

8.5.10 In line with paragraph 6.8.10 and 6.8.11 of the Environmental Statement we would recommend that conditions be applied covering the following issues:

8.5.12 Exterior lighting:

8.5.13 So as to protect the amenity of the nearby residents I would recommend that a condition be attached to this application requiring a scheme to eliminate as far as possible adverse impact of artificial light from the site. The Lighting Strategy submitted contains an appropriate approach and details appropriate measures that are acceptable to this end.

8.5.14 Air quality

8.5.15 Public Protection Services of Wiltshire Council have developed draft supplementary planning guidance on air quality. Whilst we acknowledge the need to maintain and develop the economic infrastructure of the county it must be recognised that this frequently has a detrimental impact on the environment. The council is obliged to monitor air quality having regard to national objectives and to implement measures where objectives may be breached.

8.5.16 Provision of 438 car parking spaces also has implications for air quality. The direction of these vehicle movements is not controllable as is the case with HGVs using the A303. Adopting the polluter pays principle and having regard to our draft supplementary planning document on air quality, a formula for developer contributions is used to calculate the contribution, and is based on the relative contribution to emissions by cars and HGVs, having regard to projected costs for air quality monitoring over the life of the LDF.

8.5.17 Applying this formula PPS would therefore seek a contribution of £15,768.00 to air quality monitoring and discharge of its duties in respect of the Environment Act 1995 Part IV. However, currently Wiltshire council finds itself in a position where air quality is deteriorating necessitating the declaration of further Air quality management areas. All relate to transport sources, so developers will have to have greater regard to the implications of emissions associated with their developments, particularly transport undertaking. The further comments made by the applicants regarding the above development and in particular the comments with regard to green travel. In these particular circumstances it is appropriate for the council to not require developer contributions regarding air quality in this case. (for applicants further comments see appendices)

8.5.18 The use of the A303 as the primary link road/access to the RDC for HGVs is of paramount importance when considering air quality. Failure to use this road in favour of other local routes would have an adverse effect on air quality and a contribution from the developer would be sought in line with PPG23 and through a s.106 agreement. Due to the size of the RDC and number of HGV loading bays and spaces the contribution is calculated at £122,484.00. This would not be sought in the circumstances that HGV movements are strictly made to and from the site along the A303 which it may be appropriate to control via condition or an s.106 agreement.

8.5.19 These figures may be reduced subject to demonstrating that “green measures” are incorporated in to the design.

8.6 *Wessex Water*

8.6.1 I refer to the recent planning application submitted in respect of the above and can confirm our engineers comments on the proposals as follows

8.6.2 Foul Drainage

- There are public foul sewers in the vicinity of the site

- There are private foul sewers serving the overall site which are under agreement for adoption in due course by Wessex Water
- The foul sewerage system does have adequate capacity to serve the proposals

8.6.3 Surface Water Drainage

- There are no public surface water sewers in the vicinity of the site.
- The planning application indicates the use of soakaways.

8.6.4 Sewage Treatment

- There is sewage treatment capacity available.
- There is adequate capacity at the terminal pumping station.

8.6.5 Water Supply

- There are water mains in the vicinity of the site which have the capacity to serve this development.

8.7. *English Heritage*

8.7.1 Do not wish to offer any comments on this occasion. The application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of specialist conservation advice.

8.8. *Natural England*

8.8.1 In this instance we have no further comments to make to those dated 30 January 2008 in response to a similar application under no. S/2007/2518. If the application is amended, Natural England should be re-consulted for a further 21 days in accordance with *Circular 08/2005*.

8.8.2 For clarity, the previous comments from Natural England are attached in the appendices

8.9. *Wiltshire Council Archaeology*

8.9.1 The environmental statement sets out a good summary of the archaeological issues and what archaeological investigations have been carried out. The key part being that a number of Bronze Age round barrows identified from the preliminary investigations were fully excavated as part of the outline planning permission for the development of the area.

8.9.2 However, there is one archaeological feature on the site that has only been sampled through excavation. This is an extensive Bronze Age ditch which runs through the northern part of the site. I understand that there will be further groundworks in the area of this ditch where it has not been removed by landscaping. I therefore recommend that a watching brief is carried out 200m either side of the feature to record any archaeological features which may be associated with the ditch. I advise the condition, as set out in DoE Circular 11/95, is placed on the application to ensure this takes place. (see conditions)

8.10. *South Wiltshire Economic Partnership*

8.10.1 Following on from our letter dated the 28 February 2008 expressing our support for the last planning application for the Regional Distribution Centre S 2007 2518 the partnership would like to renew its support for the above application

8.10.2 On various consultations with residents and other key partners the developers have taken steps

to ensure that their considerations have been met e.g. noise reduction which is very encouraging

8.10.3 As per our previous letter it was highlighted that the development could also stimulate further interest in the site and also the local community whilst ensuring that its use remains fit for the purpose of the business park

8.11. *MOD Safeguarding*

8.11.1 This site falls within the statutory height and technical safeguarding zone surrounding Boscombe

Down Aerodrome The MOD's principle concern is to ensure new developments do not infringe or inhibit operations on site

8.11.2 In relation to the above proposed development I can confirm that the Ministry of Defence has no safeguarding objections to this proposal providing that the heights of the buildings and any other structures including superstructures i.e. chimneys TV aerials etc are to be no higher than 20 metres Above Ground Level AGL

8.11.3 On reading the Architectural Design and Access Statement at 08 Appendix 1 Page 34 it was mentioned the use of small to medium scale turbines If this is to be implemented the MOD will need to be consulted on this.

8.11.4 The developer and Wiltshire County Council once in Planning should be made aware of the considerable noise from the aircraft and the airfield itself throughout the year day and night may impact on staff businesses and visitors to the development Developers and Wiltshire County Council should impress upon any co developers and all potential visitors and businesses etc and in the future any successor in title that MOD and QinetiQ will not alter flying routines or entertain any claims for damages in respect of noise from the airfield

8.12 *South West of England Regional Development Agency (SWERDA)*

8.12.1 We have considered the resubmitted application and believe that our previous comments are still relevant:

8.12.2 The South West RDA supports the proposed development subject to:

- The Wiltshire Council being satisfied that the proposed development will not have a deleterious effect on the range and choice of employment space available in the district to meet the needs of business. (refer to appendices for full response at appendix 3).

8.13 *South West Councils Regional Planning Body (RPB)*

8.13.1 Under the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act and accompanying Regulations the South West Strategic Leaders' Board (the executive arm of South West Councils), as the Regional Planning Body (RPB), has the role in assessing the consultations on proposals for development on how far they would impinge on the delivery of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). It has also the duty to respond to strategic planning applications and pre-application proposals and to assess if they would impinge on the delivery of the RSS.

8.13.2 The current RSS is RPG10 but you will also be aware that the new RSS is being produced. The Examination in Public (EIP) of the draft RSS (dRSS) closed on 6 July 2007 and the Panel Report was published in January 2008. The evidence base behind the emerging RSS can be considered as a material consideration and will carry greater weight the closer to publication the RSS gets. The Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the draft RSS were published on 22 July 2008 and public consultation closed on 24 October 2008.

8.13.3 The draft RSS is the RPB's agreed strategic planning position; however, the Proposed Changes clearly set the planning policy framework for the region. Although the RPB may not agree with some of the modifications made in the Proposed Changes, it is important to note that the Government's Proposed Changes now carry very significant weight as a material consideration, and must be taken into account when assessing LDDs and planning applications. (refer to appendices for the full comments of the RPB).

8.14 *Salisbury Campaign for Better Transport:*

8.14.1 Submitted an objection to the previous planning application – S/2007/2518 – and there is nothing in this revised planning application which causes us to alter our views.

8.14.2 The objection is on the following grounds:

Traffic

- Following the cancellation of the Highways Agency A303 Stonehenge scheme the emerging South West Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) no longer supports dualling of the A303 and this is a material consideration in the determination of this planning application.
- The traffic modelling used for the outline planning permission assumed that duelling of the A303 would occur. The situation where Solstice Park was fully operational with no improvements at Countess roundabout and westwards was never modelled. With hindsight A303 improvements should have been a condition of the original outline consent, but this did not happen.
- The Highways Agency should be taking the cancellation of A303 improvements into account in their response, however they do not appear to be considering the impact on the strategic road network without duelling in place.
- Predicted queue length at Countess and Longbarrow roundabouts has not been supplied (noting that the Highways Agency identified in 2003 that queue length could be up to 60 vehicles at Longbarrow, 70 at Countess, in the summer peak).
- Traffic modelling has failed to give a full picture of the situation with the latest proposals e.g. Andover Airport RDC, Stonehenge Visitor Centre and closure of A344/A303 junction.
- No consideration has been given to where HGVs might be able to park up on the A303 (noting that supplier vehicles may need to arrive at the RDC during a specific time window).
- There would be additional traffic, especially HGV traffic, on other unsuitable roads locally and around the district including Porton Road.
- There are no strategic lorry routes running south from the A303 in Wiltshire so HGVs would inevitably be using routes which are not suitable.
- There would be further congestion in and around Salisbury and elsewhere in Wiltshire.
- There is no detail of how the 'routing agreement' proposed will work, or be enforced, including such fundamental points as whether it can be applied to supplier vehicles. Given the congested nature of the A303 at certain times this agreement would not in any case prevent other non-RDC traffic diverting along local roads when the A303 is congested or blocked.
- This location for a RDC would be bringing a very large number of HGVs onto the A303 which would not otherwise be there.
- Comparisons with a 'reference case' which would generate more traffic (though only about 1/3rd of the volume of HGVs), does not mention that other business types would be able to make much more use of green travel planning to minimise vehicle use & road congestion. A

business whose raison d'être is the generation of lorry movements clearly has much more limited scope to reduce transport impacts.

8.14.3 Development Plan Policy

- This development is not in accordance with the Development Plan currently in force and this level of B8 (Storage & Distribution) usage is far in excess of that which the district is deemed to need. The Robert Wiseman Dairy distribution centre now being built at Solstice Park (planning application S/2008/1113) – will provide sufficient employment of this type for Amesbury.
- The development is contrary to the Stonehenge Management Plan since it increases the impact of traffic in the World Heritage site, with an estimated additional 655 HGVs a day crossing the WHS from this development alone.
- The policy in the structure plan to dual the A303 no longer applies following the cancellation of the Stonehenge scheme and the updates in the RSS.

8.14.4 Government Guidance

- This development is contrary to PPG4 since it would add unacceptably to congestion.

8.14.5 In combination assessment of impact on River Avon SAC

- Both construction and operation phases of the proposed RDC require an assessment of the impact on the River Avon SAC to take account of the in combination effects with other developments. There is no evidence that this has been undertaken.
- We conclude that there are numerous reasons why this planning application should be refused, the prime points being that there is already sufficient B8 development taking place at Solstice Park and the scale of the RDC development proposed in S/2009/0794 is totally unacceptable given the cancellation of plans to dual/improve the A303 and the need to protect the Stonehenge World Heritage site from the impact of traffic.

8.14.6 Detailed grounds for objection are attached in the appendices at **appendix 4 to follow**.

8.14.7 Members attention is drawn to the fact that the detailed comments from the Salisbury Campaign for Better Transport (set out in the appendices at appendix 3) are subject to a response from Wiltshire Council Highways (will be set out in **appendix 5** which will be circulated with late correspondence).

8.14.8 In relation to the comments above regarding "In combination Assessment of Impact on the River Avon SAC", a full 'Appropriate Assessment' has been carried out concluding that no further assessment work is necessary in this case. The Assessment is included in the Appendices at **appendix 6**.

8:15 *Wiltshire Council, Economy and Enterprise, Economic Development:*

8.15.1 No objections are raised.

8.16. *Wiltshire Council Spatial Planning:*

8.16.1 In relation to this proposal and the evolving Local Development Framework process (LDF) the current application is supported from a spatial planning point of view.

9. Publicity

9.1. The application has been advertised in the local press and by site notice.

A neighbour notification exercise has been undertaken and the following letters of representation have been received.

9.1.1 No's of support letters that have been received = 2

Summary of key points raised:

- In the current economic climate employment creation is of utmost importance
- Good for the long term viability of Amesbury together with the buildings of houses at Archers gate
- Solstice Park has been promoting itself for many years and should be supported when companies willing to locate there are found
- Amesbury has history of distribution with the NAAFI Amesbury transport, Gregory Transport
- This proposal will bring back jobs
- 1000 or more employees at the Distribution centre will inevitably lead to hundreds of other jobs.
- Hope consent will be granted for this important application
- Amesbury had a big NAAFI and Amesbury transport and the roads coped
- Development will bring no more traffic than years gone by
- Solstice park was created for businesses to come to Amesbury

9.1.2. No's of objection letters that have been received = 46

Summary of Key points raised:

- How ill the A303 cope with the extra traffic
- The A30 will become a rat run
- Proposal is unreasonably close to residential areas
- Proposal not in keeping with original plans
- Amesbury does not have the housing or, infrastructure to support such a large scheme
- Noise disturbance could be a problem
- Lighting could be a problem
- Other distribution centre related businesses are closing down
- Buildings are too large
- Don't want the lorries
- Opposed to any industry that operates outside of normal working hours
- Disused railway is home to wildlife
- Proposal will adversely affect quality of life
- Traffic will be a problem
- Air pollution during construction will be significant
- Proposal is in the wrong place close to residential properties
- Development is too large
- The application reports do not adequately explain why Amesbury is well placed for this development
- Unacceptable increase in traffic will result
- Traffic planning has not taken account of local conditions
- Amesbury does not have enough unemployed people to fill the jobs
- New proposal; does nothing to alleviate the noise and pollution from lorries
- Conditions of local roads are already in a state
- Ugly development should not be located so close to Stonehenge
- Development should not be allowed after previously being turned down
- Scale of development is too great
- Employment benefits are questionable impact on local roads including the A303 will be harmful

- Object to such a large development near to a World Heritage Site.
- Blot on the landscape
- Changes to the plans are superficial
- This proposal in combination with others including the UKLF site in Wilton will be too much for the area to cope with.
- Poor economic return for Wiltshire
- Traffic modelling is flawed
- Application fails to take account of the changed circumstances with the A303
- Proposal will result in the insertion of a monster in to the landscape
- Predictions of traffic flow and routeing are liable to be highly doubtful.
- Proposed closure of part of the A303 for repair will be made worse by this proposal.
- Noise assessment contains errors
- proposal will make living nearby untenable
- lorry routeing would be self regulated
- proposal fails to demonstrate that long term employment will benefit
- Noise will be a problem.
- Do not believe that local people will benefit from this development
- Locating next to residential area is wrong.
- Local road infrastructure is inadequate
- Rail is a better option for freight transport

10 Further Third Party comments received:

10.1 South Wiltshire CPRE

10.1,2 It is considered that the proposal will have a serious and deleterious impact on the area, mainly through generating too much traffic for the local road network. especially in view of the recent approval of the Tesco Andover RDC, and also the glow of lighting after dark will be seen from the World Heritage Site to the west.

10.2 The Stonehenge Chamber of Trade:

10.2.1 It is the view of the chamber of trade that such a scheme would offer much needed employment opportunities in the area and could help to encourage other businesses to locate to the site which would help to strengthen commerce in the area as a whole.

10.3 The Tintometer limited:

10.3.1 Reiterate objections to the application which would seriously blight the employment prospects of the districts people as well as the economic development of the area. The full comments are available in the Appendices

10.4 Small Business Advisory Service:

10.4.1 The Salisbury branch FSB committee are in support of the application on a purely business grounds that it would provide additional employment and indirect business opportunities for local businesses

10.5. Copies of consultation responses are available in the **Members' Room**.

11. Planning Considerations

11.1 Planning Policy Context / Principle of Development;

11.1.2 Section 54A of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 and Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that when in making a determination under the planning acts regard must be had to the provisions of the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

11.2 Planning Policy context;

11.2.1 The application forms part of a proposed employment site as identified on the Salisbury District Local Plan (adopted June 2003) Proposals Map. Policy E8A of the plan identifies 18 hectares of land on this site to come forward by 2011. Paragraph 5.13 clarifies that this forms part of a wider area of land comprising 62 hectares for long term future development. The supporting information provided by the applicant indicates that currently 4.78 hectares (2.23 employment and 2.55 leisure) is developed, with a further 9.52 hectares (8.29 employment and 1.23 leisure) of land permitted but not implemented. The remaining site area has an outline permission for B uses.

11.3 Policy E8A is at appendix 3;

11.4 The land is subject to an outline planning permission granted with a section 106 agreement 26/01/02 (see planning history). The Section 106 (In 5.1.2 of the agreement) provides for:-

11.4.1 "No more than 18 Hectares (net) of the site shall be developed for employment purposes and no more than 4.75 hectares (net) of the site shall be developed for leisure / hotel purposes and no further development for said purposes pursuant to the planning permission shall take place on the Site during the lifetime of the replacement local plan PROVIDED THAT at the date of publication of the next deposit draft local plan the Council shall review the extent to which it would be appropriate to vary this restriction in the light of policies contained in such draft plan shall review the requirements in relation to infrastructure and sustainable transport and shall assess additional requirements in respect of any further development and the developer shall enter into any agreement under Section 106 of the Act reasonably required by the Council to give effect to requirements reasonably imposed in connection with such further assessment".

11.5 Principle of Development;

11.5.1 Notwithstanding the issues related to the areas from which this proposal departs from policy, it is considered by officers that because the material considerations set out in this report outweigh the very specific requirements of the policy relating to the phasing of the site it is considered that the proposal adheres to the spirit of the objectives behind the policy. It can be argued therefore that "in principle" this proposal is acceptable.

12 Environmental Statement

12.1 This proposal is submitted with an Environmental Statement (ES)

12.1.2 The ES is set out under the following headings / sections;

- Introduction
- Planning Policy Context
- Socio Economic Issues
- Landscape and Visual Issues
- Transport
- Noise and Vibration

- Air Quality
- Hydrology and Drainage
- Archaeology
- Summary

12.1.3 The following section of the report will comment on each section of the ES in the order set out above. However, as planning policy context is set out above the comments will commence with Socio Economic Issues.

12.2. Socio Economic Issues

12.2.1 This part of the ES assesses the social and economic implications of the proposed Regional Distribution Centre in relation to the impacts on the supply of land for employment; the numbers of jobs the RDC will accommodate; the labour force arising from the surrounding area's population; future growth in the local labour supply; and the implications for employment structure, commuting and housing demand.

12.2.2 Members are advised that a full detail relating to these issues are included within the Environmental Statement Volume 1. However the following concluding summary of the points and issues covered within the ES is set out below and remains essentially unaltered from the previous application. This is except that the revised ES sets out the reasons as to how the applicants consider the previous refusal reasons, in particular reason 4), and have been addressed.

12.2.3 Summary;

12.2.4 The applicants state that the proposed Regional Distribution Centre will provide some 94,144 sq metres of floor space, including 6% ancillary offices (6,065 sq metres).

12.2.5 "The employment potential of the RDC is some 1,200 jobs (similar to the potential of proposals at Porton Down) and there could be additional indirect and induced employment of as many as 400 jobs.

12.2.6 The allocation of employment land at Solstice Park supports the aim of the Local Plan and the Community Strategic Plan to diversify the employment base of Amesbury which is currently highly dependent on the Ministry of Defence and related activities. Additional employment will also help to reduce the relative deprivation of employment and income in some surrounding rural areas.

12.2.7 Employment land supply in Salisbury District is highly dependent on land at Solstice Park, Amesbury. The applicants surmise that In the City, provision of employment land lags behind other parts of the District and County in relation to Structure Plan targets. The proposed RDC could result in employment land commitments in excess of the local plan phasing policy for Solstice Park to 2011, by 6.47 ha or more, but not all outstanding consents are expected to be implemented in full by 2011. Any breach of the local plan phasing policy would be towards the end of the plan period and it is likely that the local plan will be rolled forward (to 2021) well before then in a new local development document.

12.2.8 The Local Plan target is intended to provide some flexibility and to promote economic development in Amesbury. County Council / Wiltshire Council officers have also confirmed that the structure plan targets are not meant to be interpreted as rigid floor space limits. The Structure Plan recognises the need for a liberal scale of provision, to allow for a choice of sites and variations in employment densities

12.2.9 The Regional Economic Strategy includes expectations of substantial job growth potential in Salisbury District, but warns about the possibility of shortages of labour, employment land and affordable housing, especially in the City where there are capacity and environmental constraints.

12.2.10 The draft Regional Spatial Strategy focuses job and housing growth in the City, but its housing target is low in comparison with job forecasts and household projections and is likely to have to increase following the report of the Panel for the Examination in Public.

12.2.11 Much of the additional housing and job growth required will have to take place outside the City. Amesbury is an obvious focus for additional growth, as the next largest town with good communications, an abundant supply of employment land and opportunities to boost the supply of housing land.

12.2.12 The growth in jobs and housing and the balance between them would logically be seen at Housing Market Area level, which covers the whole District. At this level – or even just taking the Amesbury and Salisbury Community Areas – labour force projections indicate that the growth in economically active population could accommodate the expected job growth at the RDC and Porton Down, especially when the expected requirement for more housing through the RSS and the possibility of reducing outward commuting flows are considered.

12.2.13 The opportunity for reductions in journey lengths and the scope for green travel plans related to the new developments help to improve the sustainability of journeys to work in the area.

12.2.14 It is concluded that the proposed RDC will contribute to the overall balance of housing and jobs within the District and, more importantly within the Amesbury Community Area. This development will also help to achieve more sustainable patterns of development by underpinning the delivery of retail, social and community initiatives for Amesbury, as set out in the Community Action Plan”.

13 *Landscaping and Visual Issues*

13.1 The proposed landscape scheme has been worked up following close liaison with the case officer and the council tree officer and subsequently following the refusal of the previous application. The proposal is the subject of amendments updated to include a reassessment of the existing treatment of the southern boundary making suitable alterations to the previous scheme where specific sensitive sections were noted. The resulting amendments include:

- Strategically relocating certain woodland copses to screen certain viewpoints
- In parallel with noise assessments, propose a 3 metre high timber fence along the southern boundary with planting on the north side to soften the visual impact of the fence
- Propose additional planting to the south of the fence to “gap up” sparse areas of existing vegetation.

13.1.1 The comprehensive landscape scheme would create a new setting of native trees and shrubs to the units, provide enclosure to activity on the site, filter views in, break up the built form of the development, and create habitats of nature conservation value. Members attention is drawn to the landscape “master plan” which is contained at Appendix 4.3. of the Environmental Statement.

13.1.2 As a point of fact the landscaping scheme will conflict with the requirements set out in the Master Plan regarding the ‘Strategic Landscaping’. The requirement within the master plan was that the planting is carried out before buildings are constructed on the site. The Development Brief at page 29 4.66 states

13.1.3 “The open space as identifies on the master plan will form part of the strategic landscaping required as a prerequisite to early development of the site”

13.1.4 Clearly this requirement of the master plan has been carried out as the landscaping is proposed to be removed and replanted to accommodate the larger of the two proposed building. However, it is considered that as the proposed replanting will achieve the same objective as was originally intended in particular, in providing screening for the residential properties adjacent to this part of the site, this conflict with the Master Plan is minimal and is easily mitigated. This issue will also be dealt with via the section 106 Agreement for this application,

13.1.5 Members are advised that an application to vary the Section 106 Agreement is being dealt with in conjunction with this proposal.

13.1.6 The landscape scheme has proposed that a group of copper beech trees at the end of Solar Way would create visual interest in the view along Solar Way. However, whilst when mature, such trees would create an attractive visual stop at the end of Solar way, the use of beach has been subject to failer at Solstice Park in the past, probably due to the chalk ground. As such it is considered that an alternative species should be agreed and as such a condition will be imposed to secure this element of the landscaping scheme.

Woodland blocks would also create visual separation between the two units. This planting would supplement existing woodland planting on the southern boundary of Solstice Park, on the eastern boundary adjacent to Amesbury Road and around the setting of Ratfyn Barrows (SAM), which would be retained.

13.1.7 Overall, 6,530m² of structural woodland planting outside of the development plot would be removed as a result of the development, but it is proposed to plant 10,100m² of new woodland, a net gain of 3570m². A further 9.050m² of structural woodland planting, which is already starting to provide screening to Solstice Park, is retained. Planting within the development plot would be in addition to this figure.

13.1.8 Other planting treatments that are incorporated in the landscape master plan include shrub and tree mix planting, which would create dense native shrub cover with a reduced tree density, amenity shrub planting, to create areas of seasonal colour and interest around the development, and planting of multi stem and parkland trees in mainly grassed areas. The surface water drainage system for the development would incorporate SUDS features, including grassed soakaways between the units and to the east of the unit forming Plot 1, with surrounding areas of naturalistic marginal and shrub planting. The peripheries of the buildings and roads / parking areas would comprise amenity grassland.

13.1.9 It is clearly the case that landscaping has been very thoroughly considered as part of this proposal overall and that when mature, the park will benefit significantly from the planting and open spaces etc. However, it is considered that plant species both trees and shrubs should not be those that produce berries. The reason for this is that berries attract birds sometimes in flocks, which may pose an airfield safety issue for Boscombe Down Airfield. Clarification that such berry baring species will not be used will be sought and will be a conditional if approval is granted.

13.1.10 The Environmental Statement at the 'Landscape and Visual Issues' section (ES Volume 1) sets out the following summary of landscape and visual issues:

13.1.11 The topography of Solstice Park forms a sloping bowl with flowing contours, set against the rising backdrop of Boscombe Down to the south, and Earls Farm Down to the east. The wider context of the site is of open rolling chalk downland, which extends for some miles. Views into the site are limited by local topography, vegetation and built form. A ridge of land to the south of Bulford limits views from the north. Beacon Hill and adjacent high land curtails views from the north east. Views from the southwest, south and south east are blocked by the built form of Amesbury, and high ground on Boscombe Down and Earl's Farm Down. From the west and North West, woodland in the Avon valley and around Solstice Park junction on the A303 limits visibility.

13.1.12 Close and medium distance views from within the Estimated Primary Zone of Visual Influence include those from roads within Solstice Park and other local roads, and views from public rights of way. There are also limited, glimpsed views from public open spaces and from some employment areas. Residential areas lie close to the southern and western boundaries to Solstice Park, but due to the screening effects of vegetation and built form, only a limited number of local residents have views into the site.

13.1.13 Long range viewpoints include some within the World Heritage Site to the north west of the application site, and more distant views from residential areas to the north and east, including parts of Durrington and Countess.

13.1.14 The proposed development would comprise two buildings, up to 19.3m in height, and of large scale. However, the impact of the proposed development would be mitigated by terracing of the existing sloping landform to create development platforms, and through the design of the buildings, including elevational treatments which would break up the form of the buildings and minimise their impact in the local landscape. Undulating roof forms are also proposed which would echo the local context of rolling downland.

13.1.14 The development would also be the subject of a comprehensive landscape scheme, which would create a new woodland setting to the units, provide enclosure to activity on the site, screen views in, provide acoustic mitigation by a 3 metre high timber fence with hedge planting to the park side and create habitats of nature conservation value. A recently planted area of woodland at the southern corner of the development would be removed, but new compensatory and additional woodland planting would create a backdrop to the development and filter views of the western boundary.

13.1.15 Other landscape treatments would include shrub and tree mix planting, amenity shrub planting, planting of multi stem and parkland trees in mainly grassed areas, grassed soakaways to form semi wet meadows and surrounding areas of naturalistic marginal and shrub planting. This planting would supplement existing woodland planting on the southern boundary of Solstice Park, on the eastern boundary adjacent to Amesbury Road and around the setting of Ratfyn Barrows SAM, which would be retained.

13.1.16 Whilst there would be some impact to local landscape character from the introduction of large-scale buildings to the site, Solstice Park is already designated for employment uses, and the new buildings would be seen in the context of other existing medium to large-scale development on the Park, and to the west of Porton Road, which have been constructed on similar terraced landforms.

13.1.17 To the south of the site is Boscombe Down Airfield, with high buildings that dominate the horizon. The proposed development would therefore not be out of character in the context of existing nearby and adjacent buildings.

13.1.18 “Most close and medium distance views towards the development would be mitigated to an extent by the comprehensive landscape scheme proposed as part of the development. The most significant residual impacts at Year 15 following completion of the development are to those views from public rights of way in close proximity to the development, including Amesbury Road (Byway AMES1) and Bridleway AMES29 which crosses Solstice Park, and rights of way to the north of the A303. However, although there would be a notable change to views from (what is referred to in the ES) these sensitive receptors, the general context of the views are of an area on the urban fringe of Amesbury, which already include other large scale built form. Views from the few residential properties which look onto the site would also be mitigated by the proposed planting scheme. The proposed landscape scheme would provide less mitigation to long range views of the development, as the tops of buildings would generally remain visible in the medium to long term”.

13.1.19 The applicants surmise that there would be “no conflict with wider Wiltshire council and local planning policies relating to landscape issues. The settings of Stonehenge SAM would not be affected by the proposed development. The development would only be partially visible from viewpoints within the World Heritage Site, where topography and vegetation permit. Although the development would be visible from parts of the World Heritage Site, resulting in impacts ranging from slight to moderate adverse impact, in practice, the development may not be apparent to the casual whose attention may be focussed on the more immediate environment of the World Heritage Site. It is considered that there would be no additional impact to the setting of Ratfyn Barrows (SAM) resulting from the proposed development”.

13.1.20 In conclusion, taking into account the scale and height of the proposed buildings, it is considered that the development can be accommodated on the application site within Solstice Park without giving rise to unacceptable landscape and visual impacts. The ground modelling proposed on site, the design of the buildings and the comprehensive landscape scheme proposed would all assist in mitigating the impact of the proposed development. The overall scheme design, combined with the scale and low sensitivity of the local landscape character, and the enclosure provided by existing

topography, vegetation and built form, means that impacts to landscape character and visual amenity would be minimised.

14 Transport

14.1 The transport section of this report covers the potential significant impacts of the proposal in terms of traffic and transport. Members' attention is drawn to the entire transportation sections of the application made up of the Transport section of the "Environmental Statement" Volume 1, and the "Transport Assessment" Volume 3 and the accompanying Appendices.

14.1.1 Members will be aware of the high numbers of consultation responses from members of the public to the previous refused application and to this proposal which mostly centre on traffic related impacts and issues.

14.1.2 The "Traffic Assessment" document "Volume 3" of the Environmental Statement provides the detailed modelling and assessment carried out in relation to traffic and is set out under the following headings:

- Existing Transport Network
- Solstice Park Development
- Sustainability and The Solstice Park Travel Plan
- Traffic Modelling
- Impact on the Highway Network
- Construction traffic.

14.1.3 The TA is an extensive document and members' attention is drawn to it should further clarification of the transport issues be required. However, the following section is a summary and is intended to provide members with an overview of the transportation issues covered within the ES.

14.1.4 Members of the committee are advised that, ASDA has recently received support for a store at Solstice Park in place of the Aurora office development. Whilst this application was the subject of a separate Transport Assessment a single model has been used to assess the impact of both the proposed RDC and ASDA. Account is taken in the model of the housing on land South of Boscombe Down at Amesbury, allocated in the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan, as well as those elements of Solstice Park which are not yet occupied.

14.1.5 The key objectives of government policy in relation to transport are summarized in Planning policy Guidance Note 13 – Transport, published in March 2001. The aim is to integrate planning and transportation at the national, regional and local level in order to:

- Promote more sustainable transport choices for both people and for moving freight;
- Promote accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling; and
- Reduce the need to travel, especially by car

14.1.6 The Regional Transport Strategy is set out in Chapter 8 of RPG10. It suggests that agencies should work together towards reducing the need to travel by private motor vehicle through the appropriate location of new development. Agencies should also aim to locate major freight generating development close to the regional road and rail networks.

14.1.7 Wiltshire and Swindon Structure Plan 2016 reinforce this. It says that away from Swindon there is a need to give greater emphasis to job creation, to avoid the need to travel long distances to work. Employment uses which attract significant movements of freight should be located away from central areas with good access to the road network, and accessible by public transport, cycling and walking.

14.1.8 Solstice Park is adjacent to the A303 trunk road on the north east side of Amesbury. A grade separated junction on to the A303 here was a requirement of the Solstice Park development in the Salisbury District Local Plan, and was opened to traffic in April 2004. Access to the RDC for cars will be from Meridian Way, and access for HGVs will be from Equinox Drive.

14.1.9 Porton Road runs along the western side of Solstice Park. Southwards it leads to residential areas and to Boscombe Down. It will form part of the proposed Amesbury Link Road between the A303 and A345 to Salisbury, avoiding Amesbury town centre. London Road leads westwards from the Solstice Park Avenue/Porton Road junction to Amesbury town centre, a distance of around 1.5 km.

14.1.10 A Green Transport Plan for Solstice Park was prepared under the terms of the outline planning consent, and this will cover the RDC. The road system for Solstice Park has been designed to include a network of footways and cycle ways. A number of bus routes serve the area as and a shuttle bus service between Solstice Park and Amesbury Bus Station commenced in November 2007

14.1.11 As part of the Green Transport Plan, the travel patterns of employees are monitored regularly. The modal split of Solstice Park employees in Spring 2007 is set out in Table 9.1 of the TA and compared with the modal split for travel to work in Amesbury East from the 2001 Census. This shows that Solstice Park employees have a good record for the use of sustainable modes of transport.

14.1.12 The impact of the proposed Regional Distribution Centre on the local road network has been assessed during the weekday AM and PM peak hours using the S-Paramics model. Peak traffic surveys were carried out during June 2007 at the following locations to form the base data for the model:

1. A303 westbound/Solstice Park Avenue/Equinox Drive
2. Solstice Park Avenue/Mid Summer Place/Meridian Way
3. A303 eastbound/Porton Road/Salisbury Road
4. Solstice Park Avenue/Porton Road/London Road
5. Porton Road/Sun Rise Way
6. Porton Road/Raleigh Crescent/Amesbury Link Road/Butterfield Drive
7. London Road/Countess Road/High Street

14.1.14 In addition a week's automatic traffic count (ATC) was carried out on Porton Road, again during June. Details of the findings are contained in the Appendices to the TA.

14.1.2 Weekday peak hour trip generation was estimated based on the TRICS database. Predicted weekday trip generation by the RDC alone is set out in Table 9.2. of the TA

14.1.3 Whilst it is recommended that the full details of the TA are read in conjunction with this report, within the TA the applicants surmise that "the data and findings of the TA as updated confirm that the traffic generated by the proposed Regional Distribution Centre at Solstice Park can be accommodated on the surrounding road network without causing unacceptable increases in queues, delays or journey times".

14.1.4 Furthermore, within the TA the applicants surmise that "the existing Green Transport Plan for Solstice Park, which continues to have a good record in encouraging the use of sustainable forms of transport, will also cover the RDC. The proposals for the RDC meet policy guidance which suggests that employment uses attracting significant movements of freight should be located away from central areas with good access to the road network, and accessible by public transport, cycling and walking. It is concluded that there is no demonstrable planning / transportation reason as to why the planning application for a Regional Distribution Centre at Solstice Park should not be permitted".

14.2 Lorry Routeing Agreement;

14.2.1 Members may also be aware that the Section 106 agreement for this proposal will include a transport / lorry routing requirement. The purpose of this requirement is to manage the lorry movements derived from the development in terms of ensuring that wherever possible, the routes to and from the RDC do not unreasonably, or unnecessarily utilise local residential roads but, stick to the

main routes. This agreement will include for example, “Barred routes” where lorries will not be permitted access.

14.2.3 The routing agreement will set out how lorry movements will be controlled and will be consistent with the following objectives;

- To prevent lorries using the C11, C32 (north of the A303) the B390, B3083, B3086 and London Road, Amesbury.
- To restrict the number of lorries using the A345, North of Countess Road Junction and South of Stock Bottom junction.
- Traffic Regulations on local roads where considered necessary by the Highways Authority.
- Establishing a Local Forum for dealing with concerns and issues raised by local people regarding lorry movements as a direct result of the development
- To set up a data scheme to enable lorry movements to be recorded and monitored.
- To develop an effective means of enforcing the restrictions placed upon lorry movements.
- To make a payment to ensure the delivery of a Toucan Crossing on Porton Road

14.2.4 Wiltshire Council Highways have confirmed as before, that the use of such agreements is considered to be affective and enforceable; Wiltshire council highways are in the process of further negotiating the agreement with the applicants expressly aimed at mitigating the concerns raised with the previous application.

14.2.5 Wiltshire Council Highways have advised that the case officer for this application will be informed of the details of the final comments as soon as the agreement is finalised. An oral update will be given at the meeting.

14.2.6 It is concluded that in transport terms the proposed Regional Distribution Centre at Solstice Park will be constructed and operated in an appropriate responsible manner, and in combination with the routing agreement, will avoid significant negative effects on the local and regional transport networks.

14.2.7 Members are reminded of the comments of the Highways Agency who have not objected to this proposal on highway grounds.

14.3 *Noise and Vibration;*

14.3.1 The noise and vibration effects of the construction and operation of the proposed RDC have been assessed. The findings of the assessments are provided in the ES “Noise and Vibration” Volume 1.

14.3.2 In order to assist members the following is a Summary from the ES:

14.3.3 Baseline noise measurements have been undertaken at three representative locations around the site. Noise levels are typical of this urban fringe location. Committed and consented developments across parts of the Solstice Park site are likely to change the noise environment experienced by Noise Sensitive Receptors (NSRs) near the site.

14.3.4 The significance of the construction noise effects have the potential to be of Major Adverse significance and would be of temporary duration. However, with the implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 6.6, this would reduce to Minor Adverse.

14.3.5 The significance of the construction vibration effects are likely to be of negligible significance and of temporary duration.

14.3.6 The significance of the construction traffic noise effects are considered to be of negligible significance and of temporary duration.

14.3.7 The change in existing ambient noise levels due to on-site HGV movements is predicted to be of negligible significance.

14.3.8 External maximum noise levels from HGV movements, including reversing alarms and pulling up to service bays, are predicted to be less than the L_{Amax} criterion for sleep disturbance published in the World Health Organisation's (WHO) Guidelines for Community Noise.

14.3.9 With open windows, predicted internal noise levels from on-site HGV movements range from good to reasonable within the BS 8233 design criterion for sleeping and resting during the day and night.

14.3.10 During the busiest hourly daytime period, noise from HGVs with refrigeration plant would result in a level that is below marginal significance, under the guidance provided in BS 4142.

14.3.11 During the busiest night-time period, noise from HGVs with refrigeration plant would result in a level that is below that which complaints would be expected, under the guidance provided in BS 4142.

14.3.12 The change in existing ambient noise levels due to HGVs with refrigeration plant is predicted to be of negligible significance.

14.3.13 With open windows, predicted internal noise levels from HGVs with refrigeration plant would achieve the BS 8233 good design criterion for sleeping and resting during the day and night within any habitable rooms at the nearest NSR.

14.3.14 The change in existing ambient noise levels due to the combined level associated with HGV movements and HGV refrigeration plant is predicted to be of negligible significance.

14.3.15 With open windows, predicted internal noise levels from the combined level associated with HGV movements and HGV refrigeration plant would range from good to reasonable within the BS 8233 design criterion for sleeping and resting during the day and night.

14.3.16 The noise effects from the HGV wash and fuel points are predicted to be of negligible significance.

14.3.17 The noise effects from the loading and unloading of HGVs are predicted to be of negligible significance.

14.3.18 Taking all on-site activities into account, the noise effects at the proposed RDC are considered to be of Minor Adverse significance.

14.3.19 Noise effects from mechanical plant associated with the operational RDC are considered to be of negligible significance.

14.3.20 Noise effects due to the change in road traffic associated with the proposed RDC are considered to be of negligible significance, therefore no mitigation is required or proposed.

14.3.21 The results of the vibration assessment detailed in Appendix 6.5 indicate that:

14.3.22 There is no evidence to suggest that HGV movements on Equinox Drive would give rise to measurable or humanly perceptible vibration within a park home at Beverley Hills Park;

14.3.23 The operation of the proposed RDC would not give rise to VDV's within a park home that exceed the level at which BS 6472 suggests is commensurate with a 'Low probability of adverse comment';

14.3.24 The levels of re-radiated ground borne noise arising from HGV movements on Equinox Drive would not be measurable or humanly perceptible;

14.3.25 The levels of re-radiated ground borne noise arising from HGV movements within the proposed RDC would not be expected to be significant; and

14.3.26 There is no evidence to suggest that HGV movements on Equinox Drive, or within the proposed RDC, would be expected to give rise to significant low-frequency noise effects, such as sleep disturbance, within a park home at Beverley Hills Park. This is further implied as the amended proposal includes a 3 metre high acoustic barrier along the residential boundary.

14.4 Conclusions;

14.4.1 It is considered that, with appropriate mitigation and good practice, the proposed RDC at Solstice Park, can be constructed and operated without significant noise or vibration effects. For clarity the mitigation measures are set out as follows.

14.4.2 Construction Phase;

Construction Noise;

14.4.3 Construction works would follow Best Practicable Means as defined in Section 72 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 (CoPA), to minimise noise and vibration effects. The construction programme and activities would be discussed with the local authority once a contractor has been appointed. Noise levels may be controlled and consent sought from the local authority under Section 61 of the CoPA to minimise construction noise effects on NSRs.

14.4.5 Standard construction working hours are Monday to Friday, 07:00 to 19:00 hours, Saturdays 07:00 to 13:00 hours, with no noisy working on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays. The principal contractor would adhere to these standard working hours as far as reasonably practicable. However, for certain activities, it may be necessary to work outside these hours and in this instance, the principal contractor would apply to the local authority for written consent prior to work commencing.

14.4.6 Site hoardings and portable acoustic barriers may be used to reduce construction noise emissions from the site. The acoustic performance of these barriers would depend on their siting, height, topography of the area and the character of the works required.

14.4.7 Where practicable, plant, equipment, site offices, storage areas and worksites would be positioned away from NSRs, both on and off-site.

14.4.8 The principal contractor would ensure that all vehicles, mechanical plant and equipment are maintained and operated in an appropriate manner, to minimise extraneous noise from mechanical vibration, creaking and squeaking. The principal contractor would ensure that all plant complies with the relevant statutory requirements.

14.4.9 Construction Vibration;

14.4.10 Equipment would be located away from NSRs, where possible, as highlighted in BS 5228 Part 1.

14.4.11 Construction Traffic;

14.4.12 Delivery movements would only take place during the working hours and no mitigation is necessary.

14.4 13 General On-Site Operational Noise;

14.4.14 The assessment has indicated that noise effects from general on-site activity are acceptable and hence no further mitigation measures are required.

14.4.15 Mechanical Plant;

14.4.16 The following best practice measures would be adopted where practicable:

14.4.17 All externally mounted fixed mechanical plant should be assessed in accordance with BS4142;

14.4.18 The specification of all mechanical plant should be agreed with SDC prior to installation; Mechanical plant should be located away from NSRs; and regular maintenance would be undertaken on all mechanical plant to ensure the units are operating efficiently and do not generate undue noise.

14.4.19 A suitably worded planning condition can be used to control noise from mechanical plant, e.g. 'No development shall not commence until full details of proposed plant systems have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Details shall include proposed noise control measures, fan location, duct-discharge positions and supplementary ventilation systems. The development shall take place in accordance with the approved details without variation unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA. Reason: to protect residential amenity.

14.5 Road Traffic Noise;

14.5.1 Due to the minimal predicted increase in traffic noise that would occur as a result of the predicted increase in flows attributable to the fully operational RDC, no mitigation is required or proposed.

14.6 *Air Quality*;

14.6.1 Members will recall / are advised that this site has in the past been the subject of concern regarding dust being created during excavation work. The area is known to have a very high chalk content that can easily become airborne particularly in dry weather. As such this issue has been of significant importance in relation to this proposal and is dealt with within the "Air Quality" section of the ES Volume 1. The Air Quality assessment section of the ES identifies that (amongst other things) the site is concluded as being at 'high risk' of causing air quality impacts and emissions during the construction phase. Whilst this is identified within the assessment the conclusions for this development overall are clear that only extremely small or negligible impacts will result. However, the assessment has recommended a range of mitigation measures "Mitigation of Effects" (see below) to ensure that even in the unlikely event of any adverse effects occurring, the mitigation will have prevented the effects from being harmful and unreasonable.

14.7 Mitigation - Effects:

14.7.1:

1. Construction Phase;

Site Planning

- No bonfires would be permitted on the site
- Machinery and dust causing activities would be located away from sensitive receptors, where practicable.
- Site personnel would be trained in appropriate dust minimization techniques.
- Trained and responsible manager on site during working times to maintain logbook and carry out site inspections.
- Hard surface site haul routes where practicable.

Construction Traffic

- All vehicles to switch off engines – no idling vehicles.
- Effective vehicle cleaning and specific fixed wheel washing on leaving site and damping down of haul routes.
- All loads entering and leaving site to be covered.
- No site runoff of water / mud.
- On-road vehicles to comply to set emission standards.
- Non Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) to use ultra low sulphur diesel (ULSD) where practicable and be fitted with appropriate exhaust after-treatment from the approved list where practicable.
- Minimise movement of construction traffic around site.
- Hard surfacing where practicable and effective cleaning of haul routes and appropriate speed limit around site.

Site Activities

- Cutting equipment to use water as suppressant or suitable local extract ventilation.
- Use enclosed chutes and covered skips.
- Minimise dust generating activities.
- Use water as dust suppressant where applicable.
- Cover, seed or fence stockpiles to prevent wind whipping.
- Re-vegetate earthworks and exposed areas.

14.7.2 Additional Measures

14.7.2.1 in addition to the above listed mitigation measures, and in response to the SDC's concerns with respect to the potential for construction dust due to the topography and geology of the area, the following specific measures should be implemented by any contractor on site during the civil engineering work and construction phase:

- Water spraying by site bowser.
- Compaction, grading and maintenance of haul routes.
- Adherence of a site speed limit of 10mph.
- Use of upswept exhausts on plant.
- Evenly loading vehicles to avoid spillages.
- Regular removal of spilled material from haul routes.
- Minimal number and length of designated haul routes.
- All site operatives and management staff should be briefed with respect to good practice for dust control as outlined above.

14.7.3:

2. Operational Phase;

14.7.3.1 Mitigation measures are not required for the operational phase of the development as air quality effects are concluded to be of negligible significance according to the criteria adopted for this assessment.

Cumulative Effects;

14.7.4 The air quality effects associated with all committed developments in the area have been quantified in both the 'With' and 'Without Development' scenarios. Consequently, the pollutant predictions include cumulative effects.

14.7.4.1 The UK development control system considers each proposal on its own merits within the confinements imposed by the relevant planning policies. If a further series of unrelated potentially low polluting developments are permitted, the cumulative impact may result in a worsening of local air quality.

The Air Quality section of the ES is summarised as follows;

14.8 Summary from ES;

14.8.1 The previous SDC has designated five Air Quality Monitoring Areas due to high levels of NO₂ attributable to road traffic emissions. The site is not located within a designated AQMA. The nearest AQMA is located approximately 12km from the proposed development.

14.8.2 During the construction phase, dust generation due to construction activities would be controlled and minimized through the use of standard mitigation measures and best practice employed during construction.

14.8.3 Concentrations of the key traffic related pollutants, NO₂ and PM₁₀, have been predicted in the opening year, with and without the proposed development. Predicted NO₂ and PM₁₀ concentrations are well below the relevant objectives. Air quality effects associated with the operation of the proposed development, due to increased road traffic emissions are considered to be of negligible significance.

14.8.4 As such it is concluded that there are no air quality constraints to the proposed development and the overall impact of the development with respect to air quality is of negligible significance.

15. *Hydrology and Drainage / Appropriate Assessment*

15.1 The ES provides extensive and details information on the matter of Hydrology and Drainage. Attention is drawn to the ES for clarification of points of detail. The Assessment recommends that the mitigations forming part of the application are implemented as set out in the appendices to the ES. The ES Commitment to Mitigation” states the following

15.1. “The mitigation measures proposed for the construction phase would be implemented upon commencement of site works and maintained throughout the construction phase, in accordance with the proposed Construction Environmental Management Plan/Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) adopted. The majority of measures relate to standard good working practices that should always be adopted by developers. Other measures are site specific including the accidental pollution action plan and interceptor soakaways.

15.1.3 Mitigation measures relating to the installation of water-efficient systems including toilets, taps and appliances will be discussed and agreed with the Local Authority prior to the commencement of construction.”

15.1.4 The following is a brief summary of the Hydrology and Drainage section of the ES

15.2 Summary;

15.2.1 It is considered that the Proposed Development will not impact on the River Avon Special Area of Conservation. In addition, the development is considered to have a negligible impact on the existing groundwater resource in the underlying chalk aquifer.

15.2.2 With the benefit of the proposed mitigation measures, the residual impact of the Proposed Development upon water resources is considered to be low.

15.2.3 The proposed on-site soakaways will result in an improvement in the management of surface water run-off compared with the existing site. Consequently, there will be a reduction in the volume of surface water run-off during high intensity rainfall events, and a reduced risk of surface run-off affecting neighbouring sites. The residual effect of the Proposed Development will therefore be a slight reduction in the potential for flooding of the area surrounding the Proposed Development.

15.2.4 With the benefit of the proposed mitigation measures, the flood risk to the Proposed Development is considered to be low. The impacts of the Proposed Development upon flood risk beyond the boundaries of the Application Site are considered to be low.

16 . Need for an Appropriate Assessment

16.1 Under Regulation 48 (3) of the Habitats Regulations 1994 and based on the supporting information EIA provided Natural England is of the opinion that the proposals either alone or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to have a significant effect on the important interest features of the River Avon Special Area of Conservation SAC or any of the features of special scientific interest of the River Avon System Site of Special Scientific Interest SSSI

16.1.1 It was clear from the consultation response from Natural England in relation to the previous application, that this proposal is not likely to have a significant effect on the River Avon “Special Area of Conservation” SAC. Whilst this was, and remains to be clearly the view of the principle consultee regarding these matters, it is for the LPA as the “competent Authority” to assess whether an appropriate assessment should be carried out. This assessment must be based on the extent to which the information provided by the applicants is adequate to assess SAC issues, and on the consultation responses received from the principle / statutory consultees.

16.1.2 Conclusion;

It is the view of the LPA as the competent authority in this case, that an appropriate assessment is not required as the proposed development either by itself or in combination with other developments is unlikely to have a significant effect on the SAC. However, during the course of consultation for this application, attention has been drawn to these issues afresh. Whilst it remains the case that an assessment is not required in this case, In the interest of complete clarity in these matters, an Appropriate Assessment has been carried out by the Councils Ecologist. (see appendices)

17 Archaeology

17.1 Members will be aware of the significant importance of this site and in particular the general surrounding are in archaeological terms. As such this proposal has been the subject of a great deal scrutiny regarding archaeological issues.

17.1.2 An extensive programme of archaeological work has previously been carried out for the Solstice Park development, including field surface collection, geophysical survey, and test-pitting, trial trenching and open-area excavation all within the proposed Solstice Park Regional Distribution Centre development site. This programme, developed in co-operation with the Wiltshire County Council Archaeology (now Wiltshire council) Service, has established the archaeological content of the development area and undertaken mitigation works by means of excavation of the major sites and deposits within the development area.

17.1.3 The potential effects on the setting of the Stonehenge World Heritage Site are discussed in the Landscape and Visual Issues chapter (Chapter 4) of the ES Volume 1.

17.1.4 The major features of interest within the area have already been removed by archaeological excavation. Those that survive comprise a series of linear ditches which are the least well-preserved remains of a prehistoric field system extending eastwards outside the development area. The largest of these ditches is assessed as being of Moderate Importance, and the others of Low to Moderate Importance. All have previously been sampled by archaeological excavation; further observation and recording of the most significant of these ditches during development would allow a better understanding of this feature. As a result of work already carried out, the development is assessed as having a Neutral to Minor Effect on the cultural heritage overall.

17.1.5 However, notwithstanding the conclusions of the ES relating to archaeology the consultation response from WCC Archaeology is clear that further excavations may result in findings related to the Bronze Age ditch. As such a condition is recommended to secure a watching brief in order to evaluate

any finds that may result. A suitable condition as set in the full comments from Wiltshire Council Archaeology will be imposed.

18. Conclusion to Environmental Statement;

18.1 This submitted Environmental Statement (ES) is considered, to have extensively covered all the relevant material planning consideration / issues related to this proposal. The ES together with its appendices has provided a clearly set out evidence base to support the findings and conclusions of each respective section. Whilst it is considered that the ES has extensively covered all the relevant issues and material planning considerations appropriate to this proposal and thus most of the mitigation forms part of the application itself, should the proposal be approved, where relevant, conditions will be imposed to secure the mitigations set out in the ES and where advised by the statutory consultees.

19. Have the refusal reasons set out the previous proposal been addressed by this proposal?

19.1. Refusal Reason 1

Refusal reason 1 centred on: Design / Materials / Scale / Layout / Residential amenity and is set out as follows:

19.2 *“The proposal, by reason of the visibility of the site in the landscape , its excessive scale and massing, particularly with regard to the elements nearest to the adjoining residential boundary, would result in a visually intrusive over-bearing and bulky form of development detrimental to the visual and general amenity of adjacent residential properties and the surrounding area. As such the proposal would fail to comply with the aims and objectives of saved policies D1, (v), (vi) of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan and with the advice on design matters set out in Planning Policy Statement 1 ‘Delivering Sustainable Development’”*

19.3 This proposal has been subject to a very through and lengthy design process with SDC over several months prior to the design being worked up into the form presented as part of both the previous and this proposal. The case officer and the councils design adviser and the Design Forum had previously considered several draft designs and have made observations on how to improve them. It is clear that the proposal has taken into account the advice given by SDC and the resultant buildings design is as advised. This is most clear in the changes to the design of building 2 (nearest the residential boundary) in that the offices have been “extruded” and pulled out from the main building in order to add articulation and relief to the external form. Importantly this also has the affect of reducing the size of the buildings footprint in length terms, enabling the building to be pushed further away from the residential boundary by approximately a further 4 metres over the previous scheme.

19.4 Whilst it is considered that the above process has brought about relative success in terms of the design of these building being appropriate particularly in the revised form, it is important to consider the significant limitations on design resulting from the end use as is set out in the applicants Design and Access Statement in Section 5 Design,

19.5 “Regional Distribution Centres (RDC) are storage buildings for businesses to distribute their products to outlets within a region. They act as storage hubs to reduce long distance delivery traffic movements”.

19.6 This suggests that with proposal for buildings such as these, in order that the proposed uses can be successfully carried out, it is reasonably expected therefore that design will primarily be the result of the function.

19.7 However, whilst this is reasonable, the applicants have pursued a design approach that utilises appropriate materials particularly in terms of colour and finish. Colour and finish has been important

throughout the pre-application design discussions where it was considered that a mixture of colour and finishes should be used to avoid the large shed like buildings seen elsewhere in similar developments. In the case of Solstice Park, materials are subject to the requirements of the Development Strategy Submission 1 document that has also guided all other development at the site in design and materials terms. Page 37 of the strategy states "Material choice will depend upon building use, budget and programme and may range from local flint to aluminium cladding panels encompassing everything in between."

19.8 This building will be seen from several vantage points including areas where the surrounding land is significantly higher than the site itself. As such it was considered that a highly visible feature of these buildings will be the roofs. As a result the roofs have been designed to include ridged sections positioned to break up the roof form. The sections will be a different colour than the larger vaulted sections in between them. The design objective is to give the visual impression of several small units particularly when viewed from the surrounding higher areas.

19.9 The design and access statement clarifies that "Two simple roof forms have been created and repeated along the length of the building, the larger of the two roof forms is a curve with the smaller form being a pitched roof. These forms help to break down the overall mass and scale of the building; a high level feature band helps to visually reduce the height of the buildings further"

19.10 The positioning on the site of the buildings has also been carefully considered resulting in the proposed layout and juxtaposition. The design and access statement refers:

19.11 The typical efficient operation of a RDC dictates how the building and yard are laid out. The layout of the development will be such as to optimise and efficiently use the available space on site. Consideration has also been given to minimizing the mass of the development and this has generated a design approach which ensures that the buildings should not be parallel to each other.

19.12 It is the intention to provide a dedicated but segregated access and parking areas for HGVs and cars. Car parking will be adjacent to the main office areas situated on the southwest side of the plot in order to respect the existing residential amenity and create an enhanced visual aspect. The yard areas will be shielded by a combination of building, car parking and landscape planting. The main lorry access to the yards will be on the eastern boundary away from the residential area.

19.13 The buildings fan out from east to west to generate a softer edge along the western boundary and to assimilate the scheme into Solstice Park. The juxtaposition of the buildings allows the landscaping to penetrate deep within the site and views across are also maintained. Other significant landscape zones will be present around the perimeter of the development particularly along the western boundary, where this will be as much as 70m wide in places.

19.14 The car parks are laid out so that accessible parking spaces, including disabled, are positioned close to the entrance to the offices. There will also be the provision of cycle and motorcycle shelters adjacent to the office entrances. There will be a gatehouse close to the entrance of the yard on both units and potential areas set aside on the larger unit's east side for a fuel island and a vehicle wash.

19.15 In terms of scale itself, the buildings have been designed to limit scale as far as is possible for example in the roof design (as explained above), but also in the positioning of the buildings on the lowest parts of the site and through the proposed excavation of the site further reducing overall impact. The design and access statement refers,
Building Plot 1 is 320m long and 170m wide whilst building Plot 2 is 281m long and 126m wide. Both warehouses have a clear internal height of 15m, enabling the accommodation of modern racking systems, product handling equipment and high level sprinklers. The highest part of the curved roof is 19m. It is recognized that buildings of this scale need to be carefully considered for their visual impact and therefore the general design utilises several devices to reduce the perceptible scale and visual impact.

19.16 In conclusion it is considered that the design has been conceived in general accordance with the spirit of the development Brief and the Development Strategy Submission 1 May 2002.

19.17 It is further considered that as a result of the revised proposal including:-

- a redesign of the offices (Plot 1) so that they are pulled out of the building forming a visual relief to the otherwise shed like gable end form of the building nearest the residential boundary,
- the redesign enabling the building to be positioned further away from the residential boundary by an additional 4 metres approximately
- the use of a range of materials and colour to break up the physical mass of the buildings
- The juxtaposition of the buildings allowing views through the site to be maintained
- The positioning of the buildings utilising the topography of the land reducing height as much as possible
- the additional landscaping to the site generally and particularly to the residential boundary
- the proposed erection of a three metre high acoustic barrier / fence along the northern / residential boundary;

19.18 The revised proposal is considered to have adequately addressed the criterion set out in saved policy D1 (v) and (vi) of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan. As such it is considered that refusal reason 1 of the previous proposal S/2007/2518 is no longer considered to be justified.

20 . Refusal Reason 2

20.1 Refusal reason 2 centres on disturbance from noise (both from vehicles visiting and manoeuvring within the site and from the ongoing operation of the site) and is set out as follows:

20.2. *“The application has failed to satisfactorily demonstrate that the impacts of the proposal in terms of disturbance from noise, (both from vehicles visiting and manoeuvring within the site, and from the ongoing operation of the site) would not result in unreasonable detriment to the occupiers of the nearby residential properties. As such the proposal has failed to accord with the aims and objectives of policies G2 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan and to Planning Policy Guidance Note 24 ‘Planning and Noise’”*

20.3 In addressing these issues the revised proposal has concentrated on changes to the development design, layout and site operation to expressly reduce noise levels. Noise modelling input has also been adjusted to provide a more accurate and robust assessment of noise affects based on best practice and the likely use of the RDC.

The ES clarifies that previously the noise assessments assumed the following:

- HGV movement bases on the number of parking bays
- HGVs with refrigeration units were spread evenly across the HGV parking bays
- There was no mitigation in the form of noise barriers (other than planting) to the residential boundary
- There was no mitigation in the form of building design that sought to minimise noise levels reaching the residential boundary.

20.4 However, the noise assessment for this revised proposal assumes:

- HGV movements based on floor area resulting in a more accurate ratio of movements between the two buildings based on total movements

- HGVs with refrigeration units will now be located at the north east end of the buildings furthest away from the residential boundary
- A 3 metre high acoustic barrier is now proposed along the residential boundary
- Plot 2 now has been redesigned so that the offices now shield the residential boundary from noise from HGVs in the parking area.

20.5 As is stated in the ES, PPG 24 “Planning and Noise” clarifies that:

20.5.1 “There will be circumstances when it is acceptable or even desirable- in order to meet other planning objectives - to allow noise generating activities on land near to or adjoining a noise sensitive development. In such cases, local planning authorities should consider the use of conditions or planning obligations to safeguard local amenity. Care should be taken to keep the noisiest activities away from the boundary or top provide for measures to reduce the impact of noise”.

20.6 Based on the changes incorporated in to the revised application and the comments having considered then of Wiltshire Council Environmental Health officer, (see above) it is considered that sufficient additional measures are now being proposed that mitigate the previous reasons for objecting to the proposal on noise grounds. However, the EHO has requested that more information in the form of details for example, re the acoustic fence, be submitted for agreement. This will be achieved through the use of planning conditions in line with the advice contained within PPG 24 as above. The matter of the additional payment required in regard to the draft supplementary document on air quality, the “polluter pays approach” is currently subject to debate between the applicants and Wiltshire council. Should such a payment be justified in this case, it will be received through the section 106 agreement that will be adjusted accordingly.

20.7 As such it is considered that the revised proposal is no longer contrary to the aims and objectives of saved policy G2 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan, or to the advice of PPG 24. As such it is considered that a continued objection to this proposal on noise grounds could not be sustained.

30. Refusal Reason 3;

30.1 Refusal reason 3 centred on transport / traffic issues in so far as the LPA resolved that it was not satisfied that in the absence of an identified end user the proposal would not generate significant traffic and place an undue burden on the existing services and facilities, the existing local road network and other infrastructure, and is set out as follows:

30.2 *“The Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that in the absence of an identified end user, the proposal would not generate significant traffic and place an undue burden on the existing services and facilities, the existing local road network and other infrastructure. As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to the aims and objectives of policy G2 (ii) and (vi) of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan”.*

30.3 Issues related to this issue have proved to be the most significant in relation to this proposal.

30.4 This proposal does not clarify that an end user is known who may take up and operate the site. As such the proposal can be reasonably considered as “speculative”. Whilst this matter therefore remains unresolved by this application, it is important to consider the wider traffic impact issues that can more clearly be attributed weight as material planning considerations. Furthermore, Planning Policy Guidance Note 4 (PPG4) “Industrial & Commercial Development” is clear that “planning applications for speculative developments should be considered on their land – use planning merits: authorities should not normally seek to investigate whether the developer already has particular prospective purchasers or tenants: this will seldom be a material consideration”

30.5 As with the previous application this proposal will result in a development where the nature of the business means that there will be significant numbers of HGV s entering and leaving the site. However, as the ES suggests, few of the HGVs will be new traffic to and from new markets in the South West. Rather, the RDC gives the opportunity to rationalise and improve the efficiency of business taking advantage of the location of Solstice Park adjacent to the strategic highway network, and to capture HGV movements which are already on the strategic road network.

30.6 It is clearly explained in the tables and the text of the Transport Assessment that the RDC is predicted to generate over 3000 vehicles per day in total. Whilst this is significant, It is confirmed both within the transport assessment and via the comments of the Highways Agency where they accept that that the proposal would have a smaller impact than the alternative mixed use of B1/B2/ and B8 uses on a similar scale. As such this proposal is considered to be a better alternative in transport terms than the mix of uses that was originally expected to come forward on the site.

30.7 Following discussions between the Wiltshire council and the developers in relation to the previous refused application and subsequently with this application, agreement has been reached on measures to limit or, prohibit the movement of HGVs associated with this proposal along local roads. Clearly HGV traffic was a concern of residents generally but in particular at night. As a consequence, measures have been agreed to limit the numbers of HGVs between 11pm and 7 am. As with the previous application, this has been agreed through a traffic routeing agreement. The measures will include:

- Preventing HGVs associated with the RDC from using London Road and minor roads through Bulford, Larkhill, Shrewton and Berwick St James.
- Limiting the numbers and the times that HGVs which are allowed to travel along Porton Road and the A345 between Amesbury and Salisbury to a level which will be sufficient only to allow local deliveries to the Salisbury Area.
- Limiting the number and timings of HGVs associated with the proposals which are allowed to travel along the A345 between Amesbury and Marlborough to a level which will sufficient only to allow local deliveries to the villages and towns on Salisbury plain and its northern edge.
- Setting up a forum to meet at regular intervals to consider any issues and concerns of the local community resulting from the operation of the RDC.
- HGV movements to be monitored to ensure that routing agreements are enforced.

30.8 As a result a limit of 80 HGV movements per 24 hour day will be placed on Porton Road and the A345 between Amesbury and Salisbury, with a further limit of only 10 movements overnight between 11 pm and 7 am. A limit of 40 HGV movements per day on the A345 between Amesbury and Marlborough has also been agreed, again with a further limit of only 10 movements overnight. HGVs will be prevented from using local roads in and around Amesbury to join the A303 further to the west.

30.9 The above limits imposed as part of the traffic routing agreement will it is considered significantly reduce the impacts of the proposal on the surrounding road network and on the amenities of adjacent and surrounding residents / properties. The Transport Assessment has included a range of evidence based documentation concluding that in terms of the “expert” evidence with regard to the impacts from traffic in relation to this RDC, there is no clear reason for objecting to the proposal on this basis.

30.10 The expert evidence suggests that the traffic generated by the proposal can be accommodated on the surrounding road network without causing unacceptable increases in queues delays or journey times. This is supported in the no objection comments of the principle consultees in this case, including the Highways Agency.

30.11 Furthermore, the above comments must be considered in combination with all other relevant material planning consideration including the advice in government guidance. This advice as explained above contains a clear expectation that proposals such as this will be expected to be located next to suitable road infrastructure. This site clearly achieves this objective whilst also complying with similar government advice that recommends the use of planning conditions and legal agreements to secure mitigation of potential problems brought about by the development.

30.12 In combination with the comments from Wiltshire Council Highways, the Highways Agency and the Traffic routing agreement required under the section 106, In the absence of any expert evidence which can clearly demonstrate harm, it is difficult to foresee how this revised proposal would place an undue burden on the existing services and facilities, the existing local road network and other infrastructure. As such it is considered that the proposal is no longer contrary to the aims and objectives of policy G2 (ii) and (vi). As such it is considered that a continued objection to this proposal on traffic grounds based on policy G2 can no longer be sustained.

40 Refusal Reason 4

40.1 Refusal reason 4 of the previous proposal was concerned with the importance of Amesbury in its role in delivering strategic growth over the next 20 years. It was considered previously that given the limited number of such sites in the district it is important that strategic growth is delivered in a managed way which matches employment to housing. In addition concerns were expressed regarding the fact that the proposal was and remains to be, a material departure from the development plan and Policy E8A. It was considered that the departure will result in the bringing forward of land earmarked for future employment growth beyond the life of the adopted local plan that could result in a deleterious affect on future employment land supply. Refusal reason 4 is set out as follows:

40.2 “Both the Local Plan and evidence collated for the emerging south Wiltshire core strategy highlight the importance of Amesbury in south Wiltshire, and its role in delivering strategic growth over the next 20 years. Given the limited number of such sites in the district it is important that strategic growth is delivered in a managed way which matches employment to housing. The proposal is on land identified for employment beyond the lifetime of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan and is therefore a material departure from policy E8A”.

The applicant has also failed to demonstrate;

- i) That the proposal meets the long term strategic employment needs of Amesbury.
- ii) That the proposal will deliver the level of employment land required to balance long term housing growth as set out in the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy and emerging Core Strategy
- iii) How the scale of the proposal, the mix of employment types and the number and types of jobs the proposal will generate will be beneficial to Amesbury
- iv) How the proposal accords with the aims and objectives of creating mixed use developments on the site as set out in the accompanying documentation and text (Zone D) to the Solstice Park Master Plan”.

40.3 However, since the previous application was considered the employment land position has changed significantly. These changes have resulted in a fundamentally different assessment of the spatial planning issues related to several employment sites including Solstice Park. The following section sets out the reasons for adopting a different approach;

40.4 The following employment land position was agreed for the Amesbury supermarket inquiry and shows Wiltshire Council’s understanding of employment land supply within the former Salisbury District area at that time (April 2009)

Area	Structure Plan Provision to 2016	Completed	Outstanding (consent but not implemented)	General Area (spare land left over after planning)	Total completed, outstanding and general area	Adopted Local Plan provision	Structure Plan provision less permissions (- = surplus)
	A	B	C		E (B+C+D)		

				<i>D</i>		<i>F</i>	<i>G (A-E)</i>
Salisbury City	35	10.47	5.50	0.58	16.56	6.48	18.44
Remainder of (former) District	45	5.23	60.36	0.63	66.22	14.50	-21.22
Total for former Salisbury district area	80	15.71	65.86	1.21	82.78	20.98	- -2.78

Source: Wiltshire County Council Monitoring
All figures are as of April 2008

40.5 The Structure Plan up to 2016 requires that south Wiltshire provides 80 hectares of employment land. The above table shows that there is a shortfall of 11.97ha of employment land in Salisbury City (or Salisbury SSCT) but a surplus in the remainder of the district that would include Amesbury of 35.72ha.

40.6 The outstanding figure of 60.36ha in the 'Remainder of former District area' includes the 18ha at Solstice Park approved in the first phase up to 2011, plus the residual 41.25ha with outline planning permission for employment uses but phased beyond 2011 (Solstice Park Outline planning permission : First Phase = 18ha employment uses & 4.75 ha Leisure. Second Phase = 41.25ha employment uses. Total = 64ha) There are 1.11ha elsewhere in the 'Remainder of District'.

40.7 As completions are only recorded by the County Council when over half of the site is completed, none are identified for Solstice Park. It is agreed however that 1.12ha has been completed at Solstice Park. This has not been translated into the table above.

40.8 It should also be noted that the former Salisbury District Council granted planning permission (S/2008/1661) 31st March 2009 on 0.4ha (Plot C4A) of Solstice Park for a children's nursery on part of the second phase land, but on the basis that there is a land swap with 0.4ha of first phase land.

40.9 The Secretary of State's proposed changes to the South West RSS require that about 37ha of employment land is provided across Salisbury TTWA (which includes the majority of the former Salisbury District and some areas beyond to the north and south, but excludes the western part of the district) between 2006 to 2026. The Salisbury TTWA includes Amesbury and Solstice Park. It has yet to be agreed what proportion of the 80ha in the Structure Plan will be carried forward and taken off the 37ha that Wiltshire Council have to provide. Notwithstanding this, it is important to point out that the RSS proposed changes is clearly focussing employment provision in and around Salisbury SSCT and states within para 4.1.78 that 'While there are opportunities for some job growth at locations such as Amesbury the key strategic aim is to extend and enhance Salisbury as an employment and retail centre so it can better serve the surrounding rural area and achieve greater levels of self-containment'.

40.10 Since this time, the employment land situation has been assessed in more detail. It has been confirmed that through the release of the proposed submission draft Core Strategy that the Solstice Park allocation will no longer be relied upon to meet core strategy employment growth. As it no longer conforms with the RSS, which instead directs major employment growth to Salisbury. However Solstice Park is consented and remains available for development. Therefore although employment development on this site will be supported by the council, the site will not be relied on to meet the strategic employment land requirements of the RSS or the strategic goal of enhancing Salisbury SSCT as an employment centre and consequently the relevant policy E8A will not continue to be saved. It is expected that Solstice Park could well be used for lower intensity employment such as distribution and therefore the current application is supported in policy terms. It is also not expected that Solstice Park would provide much opportunity for decant from regeneration projects as again it is geographically in the incorrect location.

40.11 It is clear that on the basis of the above section, refusal reason 4 (i), (ii) and (iii), of the previous application can no longer be supported with regard to this proposal.

40.12 With regard to part (iv) of refusal reason 4, 'how the proposal accords with the aims and objectives of creating mixed use developments on the site as set out in the documentation and text (Zone D) to the Solstice Park master plan', it is considered that the ongoing development of the park in relation to for example, the children's nursery recently approved which is a Class D1 Use, the restaurant and Hotel developments A3 uses and the Office uses already built Use Class B1, amongst others, suggests that the park is developing with a range of uses overall.

40.13 With regard to the particular RDC application site itself, whilst much of this site will be single use, a significantly large area of land has been left in the North West part of the site which is not affected by this proposal. This area of land will be available for subsequent developments which would assist in the delivery of smaller scale mixed use employment developments thus achieving the objective of the master plan.

50 Conclusion

50.1 In considering the planning issues relevant to this proposal in this report Section 54A of the 1990 T&CP Act makes clear that decision must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material planning considerations indicate otherwise... It is therefore appropriate that Policy E8A was the starting point for consideration of this proposal.

50.2 It is also important that when considering material planning considerations generally and particularly in this case, the comments of all consultees and particularly statutory consultees, are given due weight.

50.3 This proposal has generated a great deal of public interest both from the immediate locality and further afield. In the main concerns have been raised although the proposal is not absent of a significant level of support also. This interest and concern has resulted in this proposal being subject to a range of amendments and variations (as set out above) over and above the previous refused application. However, whilst a number of amendments have been made which directly address local neighbour concerns namely, the addition of the acoustic barrier along the residential boundary, the electrical hook up preventing refrigerated lorries from running via noisy generators and the re-design of the office element of the building nearest the residential boundary to enclose the area (from both site and sound) where vehicle activity and potential noise disturbance may otherwise occur, many other further changes have been made.

50.4 In relation to the comments of the Amesbury Town Council, whilst the council has no objections to the proposal, further changes include for example, electric hook – up, for refrigerated lorries. As such, point 1 of their comments has been accommodated in this proposal and is conditioned.

50.5 Point 2, negotiations are ongoing regarding the possibility of a pedestrian crossing being installed on Underwood Drive at a point close to the Archers Gate estate entrance roundabout. Whilst such a crossing is not part of this proposal negotiations are ongoing and members will be updated at the meeting regarding any progress on this matter.

50.6 Point 3 of the comments is concerned with preventing vehicles from parking either side of the roundabout. This matter raises issues that are most often beyond the scope of planning applications particularly when the parking is occurring on the public highway. In the case of the roundabout referred to at Archers Gate, this applies. As such the matter of parking either side of the roundabout cannot be controlled through this application. The enforcement of parking regulations and the Highway Code is a matter for the highways authority in combination with local policing.

50.7 As is set out above from a strategic planning standpoint the proposal has support. In addition to these Wiltshire Council Highways have not raised objection subject to the implementation of a traffic / Lorry routing agreement. This has been worked up and will form a key part of the "heads of terms" within the proposed Section 106 Agreement.

50.8 It is also clear that the Highways Agency do not object to the proposal having considered the implications and affects of the proposal on the A303. The Highways Agency have considered that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the strategic road network and have raised some issues relating to cycle parking, the green travel plan and have expressed a desire that a construction management plan be provided. The Highways Agency has recommended that conditions be attached to cover these issues (see conditions) .

50.9 The South West of England Development Agency SWERDA have also considered that subject to Wiltshire Council being satisfied that the proposal will not have a deleterious effect on the range and choice of employment space available in the area to meet the needs of business, no objections are raised. It was this issue that proved paramount with the previous proposal and notwithstanding the issues related to transportation, it was this issue that proved the most challenging from a local planning standpoint in the previous application. However, given the considerable weight that must be attributed to the strategic and regional planning consultation responses, and as for the reasons set out in the report, Wiltshire council spatial planning support the proposal, it is considered that the balance of considerations weighs in favour of the proposal.

50.10 Whilst the spatial planning comments set out in 10.4 above, confirm amongst other things, that Policy E8A will cease to be a saved policy as a result of the RSS becoming adopted, at this point in time policy E8A is a saved policy. The proposal is thus considered to be contrary to the adopted local plan as before. The local plan is continuing to undergo significant scrutiny in relation to the LDF that will replace it. It is relevant to carefully consider the implications of this as the principle influences guiding the LDF process include the regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and the regional Economical Strategy (RES) and the evidence on which these strategies are based, also appear to support the proposal.

50.11 Issues related to these matters are set out above in the report particularly in the comments of the South West Regional Assembly. These comments are clearly comprehensive in relation to all relevant planning policy matters / material planning consideration.

50.12 Members are reminded of the issues and concerns raised locally in relation to this application and are advised that the application provides as far as is possible and reasonable mitigation of these concerns. It is further considered that the considerations of the statutory consultees set out in the report are very weighty material planning considerations and mostly support the proposal. Whilst such support was not in line with the approach adopted by the LPA from a policy point of view in the previous application, this is now fundamentally different for the reasons set out in the report. It is further considered that in the face of such clear support for this proposal and as the application will mitigate as far as is possible the concerns raised locally, a refusal of the proposal would not be appropriate.

50.13 It is also important to consider that whilst the site forms part of the allocation intended for smaller mixed business uses under policy E8A of the adopted local plan, take up of this allocated site for the preferred range of employment uses has been very slow. The proposal will provide a significantly high number of jobs for Amesbury both on site as a direct result of the proposal and around the site as many more knock on jobs. As such the proposal will result in significant benefit locally and will result in the development of this large parcel of employment land that to date has not delivered the employment opportunities for Amesbury and the surrounding area, as originally intended.

50.14 In combination with the significant affects that this proposal will have on the allocation of the site under policy E8A, the Development Brief and Master Plan, it is also necessary that the section 106 Agreement covering the site, is modified to accommodate this proposal. A separate application has been made to vary the existing Section 106 agreement and progress on this application will be orally reported to members at the meeting. The heads of terms are set out above in the 'purpose of report' section.

50.15 Whilst having regard to all the documentation contained within the application, the Environmental Statement (ES) and to all relevant material planning considerations and consultation

comments received, this proposal is considered to be acceptable from a Town & Country Planning standpoint.

60. Recommendation

60.1. Following completing a section 106 agreement in respect of the following matters:

1. To apply the provisions of the section 106 Agreement dated 20th January 2000 (as varied) to this application.

To vary the section 106 as follows-

- a. To increase the limit of land to be developed before 2011
 - b. To vary the areas of open space / Strategic Landscape areas, to take account of this application and any consequential amendments to the landscape management plan.
 - c. To vary the location of the main Off road / Cycle way
 - d. To remove the local centre provision
 - e. To enhance the Travel Plan
 - f. To amend the approved Landscape Management Plan
- 2.. To secure the Lorry Routeing Agreement provisions under the following Heads of Terms;
- g. To prevent Lorries using the C11, C32 (north of the A303) the B390, B3083, B3086 and London Road, Amesbury.
 - h. To restrict the number of lorries using the A345, North of Countess Road Junction and South of Stock Bottom junction.
 - i. Traffic Regulations on local roads where considered necessary by the Highways Authority.
 - j. Establishing a Local Forum for dealing with concerns and issues raised by local people regarding lorry movements as a direct result of the development.
 - k. To set up a data scheme to enable lorry movements to be recorded and monitored.
 - l. To develop an effective means of enforcing the restrictions placed upon lorry movements.
 - m. To make a payment to ensure the delivery of a Toucan Crossing
3. To make any further consequential amendments found to be necessary.

60.2 . That conditional permission is granted.

For the following reason:

Whilst the proposal will result in a large scale development resulting in a material departure from the approved Master Plan for Solstice Park, and from saved policy E8A of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan in terms of the provision of additional employment land that it would bring forward before 2011, when having had regard to, in particular, the Regional Economic Strategy (RES), it is considered that the wider economic benefits to the area ahead of the proposed phasing outweighs the provisions of policy E8A.

Whilst the proposal will result in a layout that differs materially from the approved Master Plan in terms of zones and uses, the Environmental Statement (ES) clearly identifies that no demonstrable harm will result to interests of acknowledged importance provided that the ES and the mitigations measures set out within it, are conditioned.

It is considered that 'on balance' and in combination with the implementation (subject to conditions) of the full details of the application and the Environmental Statement (ES) and consultations, that a local planning policy objection to the proposal based on policy E8A of the adopted Salisbury District Locals Plan is outweighed by the wider economic considerations for the district and its surrounding environs. As such the proposal is considered to be acceptable from a Town & Country Planning Standpoint having regard to all material planning considerations and to otherwise accord with the policies of the development plan.

Subject to the following conditions:

(1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. AS amended by section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

(2) Surface water shall be disposed of via a suitable infiltration system (Designed and constructed as recommended in CIRIA report 156 "Infiltration drainage, Manual of Good Practice" and to ensure that there is no surface water runoff from the site for all events up to 1 in 100 year storm (including an allowance of 10% increase in peak rainfall intensity to take account of climate change in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 25.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory provision of drainage facilities to serve the proposed development.

Policy: G5 Development and water services, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(3) Prior to being discharged into any watercourse surface water sewer or soakaway system all surface water drainage from impermeable parking areas and hardstandings for vehicles commercial lorry parks and petrol stations shall be passed through an oil interceptor designed and constructed to have a capacity and details compatible with the site being drained Roof water shall not pass through the interceptor.

Reason: To prevent petrochemical substances from car parking surfaces polluting the water environment.

Policy: G5 Development and water services, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(4) Oil or chemical storage facilities should be sited in bunded areas The capacity of the bund should be at least 10 greater than the capacity of the storage tank or if more than one tank is involved the capacity of the largest tank within the bunded area Hydraulically inter Linked tanks should be regarded as a single tank There should be no working connections outside the bunded area.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment

Policy: G5 Development and water services, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(5) No development approved by this permission shall commence until a scheme for water efficiency has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable development and prudent use of natural resources

Policy: G5 Development and water services, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(6) No development shall commence on site until a scheme for allowing access at all reasonable times to any archaeologist nominated by the Local Planning Authority, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the nominated archaeologist shall be allowed to observe the excavations and to record items of interest and finds, in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To safeguard the site of archaeological interest.

Policy: CN22 Archaeological recording, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(7) Notwithstanding the details set out in the "Control of Pollution during Construction report" dated June 2009, no development shall commence until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with the Secretary of State for Transport and Wiltshire Council). The plan will include construction vehicle movements, construction operating hours (which shall be in accordance with those set out in condition 19 of this decision) which shall confirm that the following activities shall not be conducted outside the approved hours:

1. Use of piling equipment and rigs
2. Movement and use of tracked box excavators
3. Movement and use of tracked box excavators over 18T
4. Movement and use of vibrating rollers
5. Delivery and movement of steel
6. Cleaning and maintenance of heavy plant
7. Control and suppression of dust emissions;

construction vehicle routes to and from the site, construction delivery hours, expected numbers of construction vehicles per day, car parking for the contractors, specific measures to be adopted to mitigate construction impacts in pursuance of Environment Code of Construction Practice and details of a scheme to encourage contractors to use alternative means of transport to the private motor vehicle. Construction works shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the Construction Management Plan.

Reason: To ensure that a best practice approached to the construction management of the site is adopted.

Policy: G1 Principles of Sustainable development, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan
G2 Criteria for considering new development, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(8) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in complete accordance with the submitted "Lighting Strategy" dated June 2009, received 08/06/09.

Reason; In the interest of avoiding light pollution and disturbance from light to the nearby residential properties, and the visual amenity of the wider area.

Policy: G2 Criteria for considering new development, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(9) The development hereby approved shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the materials schedule as set out on page 20 of the Design and Access Statement and shall be subject to final confirmation following the provision of samples of materials to illustrate texture, colour and finishes, to be used for the external wall's and roofs of the proposed development. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To secure a harmonious form of development.

Policy: G2 Criteria for considering new development, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan
D1 Extensive Developments, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(10) No development shall commence until the details of the Paladin type fence to be erected around each of the buildings has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include height, colour finish and texture. The approved detail shall not be subject to any variation unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity

Policy: G2 Criteria for considering new development, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan
D1 Extensive Developments, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(11) The finished floor levels of the proposed buildings shall be in accordance with details to be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority before development is commenced.

Reason: To ensure the exact finished floor levels of the buildings.

Policy: G2 Criteria for considering new development, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan
D1 Extensive Developments, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(12) No development shall take place until details of the treatment to all hard surfaces have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall accord with the details as so approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity and the environment of the development.

Policy: G2 Criteria for considering new development, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(13) The details of the landscaping proposals shall be as illustrated within the RPS "Landscape Master Plan" Drawing No: 011 Rev B and the "Landscape Master Plan, Sections and Planting schedule dated March 2009", set out in the Environmental Statement Supporting Appendices Volume 2 at Appendix 4.3.

Reason: in the interest of the visual amenity of the landscape.

Policy: G2 Criteria for considering new development, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(14) No development shall commence until full details of the proposed 3 metre high acoustic barrier to be erected along the south west boundary of the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved barrier shall be erected in its entirety to its full length as illustrated on the "Acoustic Barrier Location Plan" received 03/09/09, before the commencement of any of the approved on site works.

Reason: To protect the nearby residential properties from unreasonable levels of noise disturbance and in the interest of visual amenity and the security of the site and nearby residents.

Policy: G2 Criteria for considering new development, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(15) All lorry loading bays shall be fitted with mains electricity points allowing refrigeration units to connect and operate whilst loading / unloading.

Reason: To prevent the use of noisy generators in the interest of avoiding unnecessary disturbance from noise to nearby residential properties.

Policy: G2 Criteria for considering new development, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(16) No development shall commence until full details of the implementation (including an implementation programme) of the landscape scheme specific to this development, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The implementation shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved details unless the LPA agrees to any variation.

Reason: In the interest of the visual amenity of the landscape and the continuity of the landscaping provisions of the approved Master Plan for Solstice Park.

Policy: G2 Criteria for considering new development, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(17) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Approved Master Plan for Solstice Park, a landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the development or any phase of the development, whichever is the sooner, for its permitted use. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to secure the satisfactory evolution, management and maintenance of landscape works, in the interests of visual amenity.

Policy: G2 Criteria for considering new development, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(18) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved implementation programme and any trees or plants which within a period of 10 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity and the environment of the development.

Policy: G2 Criteria for considering new development, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(19) No development shall commence until details of the proposed Mechanical Plant systems have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include proposed noise control measures, fan location, duct- discharge positions and supplementary ventilation systems. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details without variation unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.

Policy: G2 Criteria for considering new development, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(20) None of the buildings shall be occupied until works for the disposal of foul and surface water, have been provided on the site to serve the development hereby permitted, in accordance with details contained within the Environmental Statement Volume 1, Hydrology and Drainage and the 'Commitment to Mitigation Measures'.

Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with a satisfactory means of drainage.

Policy: G2 Criteria for considering new development, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan
G5 Water services, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(21) No ground works or construction shall be undertaken outside of the following hours:
Monday to Friday: 8.00am- 6pm Saturday: 8.30 am - 1pm Sundays & bank holidays: No construction or ground working. This condition does not apply to works of fitting out and decoration.

Reason: to protect the amenity of nearby residential property

Policy: G2 Criteria for considering new development, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(22) No construction shall commence on site, until plans for the extension of Equinox Drive, Sunrise Way and Meridian Way, including details of pedestrian and cycle facilities to connect the site with the Solstice local services and to the proposed Toucan crossing on Porton Road, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and the works completed in accordance with the approved plans prior to the site being brought into operational use.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety

Policy: G2 Criteria for considering new development, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(23) No buildings shall be occupied on the site until a Travel Plan, which is compatible with the overall Solstice Park Travel Plan, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The site shall be operated in accordance with the requirements and principles of the approved Travel Plan.

Reason: In the interests of encouraging access to and within the site by sustainable modes of transport.

Policy: G1 Principles of Sustainable development, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

(24) No buildings shall be occupied on the site, until detailed plans for the site access, servicing and parking facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the works completed in accordance with the approved detailed plans. Such plans shall include all necessary details of construction, drainage and site levels. The service and parking areas shall at no time be used for storage of goods or materials.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, and to ensure that the site is constructed and operated without prejudice to highway interests.

Policy: G2 Criteria for considering new development, adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

INFORMATIVE:

The development should include water efficient appliances fittings and systems in order to contribute to reduced water demand in the area. These should include as a minimum dual flush toilets, water butt, spray taps, low flow showers (1) and white goods where installed with 11 maximum water efficiency rating. Grey water recycling and rainwater harvesting should be considered. The submitted scheme should consist of a detailed list and description including capacities water consumption rates etc where applicable of water saving measures to be employed within the development. Applicants should visit www.environmentagency.gov.uk/Subjects/WaterResources/HowWeHelpToSaveWater/Publications/ConservingWaterinBuildings for detailed information on water saving measures. A scheme of water efficiency should be submitted in accordance with the information supplied on the website.

The following may also be helpful www.savewatersavemoney.co.uk.

Sustainable Construction

We strongly recommend that the proposed development includes sustainable design and construction measures. In a sustainable building minimal natural resources and renewables are used during construction and the efficient use of energy is achieved during subsequent use. This reduces greenhouse gas emissions and helps to limit and adapt to climate change. Running costs of the building can also be significantly reduced.

INFORMATIVE:

Safeguards should be implemented during the construction phase to minimise the risks of pollution and detrimental effects to the water interests in and around the site.

Such safeguards should cover the use of plant and machinery oils chemicals and materials the use and routing of heavy plant and vehicles the location and form of work and storage areas and compounds and the control and removal of spoil and wastes.

We recommend referring to our Pollution Prevention Guidelines found at:

www.environmentagency.gov.uk/business/444251/444731/ppgversion1&ang=e

INFORMATIVE:

The PLA should confirm that a design life of 40 years as stated in paragraph 5.4 of supporting appendix 8 is appropriate to this form of development. The LPA should also confirm with their building control section that and the adopting Highway Authority if relevant that this will be acceptable to them. We do not accept any liability for the detailed calculations contained in the FRA. This letter does not constitute approval of those calculations nor does it constitute the Environment Agency's consent or approval that may be required under any other statutory provisions, bylaw, order or regulation. Flood Risk cannot be eliminated and is expected to increase over time as a result of climate change and this letter does not absolve the developer of their responsibility to ensure a safe development.

INFORMATIVE:

Any oil storage facility of 200 litres or more must include a bund and comply with the Oil Storage Regulations. The Control of Pollution Oil Storage England Regulations 2001 a copy of which has been forwarded to the Applicant Agent

INFORMATIVE:

Protected Species; If planning permission is granted the applicants should be informed that this does not absolve them from complying with the relevant law protecting species in particular bats including obtaining and complying with the terms and conditions of any licences required as described in Part IV B of Circular 06 2005. If the application is amended Natural England should be re-consulted for a further 21 days in accordance with Circular 08 2005

Note to Applicant:

Plan References:

14976 / AD / 001 Proposed site Plan.

14976 / A1 / 5000 Plot 1, Building Plan.

016 Revision A Review of Public Open Space Provision.

14976 / A1 / 5310 Revision C Plot 2, Proposed elevations.

14976 / A1 / 5300 Revision B Plot 1, Proposed elevations.

14976 / A1 / 5020 Application Comparison.

14976 / A1 / 5101 Plot 2, Typical Warehouse Section.

14976 / A3 / 5010 Plot 1, Transport Office Layout.

14976 / A3 / 5011 Plot 2, Transport Office Layout.

14976 / A1 / 5005 Plot 1, Office Layout.

14976 / A3 / 003 Revision B, Ridge Level Location Plan.

14976 / A1 / 5100 Plot 1 Typical Warehouse Section.

14976 / A1 / 5001 Plot 2, Building Plan.

14976 / A1 / Revision B, Plot 2 Office Layout.

Acoustic Barrier Location Plan, received 03/09/09

L.269:14/1E approved Solstice Park Master Plan

Appendices:	Appendix 1 Location plan. Appendix 2 Site Plan. Appendix 3 Policies. Appendix 4 Statutory consultees. Appendix 5 Highways response. Appendix 6 Appropriate Assessment. Appendix 7 Solstice Park Master Plan.
Background Documents Used in the Preparation of this Report:	“Environmental Statement” Volume 1, June 2009 “Supporting Appendices” Volume 2, June 2009 “Transport Assessment” Volume 3, June 2009

BRAD FLEET
Service Director, Development