



Minutes of a meeting of the Planning, Environment & Transport Committee held virtually on Zoom on Thursday 18 February 2021 at 7pm

Councillors present:

Richard Bambury (Chairman)	Jenny Budgell
Bill Douglas	Raj Gill
Nick Murry	Mary Norton (part)
Andy Phillips	Nina Phillips
Chris Ruck	John Scragg (Vice-Chairman)

Also Present: Councillors Desna Allen, Pete Bishop, Clare Cape and James Adman

Officers present: Matt Kirby, Director of Community Services
Andy Conroy, Planning Officer
Ann Chard, Administrative Services Officer - Planning
Heather Rae, Democratic Services Manager
Kieran Moore, Technician/Duty Officer (part)

Public present: 22 members of the public were present

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

A copy of comments/questions asked is appended to these minutes at APPENDIX A.

The response to these questions were not part of the meeting but is appended to these minutes at APPENDIX B.

102. APOLOGIES

There were apologies for absence from Councillor Michael Merry.

103. NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTION

No notification of substitution was received.

104. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

No declaration of interest as defined by the latest approved Code of Conduct in the current approved Standing Orders was received.

105. **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2021 were proposed by Councillor Chris Ruck and seconded by Councillor Nina Phillips. It was agreed that the minutes were a correct record.

RESOLVED that the minutes were approved as a correct record and will be signed by the Chairman at a later date.

106. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no Chairman's Announcements.

107. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

RESOLVED

- (i) That the attached list of observations on planning applications be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.
- (ii) That no planning applications be 'called-in'.
- (iii) That no objections be raised to New Tree Preservation Order: Land at Forest Lane, Pewsham (Ref: 2021/00001/GRP)

108. **WILTSHIRE COUNCIL REVIEW OF LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION**

The Planning Officer summarised his report (copy in minute book). Councillor Nick Murry proposed an amendment to the Recommendation at paragraph 8.1 of the report and this was seconded by Councillor Bill Douglas. Councillors were given an opportunity to make comments before a vote was taken and the following is a summary of comments made by members of the Committee.

Councillors commented on the fact that two consultations were running at the same time, which was confusing. It was felt that the housing consultation should have been carried out first, followed by the consultation on the road. Lifestyle changes brought about by COVID had not been taken into account. Concerns were raised about the high numbers of houses proposed and Chippenham turning into a town the size of Swindon. It was pointed out that the Core Strategy had included proposals which were not acceptable to the Town Council and residents, resulting in it being rejected by the Inspector. It was implied that Wiltshire Council had chosen to include 20% of the county's allocation in Chippenham because it owns the land to the south so would benefit financially.

It was noted that there is currently a national housing crisis with the younger population struggling to afford houses and with an increasing population, there are valid reasons why Wiltshire Council should look at increasing its housing stock in the county and whilst the proposed numbers are too high, there is room on the

eastern side for additional housing. There is some justification for a relief road to the east of the town, as heavy traffic undermines the town centre and other roads, but not a distributor road. Wiltshire Council have not provided evidence to justify the number of houses. The HIF Bid is driving proposals for housing and will mean flyovers, canal crossings, etc. which would not be required if appropriate numbers of houses were proposed at other locations around the town. The selection criteria was biased as it combined landscape, environment and climate into a single criteria and discounted it against some speculative economic benefits for which there is no evidence. The subjective methodology also used to dismiss alternative options involving other sites that would not require the costly and carbon intensive infrastructure. No mention is made of redevelopment of the town centre where there is potential to restore and enhance its character. No brownfield sites have been included in the numbers and the Proposals would mean the destruction of farmland and countryside.

A vote was taken and there being 10 votes in favour of supporting Councillor Murry's amendment, the motion was carried.

RECOMMENDED that at the Extraordinary Full Council meeting on 25 February 2021, Councillors agree the comments on Housing Figures and Brownfield Target set out in Appendix 1 of this Report, and to inform Wiltshire Council that their case for Chippenham housing numbers and locations has not been adequately made, and is not accepted for the following reasons:

1. The housing target allocated to Chippenham is much too high (at 9,225 and equivalent to 20% of the total number for Wiltshire), bears no relation to Chippenham's actual housing needs and is predicated on substantial numbers of people relocating here, in order to commute back out, causing more congestion and significant damage to the climate;
2. The proposals to develop large suburbs to the East (Site 1) and South (Site 2) would have a severe adverse impact on the town and cause unacceptable damage to the local environment through the destruction of high-quality farmland and wildlife habitat in the Avon and Marden Valley;
3. The Chippenham housing numbers and their location should not be dictated by a grant application for a road, which did not undergo any public consultation, and which serves to predetermine the spatial strategy;
4. Wiltshire Council needs to develop an alternative spatial strategy, which is employment led, "appropriate in scale" and "environmentally sustainable" as stated in the Vision for the Chippenham Neighbourhood Plan;

as PET Committee's recommendations to Full Council on the Wiltshire Local Plan Review Consultation, supported by the answers provided in Appendix 1, with officers delegated to make minor changes needed to bring the Appendix fully in support of the amended resolution.

109. GYPSEY AND TRAVELLER DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT CONSULTATION

Councillors considered the above consultation. Councillor Jenny Budgell stressed the importance of this consultation and that it should be given the attention it deserves.

RESOLVED that any comments on this consultation be emailed to the Administrative Services Officer - Planning by the end of February, for collation and forwarding to Wiltshire Council, and the Committee be informed of comments made.

110. NEW PREMISES LICENCE APPLICATION FOR ALDI, METHUEN PARK SN14 0GX

Councillors considered a New Premises Licence application received by Wiltshire Council made by Aldi, Methuen Park, for the following activities:

OFF Sale of Alcohol, daily 06:00 - 00:00 hrs

RESOLVED that no objections be made to this application.

111. THE COUNTY OF WILTSHIRE (CHIPPENHAM AND CHIPPENHAM WITHOUT) (PROHIBITION AND RESTRICTION OF WAITING, PROHIBITION OF STOPPING, CLEARWAYS AND ON STREET PARKING) CONSOLIDATION ORDER 2019 (AMENDMENT NO.6) ORDER 2021

Councillors considered the above proposed Traffic Regulation Order (copy in minute book).

RESOLVED that no objections be made to this application.

112. CHIPPENHAM COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP (CATG) MEETING HELD ON 2 FEBRUARY 2021

Councillors received feedback on the above from the Town Council's representative, Councillor John Scragg (copy in minute book).

113. PROPOSED TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES/TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

The following were noted:

- The temporary closure of Footpath 27, Chippenham and Footpaths 34 & 42, Langley Burrell for 6 months from 10 February.
- The recommencement of the temporary closure of the B4528 Saltersford Lane (part) from its junction with the B4528 Showell to its junction with Easton Lane from 22 February to 2 April 2021.

- The temporary closure of the A420 (part) from its junction with St Paul Street for a distance of approx. 170m in an east northerly direction from 6 to 22 March 2021.
- The temporary closure of The Green (part), Biddestone from its junction with Chippenham Road to its junction with Harts Lane on 16 March 2021 for one day.

114. ITEMS FOR COMMUNICATION

There were no items for communication.

115. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will take place on Thursday 11 March 2021.

The meeting concluded at 8.30 pm

These minutes are subject to confirmation at the next meeting
Signed on behalf of the Committee as a true record of the meeting

Chairman:

Date:

PLANNING APPLICATIONS - 18 February 2021

Application No.	Address/Description	Ward
<u>20/06040/LBC</u>	Baynton House 84 London Road SN15 3AZ Remove existing roof covering and replace with matching welsh slates. Take out existing lead parapet valley and woodwork and replace with new woodwork and leadwork. Repairs to Dormer windows as required. Cllr Bill Douglas consulted: - No objection subject to the Conservation Officer having no concerns.	Hardens & England
<u>20/10040/FUL</u> & <u>21/00711/LBC</u>	SK Fruits 22 High Street SN15 3EU Proposed EE and Hutchison 3G UK Ltd Telecommunications Installation (Health and Safety Railing improvements) on rooftop. Cllr Bill Douglas consulted: - No objection subject to the Conservation Officer having no concerns.	Hardens & England
<u>20/11328/FUL</u>	113 Hungerdown Lane SN14 0AX Proposed stable structure. Cllr Chris Ruck consulted: - No objection.	CP & Derriads
<u>20/11449/FUL</u>	84 B London Road SN15 3AZ Erection of ancillary building and replacement decking area (part retrospective). Cllr Bill Douglas consulted: - No objection but it is suggested that the ancillary building be tied to the host dwelling.	Hardens & England
<u>20/11459/LBC</u>	Avonbridge House, Suites A To D Bath Road SN15 2BB Removal of C20th internal partitions and suspended ceilings - retrospective. Proposed replacement of heating and ventilation system, installation of new ceiling lining to underside of retained roof structure within Suite B (first floor east wing) and adjacent entrance landing, repairs to bell tower support structure. Cllrs Raj Gill & Nick Murry consulted: - No objection subject to the Conservation Officer having no concerns.	Monkton
<u>20/11466/FUL</u>	Morrisons Service Station West Cepen Way SN14 6UZ Demolition of Existing Petrol Station Kiosk and Car Wash, Construction of Replacement Larger Kiosk Building. Works Involve Removal of Roof Linked to Forecourt Canopy, Creation of New Additional Parking Spaces and Addition/Relocation of Jet Wash, Air/Vac	CP & Redlands

	<p>Bay and Air Conditioning/Refrigeration Plant. Cllrs Andy Phillips & Nina Phillips consulted: - No objection.</p>	
<u>20/11469/FUL</u>	<p>1A Deansway SN15 1QY Alteration to rear roof section of single storey extension approved under 20/06120/FUL from pitch to flat roof. No Ward Councillors present: - No objection.</p>	Hardenhuish
<u>20/11567/FUL</u>	<p>Unit 1B Hathaway Retail Park Foundry Lane SN15 1JG External alterations to unit, alterations to car park, variation to permitted range of goods and associated development. Cllrs Raj Gill & Nick Murry consulted: - No objection. Whilst there is some support for the re-purposing of the building in line with Government changes to the Use Classes Order and the current economic climate, and allowance for limited 'sale of food' floorspace as proposed, there is concern that the subdivision of large comparison retail warehouses such as this one, in 'out-of-town' locations, into smaller units, may prejudice the retail offer in the town centre, which is currently in a precarious state. Therefore we would welcome reassurance that this proposal would not affect the vitality and viability of the town centre. The proposed changes to the north east elevation to enable a new front elevation for Unit 1C would be welcomed. However, the large, high level ventilation grille proposed would appear at odds with the pursuit of this elevation as new active frontage. The grille should be relocated to the rear elevation or positioned at ground level, given this elevation of the building is prominent in long distance views from the east (including the railway line).</p>	Monkton
<u>20/11580/FUL</u>	<p>Islington Vauxhall, Bath Road SN14 0UX Proposed new vehicular access and associated works. Cllr Chris Ruck consulted: - Object There is no objection to the proposed creation of a one-way vehicular access off Bath Road to service this site, and this would likely improve amenity for residents living on Hereford Close. However, the proposed development would result in the loss of 9 trees located within an important tree/shrub belt that runs along this section of Bath</p>	CP & Derriads

	<p>Road, for which no tree survey has been submitted, or replacement tree planting on the site has been proposed. Amended plans/tree survey should be submitted. As it stands, the proposal would be contrary to CP57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and the NPPF.</p> <p>The proposal explains that priority will be given to vehicles using the new access over cyclists and pedestrians using the existing popular cycle/foot path (that would need to be adjusted and made slightly longer because of the new access). Preference should be given to existing sustainable modes of transport over new non-sustainable modes, and given the Planning Statement confirms a relatively low level of traffic would use the proposed access during peak hours, amended plans should be submitted to show how cyclists and pedestrians will be given priority over vehicles, where the proposed access crosses this route. As it stands, the proposal would be contrary to CP60 and CP61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, and the NPPF.</p>	
<u>20/11666/FUL</u>	<p>18 Crown Close SN15 3UQ Single storey extension to rear to replace existing conservatory. Cllr Richard Bambury consulted: - No objection.</p>	Pewsham
<u>21/00082/ADV</u>	<p>Lidl 1no. Flagpole, 2no. Fascia Signs, 3no. Illuminated Billboards - Wall Mounted, 2no. Illuminated Small Billboards - Wall Mounted, 1no. Poster Display Unit, 1no. Trolley Bay Sign. Cllr Bill Douglas consulted: - No objection.</p>	Hardens & England
<u>21/00148/FUL</u>	<p>9 Carrick Close SN15 3ND Removal of existing single storey garage and erection of 2 storey side extension. Cllrs Raj Gill & Nick Murry consulted: - No objection. However, the Town Council wishes to highlight that the owner of the adjoining property has raised concerns regarding the party wall.</p>	Monkton
<u>21/00199/FUL</u> & <u>21/01003/LBC</u>	<p>25 New Road SN15 1HS 21/00199/FUL - Change of Use of Former Drinking Establishment to form Retail Unit - Class E(a) and residential accommodation (C3). Demolition of existing above ground cellar along with conversion and extension of existing rear building to create 2 x one bed</p>	Monkton

	<p>apartments. 21/01003/LBC - Internal and external alterations associated with change of use from Former Drinking Establishment to Retail Unit and demolition of existing above ground cellar. Conversion and extension of existing rear building in association with change of use to residential accommodation. Cllrs Raj Gill & Nick Murry consulted: - No objection The loss of this historic public house and community use is disappointing. However, it is accepted that there is probably no realistic chances of a public house use being viable in this building/location in the intermediate future. The loss needs to be balanced against:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) the longer term preservation of this listed building which this proposal would secure, b) the proposed repairs/external changes and replacement of some of the unsympathetic later additions, which would actually enhance and better reveal the building's significance, and have a positive impact on Chippenham Conservation Area, and c) retention of a commercial shop use at ground floor, which is important to ensure the vitality and viability of this cluster of 'independent' commercial uses at the top end of New Road <p>Notwithstanding the above, we wish to make the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic analysis of the building is poor, particularly with regard to any key internal features which may contribute to the significance of the listed building, and how the proposal might impact upon them • Indicative proposed signage should be omitted from this consent and should be the subject of separate detailed listed building and advertisement consent applications (there is now no justification for high level illuminated signage on the building's front elevation, when the ground floor is only in use for retail). • The painting of the front elevation in a contemporary grey colour would likely detract from the historic appearance of the listed building and the Conservation Area. 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finally, and related to point (c) above, should consent be forthcoming, it is recommended that a condition be attached to ensure that the ground floor remains in Use Class E in perpetuity. There should be no back door left open for the whole building to be converted to residential under any future permitted development rights at a later date. 	
<u>21/00293/FUL</u> & <u>21/01095/LBC</u>	<p>17 St Mary Street SN15 3JN New Garden Room to Rear of Property and Conversion of Attached Outbuilding into Annexe. Cllr Bill Douglas consulted: - No objection subject to the Conservation Officer having no concerns.</p>	Hardens & England
<u>21/00353/ADV</u>	<p>21 New Road SN15 1HS (i) Installation of 4No. illuminated fascia signs (ii) Installation of 1No. freestanding Totem Sign. Cllrs Raj Gill & Nick Murry consulted: - Object The location of the site within Chippenham Conservation Area, adjacent to the Grade II Listed Nos. 19-20 New Road and opposite other Grade II Listed Buildings means that any signage on the site needs to be particularly sensitive to its surroundings.</p> <p>The building is utilitarian and of no architectural quality and therefore an illuminated fascia sign, of the scale and siting previously displayed on the building, would be acceptable.</p> <p>However, the proposed addition of a 5m high illuminated totem sign (A totem sign was refused on the site in 2004), and other illuminated building signs, would be entirely unacceptable and form a dominant element that would harm the significance of the Conservation Area and setting of adjoining listed buildings. The siting, proliferation and illuminance of advertisements on the site would have a cumulative and individual impact to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area, the significance of Chippenham Conservation Area, and the setting of the adjacent Grade II Listed Nos. 19-20 New Road and would therefore be contrary to CP57 and CP58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, the Chippenham Conservation Area Management Plan SPG, and the NPPF.</p>	Monkton

<u>21/00375/FUL</u>	7 Anstey Place SN15 3TZ Demolish existing conservatory and construct rear extension and bay window. Cllr Richard Bambury consulted: - No objection.	Pewsham
<u>21/00409/FUL</u>	55 Derriads Lane SN14 0QL Extensions and alterations to existing dwelling. Cllrs Chris Ruck & Mary Norton consulted: - No objection.	CP & Derriads Queens & Sheldon
<u>21/00412/FUL</u>	28 Signal Way SN14 0FP Front porch extension. Cllrs Andy Phillips & Nina Phillips consulted: - No objection.	CP & Redlands
<u>21/00464/FUL</u>	45 Cheltenham Drive SN14 0SF New garden room and garden fence. Cllr Chris Ruck consulted: - No objection.	CP & Derriads
<u>21/00472/VAR</u>	Land Adjoining Wessex Water, Westmead Lane SN15 3HZ Variation of Condition 4 of 18/11596/FUL Relating to Approved Plans. Cllr Bill Douglas consulted: - No objection.	Hardens & England
<u>21/00505/FUL</u>	20 Marshfield Road SN15 1JX Replacement UPVC Windows to Front and Rear, New Front Door. No Ward Councillors present: - No objection.	Hardenhuish
<u>21/00507/FUL</u>	16 Sheldon Road SN14 0BW Free-standing bespoke garden office studio with passive provision for future en-suite. Cllrs Jenny Budgell & John Scragg consulted: - No objection.	Lowden & Rowden
<u>21/00595/FUL</u>	40 Audley Road SN14 0EH Single storey extension & loft conversion. Cllrs Jenny Budgell & John Scragg consulted: - No objection.	Lowden & Rowden
<u>21/00598/FUL</u>	6 Stainers Way SN14 6XT Two storey rear extension. Cllrs Andy Phillips & Nina Phillips consulted: - No objection.	CP & Redlands
<u>21/00599/FUL</u>	8 Stainers Way SN14 6XT Two storey rear extension. Cllrs Andy Phillips & Nina Phillips consulted: - No objection.	CP & Redlands

Amended Plans		
<p><u>20/08053/FUL</u></p>	<p>1 Langley Road SN15 1BP Change of use of offices to 8 bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) and associated works including the insertion of new windows and the formation of light wells. Cllrs Raj Gill & Nick Murry consulted: - Object The revised plans do not overcome our previous objection on the grounds that the proposal would provide poor living conditions for future occupiers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst the submitted Daylight Report appears to indicate sufficient daylight to the basement communal kitchen and lounge rooms, this does not overcome concerns regarding poor outlook from these rooms (there is still no windows or outlook to the dining room, the largest room in the basement) and it is unlikely that either rooms would receive any direct sunlight. The additional section plans provided show low floor to ceiling height in the basement would only exacerbate the claustrophobic nature of this space. • The section plans also present new concerns with regard to limited head height space and space for furniture in the top floor flat and it is likely that this flat would provide cramped and inadequate living conditions. • As previously stated, the dimensions of Bedroom 7 at only 9m in size, would provide cramped living conditions for this occupier <p>Transportation advice is noted that this could be a car-free development. Accordingly, and to address our previous concerns with regard to the lack of any amenity space, parking spaces should be omitted from the rear yard and this space could be better used as communal rear amenity space/bike storage/bin storage.</p>	<p>Monkton</p>
<p><u>20/09830/FUL</u></p>	<p>Monkton Park Golf Course Sadlers Mead SN15 3PE Proposed installation of 2no. 20ft shipping containers, formation of covered area and erection of a gate and fencing. Cllrs Raj Gill & Nick Murry consulted: - The amendments to the scheme currently do not overcome the Town Council's previous objections submitted on 8 January 2021.</p>	<p>Monkton</p>

Public Comments and Questions

The following written statements/questions were read out:

1. I have recently had the misfortune of seeing the video and presentation by the so-called Future Chippenham team and feel very depressed that this future for Chippenham is being proposed by Wiltshire Council (WC) and hope the Town Council will therefore now join me in and others in firmly rejecting it. These Future Chippenham proposals have now been transposed into the proposals for Chippenham in the Local Plan, before any consultation has even taken place, and seem to be dictating an excessive number of houses and the need to build them to the East, requiring large flyovers and canal bridges and all sorts of otherwise unnecessary infrastructure. Having viewed the proposals I cannot understand why WC want to press ahead with a road for which they do not appear to have made valid, or any coherent case for constructing. I do not understand why WC are consulting on a route before even consulting on the number of houses to be built in Chippenham, let alone gaining outline planning permission for them. Building a road, purely on a speculative basis, that some houses may be built in the future, does not make economic or environmental sense. If the planning process is independent of this road, as we are told by Future Chippenham that it is, it follows that it cannot be assumed that planning permission will be granted for the 7,500 houses and 'two new suburbs' that are needed for the road to happen. I would like to remind the Council that it (quite rightly) declared a Climate Emergency in 2019. In this is stated an intention to make Chippenham carbon neutral, and Wiltshire Council stated its intention to make the county carbon neutral, by 2030, which is now just 9 years away. It is clear that the Local Plan and Future Chippenham teams have not even calculated the carbon emissions from the construction of the road and 7,500 houses that would go with it. In other words, the emissions of carbon released when millions of tonnes of earth are dug up, millions of tonnes of materials created for construction and the millions of tonnes released while construction takes place. These have simply have simply been overlooked. This is even before considering the increase in traffic the road will create, a phenomena recognised by many studies, including from the Department of Transport, and the resulting increase in emissions, including from the manufacture and running of electric vehicles. I am not aware if CTC, or WC have yet calculated a 'road map' to net zero emissions in 9 years, and a yearly carbon budgets. Whether or not they have, it is clear that a development of this size is completely incompatible with net zero emissions by 2030 and will lock in carbon emissions for years to come. In parallel to damaging the climate, the Local Plan and Future Chippenham proposals would destroy the Avon and Marden valley, and vast amounts of high quality farmland and natural habitat, which is a valuable resource for Chippenham and so important for future generations. Building at such scale, so close to the river Avon and Marden, up stream of Chippenham and other towns on the Avon I believe that CTC response to the consultation should be to tell Wiltshire Council to go back to the drawing board and come back with a plan that

is actually fit for the future. It should point out that imposing a road to the East of Chippenham, with all the harm this would cause to our town and to the climate and natural environment, is the wrong way to go. Having contributed to the Chippenham Neighbourhood Plan as a member of one of its Topic Groups, I am aware that the Neighbourhood Plan has been working extremely hard to ensure a more sustainable future for our town, including, developing policies to ensure carbon neutral and sustainable development and protection of natural capital. Its Vision states that "future growth will be appropriate in scale... environmentally sustainable and planned so as to mitigate the causes, and be adapted to the impacts of climate change." This aligns with the survey responses. (which can be seen on the CTC website) in which 89% of respondents said that development needs to minimise climate change impacts and highlighted over-development/urban sprawl as one of residents' top concerns. WC's Local Plan proposals and road building scheme fly in the face of the kind of sustainable development the Neighbourhood Plan and Chippenham Town Council have been working towards. For development to be sustainable, it needs to be at an appropriate scale and pace, and its needs to be in the right place. These Local Plan proposals and the disproportionate scale of development they would bring are completely at odds with these principles and should be firmly rejected. My questions therefore are:

1. Will this Committee reject Wiltshire Council's proposals for 9,225 houses to be built in the next Plan period and 7,500 to be built as two huge suburbs to the East and South of Chippenham?
 2. Will the Committee make the point to Wiltshire Council that the proposed construction of the road and 7,500 houses in this location is completely incompatible with, and works in the opposite direction to, the Town Council's stated intention of making Chippenham carbon neutral by 2030?
2. I am of the opinion that the road should not be built, my objections have been or will be clearly articulated by others around the impact to our environment, wildlife, flood risks and contributing too rather than mitigating against the climate crisis we are living in. In reality it appears to me that there would only be any argument for the road if the housing needs have been agreed and as such they should be considered together. By not doing so, and by not giving the clear and open option to add a 'we don't want a road' to the questionnaire the signal that is being given is to input on which road option will be approved rather than whether a road is needed or wanted. It is therefore unsurprising that to some residents that it also appears that the housing requirements have been assumed to be inevitable. Based on this my question is 'do council members understand that the outcome of the consultation for the road appears to be a foregone conclusion, and that it undermines residents trust in local democratic processes?
3. Chippenham is a small market town with a nice community feel that is surrounded by open countryside including areas like the Avon and Marden valley, all of which contribute to making Chippenham a good place to live. I understand that populations grow and that more houses are needed, but I dispute the figures estimated by Wiltshire Council and also ask: at what cost do we continue expanding our town? Any proposal that sets out to destroy the things we value,

must surely be stopped when alternatives, such as brownfield sites, are available, and the development of which would revive our increasingly neglected town centre. There is so much potential to improve and restore the character and vibrancy of Chippenham and, post Covid, many office, retail and hospitality spaces in the centre will be available for redevelopment into domestic dwellings. Such sites can provide high density, affordable homes which remove the need for car ownership and leave our countryside intact for us, and future generations, to enjoy. The risk of allowing a huge development in Chippenham (i.e. 20% of the total number of houses for Wiltshire), is that you irreparably damage the character of our town and the quality of life here. You would, in effect, be turning Chippenham into another Swindon, with an accelerated deterioration of the town centre as you create commuter belt communities that have little or no relationship to Chippenham. If you asked every single one of the residents of Chippenham whether they wanted to live in a town like Swindon, I am quite sure that 100% of them would say a decisive "no", and that Wiltshire Council needs to think again.

My question is:

On behalf of the citizens of Chippenham who elected you, and who will remember your decision at future elections, residents who do not want our town turned into a second Swindon with a dead town centre and concreted over natural spaces, will this Committee agree to reject Wiltshire Council's proposals to build this road and associated 7,500 houses?

4. Tonight's decision is critical and will affect Chippenham for generations to come. And the impact of your decision is made all the more evident by the number of attendees tonight, each one speaking passionately against the Road. But let's be clear. The Road comes with a whole New Town attached. And it'll be on green fields between Chippenham and Calne. The two are inseparable. And this New Town is massive. About the same size as Calne. So voting for the road is a clear vote for a New Town. Here are my concerns.
To start with...is the road justified? As a local distributor road it'll have zebra crossings and calming measures, apparently a speed limit of 20mph in part, so a bit like the London Road, and clearly won't make a jot of difference to through traffic, to HGV's and lorries and the like. And what about the thousands of new cars from the New Town? Where are the 15,000 new cars going to go? All they'll do is pile up and make the traffic situation in Chippenham worse.
My next concern is whether the Road is proportionate? On size alone it isn't. Dropping a New Town across the Avon from Chippenham, one that's the size of Calne, is clearly uncalled for. And you've heard from many others about the wanton destruction to the countryside, especially the River Mardon valley. Do we believe the Road's timely? Wise heads would husband their resources during a pandemic. The way we work is changing. Where we work is changing. Local government funding will be under massive pressure. So where's the need to push this through in such an unseemly way?
And finally, and this is probably why so many people are here this evening, is it fair? Is it fair? Is it fair to North Wiltshire? Is it fair to Chippenham? Wiltshire County Council is the land owner and developer. Selling off the family silver won't

benefit Chippenham. And that's why it's not seen as fair.

So if you believe that this Road and the New Town are proportionate, timely and fair then vote with a clear conscience and support it.

If you don't think that this proposal is justified, that the Road and New Town are completely disproportionate, and that they are fundamentally damaging and unfair, then vote against the road in all its forms.

Why? For the benefit of future generations and all the people who make Chippenham their home.

5. We have seen a number of recent developments in Chippenham that have gone ahead despite local opposition from both Chippenham Council and many members of the public. One of the projects cost the town a major redevelopment of the old college site and the loss of its associated employment opportunities and so it is easy to see why the behaviour already demonstrated by WCC has upset many local residents and there is a sense that WCC simply don't listen to local opinion. Many people may only see this proposal as the building of a new road when in fact it is also a way to open the flood gates to build an excessively large number of houses equalling a settlement the size of Calne. The consequences of this are massive and far reaching for the area with many significant and long lasting environmental impacts. In a nutshell the new road will bring more houses, more houses will bring more commuters, and more commuters will result in more congestion and pollution. It is therefore easy to see that if and when people fully understand these facts, opposition to the road will increase dramatically. With this in-mind, how will the County Council ensure that people are fully and effectively informed of the proposal, the negative consequences that such a massive development will have, and vitally, will the council then listen and act appropriately to any opposition?
6. I believe Wiltshire Council are misleading Chippenham residents and we need you to stand up for us. We are not being asked if we want 5,000 extra houses over Government housing figures, we are not being told the road is not a bypass but a distributor road for new housing which will clog up the town and railway station area for existing residents. We aren't being told there are over 30 business premises of various sizes available just that we need more! We are not being told there are 260 houses on one website for sale, many have been on there for over a year. Most people haven't seen the gigantic building site at Birds Marsh or the developments at Methuen Park, Langley Park, the old police station, the old Vauxhall garage on the Causeway and many smaller projects due to lockdown. What about the brownfield sites like the old College and all the vacant and derelict houses? We see 2 large signposts on the cycle path and 6 posters in the town centre for the road with no mention of the housing and 3 webinars for the road. There was only 1 webinar for the houses and no posters. Having both running at the same time is confusing, not to mention the reams of documents the public are supposed to go through while home schooling and working, we are not experts but are going to be judged on the strength of evidence and replies we submit. We need our Chippenham Councillors to stand up for us and put this on hold until it can be consulted on properly. Give us a break from building and let us regenerate as a town after the pandemic, save our community farms for local

food and the community, the cycle path through countryside and the wildlife. Just because there isn't an entrance fee on it doesn't mean it isn't valuable to the residents of Chippenham. Once destroyed we won't be able to get it back. With falling births, 15.3% over 8 years, reflected in Chippenham Primary school admissions dropping from 5,600 to 5,000 over the last few years, death rates rising from Covid and new variants, people not getting treatment early for cancer, heart problems and other illnesses we don't know what the updated requirements will be. All good businesses adapt and we need Wiltshire Council to do the same, the gin company that changed to hand sanitiser flourished, Debenhams stores that didn't adapt went under. The pandemic, home working, our love of our local outside areas and much more have changed people's priorities. Can we count on you to stand up for the residents of Chippenham?

7. I have recently been considering the carbon budget calculations for the proposed expansion of Future Chippenham including a new road, 7500 houses and a further 9000 houses. I want to highlight that Wiltshire has committed to being carbon neutral by 2030, the UK government by 2050, and Chippenham Town council by 2030. The declared Climate emergency and parallel biodiversity loss is the most difficult and urgent issue to solve and requires immediate and continued action. I have used Professor Tim Jackson's fair carbon budget proposals in my calculations and these leave a remaining carbon budget for Chippenham of 1.69 Megatonnes of CO₂ to remain within 1.5 degrees C warming. The proposed housing built using current typical construction techniques uses at least half of that budget (0.825 mega tonnes). I have not calculated for roads and infrastructure, or for the carbon disturbed from land in the build. In short the proposals do not leave enough remaining budget to reach carbon zero by any measure. Quite simply the council has its priority wrong. It must reject the road and house building and put all efforts into getting Chippenham and Wiltshire to net zero with the remaining fair carbon budget for Chippenham. This requires work on existing buildings and infrastructure, energy generation, land use, transport etc A huge undertaking and one that will be difficult to achieve. I therefore call on the council planning to reject the Future Chippenham proposals on the basis they fail to meet the net zero commitment. Your planning proposals do not take into account their affect on future generations.
8. Since these plans for Chippenham were first proposed, the climate emergency has become even more critical. Experts say that now we have only 6 years in which we may be able to arrest human caused climate change and enable our world to be one in which our children, and our children's children will continue to exist. This is not the time to be planning the building of a major new road, nor to be increasing the number of urban settlements on ecologically significant countryside.
We know of the disastrous effects of pollution on our health. Rather than increasing greenhouse emissions by creating further road networks, we should be encouraging cycle, rail and other public transport, with better schemes and incentives for electric vehicles and shared car ownership.
During this pandemic, unprecedented numbers of Chippenham residents have been making daily use of the old Calne railway line, the riverside walks and surrounding

countryside. Whole families are walking and cycling out together, rediscovering the essential benefits that being in nature offer to our mental and physical wellbeing which the past year of crisis has highlighted. This is not time in which we should be considering building over valuable green spaces. Changing patterns of work, commuting and shopping, due to the pandemic, mean that this proposal is based on an assumption of needs that are already out of date. With more of us working from home there is and will continue to be, less need for car ownership and commuting to work. Due to Covid many businesses will close in our town centre and not be replaced by others. Redevelopment of former business premises in our town centre, for new homes, rather than planning new urban developments on ecologically valuable countryside, should be our priority. This road is not needed. It will cause permanent damage to our precious natural environment and with the increase of pollution, aggravate mental and physical ill health in our local population. In view of these environmental, health and societal changes, is not this proposal for a distributor road not only harmful for our community but already out of date?

9. My question is - Can the Council really support the notion that Wiltshire Council is working for the best interests of the people of Chippenham in the way that it's going about the local plan review?
10. I would like to ask a question about the town council's response to the Local Plan, and particularly the proposal to build the distributor road to the south and east of the town, enabling thousands more new houses to be built on green field sites. I acknowledge and appreciate that within the town council's draft response there are relevant questions and challenges about the housing figures, the allocation for the town and the use of brownfield sites - particularly in light of recent events such as Brexit and Covid. It seems like the greatest folly to proceed with such an extraordinarily costly, large-scale, environmentally destructive scheme as the distributor road when the need for such an enormous expansion of the town has not been proven or agreed - indeed it is highly questionable. When we are all facing the challenge of tackling climate change and the collapse of biodiversity, it cannot possibly be rational to think that building new roads - with two river bridges - and covering precious agricultural land with expansive housing estates, is the answer. These areas are precious for food production, for wildlife and nature, and for our cultural heritage. We need not to be thinking 'more of the same' - more roads, more new greenfield developments - to solve the very real problems we face, but 'how can we approach this differently'? My question is, therefore, do you think the town is being rushed into supporting a proposal for a distributor road and associated housing, without convincing evidence there is a need for it?
11. I am a resident of Chippenham and strongly oppose the housing target allocated to Chippenham outlined within the local plan and the proposed distributor road. How does this level of housing growth support sustainable growth of the town? when economic development is disproportionately low and the environmental impact from the 'housing and the road' have not been adequately assessed or reported within the consultation?

12. Considering the challenging economic situation brought by Covid-19, and the criticism raised by the proposals, will the council consider pausing to rethink these plans? The proposals seem rushed; don't provide sufficient justification regarding the need to spend money on a road, which is assumed to be required to serve 7,500 new houses. The need for so many houses is not clear - and also unclear are the benefits for Chippenham. Is their proposed location the most adequate option? I am concerned that it will lead to the loss of precious natural habitat by building in the Avon and Marden valley.
13. Given the local plan consultation, and Wiltshire Council's allocation of both sites and land use within sites, how does one submit an application for land to be allocated as Local Green Space? Pursuant with the National Planning Framework.
- What is the proper format and time for neighbourhoods to submit such an application?
 - Is Chippenham Town Council the relevant authority to designate LGS?
 - If it is Wiltshire that makes the decision, how does one get CTC's support for such an application?
14. As a mum of two who is very concerned about our future in relation to the climate and ecological emergencies, I would firstly like to encourage Councillors to endorse and uphold the suggested responses to the Local Plan Review consultation given in Appendix 1 by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and advisers. There are two broad and related points I would also like to express:
- 1.) The consultation (if you happen to have become aware of it) is based on a huge set of technical documents which are very overwhelming to digest, and the questions seek complex answers which are equally challenging. Add to this, online events have heavily pitched already very well-established plans using unevidenced assumptions like 'inevitable growth', the 'viability' or otherwise of different options, and the notion of 'sustainability' in relation to preferred schemes. The overall approach thereby appears more an attempt to bamboozle residents into tacit acceptance of the scheme for Chippenham, which would be supported by the grant from the Housing Infrastructure Fund. I believe this underlines the responsibility of Chippenham Council to provide robust questioning of the proposals and the claims made about them, on behalf of local residents.
 - 2.) The proposed level of development, greenbelt location of preferred sites, and associated new road are totally unacceptable when we are imminently facing the devastating and increasingly costly impacts of the climate and ecological emergencies. Planning is subject to legally binding national and international carbon reduction targets, as well as Wiltshire's own stated intention to achieve a net zero County by 2030. But they have failed to devise and include carbon emissions calculations for any proposals, and no wonder. The plan for Chippenham would be more at home modelling how to significantly increase emissions in every conceivable way, deepen reliance on private car use and commuting, worsen air quality, destroy habitats and green spaces that we benefit from, and increase risks of flooding. It surely does not address real housing 'need' either, and pays the merest lip-service to the concept of 'sustainable' development given that the accepted figures are inflated, the full potential of

brownfield sites is disregarded, and sites are not connected to enough actual or potential local employment, and to the existing transport infrastructure. As the influence of climate denial finally diminishes, and the policy landscape adjusts to the urgency and enormity of what we must do, brave, direction-changing decisions are completely reasonable and required, and I hope that with support Wiltshire Council will come to their senses on this very flawed and reckless plan.

The following written statements/questions were also received but were not read out due to insufficient time:

15. The Climate Change Commission (CCC) assert that this generation need to be the Victorians of the 21st Century and make a fast but manageable and just transition to net zero in order for our children and our children's children to stand any chance of surviving on planet earth in the future. In February 2019 the council declared a climate emergency and committed to seek to make the county of Wiltshire carbon neutral by 2030. In February 2021 WC produced an Update on Council's Response to the Climate Emergency with 2 Appendices. I am therefore at a loss as to why the Future Chippenham Proposal / Local Plan for Chippenham contain no specific details on how Wiltshire's emerging climate strategy is embedded within these proposals, no details on how emissions will be reduced or how progress will be made. The CCC advises Local Authorities to: 'Monitor and report on progress in reducing emissions to local communities and government. Where possible share standardised data, benchmark and provide clear evidence to inform policy.' but with the LP and Future Chippenham proposals there are no targets to monitor or report on. I also understand it is a requirement of planning legislation that local plans are aligned with the Climate Change Act and the Government's target of net zero carbon by 2050 and 68% reduction by 2030. The 2008 Planning Act requires Local Plan policy to contribute to the mitigation and adoption to climate change and the recent judgement in the Client Earth v Secretary of State sets an important climate planning precedent for future infrastructure planning. Thus planning for growth in economic and housing terms is meaningless unless there is certainty that such planning incorporates the mechanisms to deliver these carbon reductions. I am at a loss to see how members of CTC can ethically agree to the WC plans as they are so far removed from planning for genuine sustainable development ("Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs," World Commission on Environment and Development 1987) and urge them to reject the proposals until the county can put its horse clearly before its cart in relation to its commitment to the climate emergency and clearly embed its Climate Action Plan within all policies and proposals. I appreciate that new homes will be required across Wiltshire and in Chippenham but cannot see that a delay to ensure things are done from a value led perspective and with clear Net Zero choices embedded across all areas of the 7 delivery themes identified in the Update on Councils Response to the Climate Emergency document will do any harm to progress in the wider context of caring for planet earth. If CTC members are not prepared to do this please can they how they can justify their actions to their community and future generations?

16. Wiltshire Council consultations (the so called Local Plan being a prototypical example) are devised so that people being “consulted” are presented with equally undesirable choices, rather than with the opportunity to (dis)agree with the proposal(s) that generate the choices. As a result consultees feel obliged to choose the least bad option. Wiltshire Council appears to comply with transparency obligations, because it suggests that there's “no other way for members of the public to get the information they need.” In reality, the information presented by the council is inherently biased in ways that include but are not confined to the following:

- Part list cueing effect
- Recency effect
- Information bias
- Ambiguity bias
- System justification
- Processing difficulty bias
- Irrational escalation
- Multiple fundamental attribution errors
- Projection bias

Unrelated concepts are yoked together to simulate a reasoned argument—need “demand” “government targets”. Evidence for Chippenham’s actual needs is disregarded. Instead, assertions and out of date statistics are provided, with no attempt to account for disconfirmatory evidence, especially in regard to existing empty dwellings in the county, the need for low density sprawl on green field sites, flood risk. The bottom line is that Wiltshire Council’s proposals in the so called Local Plan for Chippenham are solely driven by its opportunistic HIF bid made in response to demands by speculative developers and land bankers. The fundamental principles of worldwide and national zero carbon targets in response to the climate emergency are utterly disregarded. Wiltshire Council prefers to put in jeopardy future generations, than to relinquish short term profiteering.

The Chairman confirmed that a written response would be sent to the residents and this is also attached at **APPENDIX B** (not part of the meeting).

Not part of the meeting

Appendix B

Written responses to public questions asked at PET on 18 February 2021:

Response to Question 1:

Thank you for speaking at the Planning, Environment and Transport (PET) Committee on 18 February 2021. At this meeting the PET Committee recommended responses to the Local Plan Review Consultation to Full Council for consideration. These responses were approved by Full Council on 25 February 2021 and can be read in full [HERE](#). This is a Wiltshire Council Consultation therefore your comments have been forwarded to Wiltshire Council for consideration. Chippenham Town Council’s Climate Emergency

Advisory Group is working on a carbon reduction action plan, more information about their meetings can be found [HERE](#).

Response to Questions 2-12 and 14-16:

Thank you for speaking at the Planning, Environment and Transport (PET) Committee on 18 February 2021. At this meeting the PET Committee recommended responses to the Local Plan Review Consultation to Full Council for consideration. These responses were approved by Full Council on 25 February 2021 and can be read in full [HERE](#). This is a Wiltshire Council Consultation therefore your comments have been forwarded to Wiltshire Council for consideration.

Response to Question 13:

Only Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans can designate Local Green Space, and it is through consultation with local communities on drafting these plans that such spaces can be identified. Usually, such designations are more suited to Neighbourhood Plans to prepare since this is a local rather than strategic tool.

Paragraph 100 of the NPPF explains that *“Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:*

- a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;*
- b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquility or richness of its wildlife; and*
- c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.”*

The Town Council is drafting a Neighbourhood Plan for Chippenham in consultation with the local community. As part of this process the Neighbourhood Plan's Green Infrastructure Topic Group (comprising of community members and Councillors) went out and surveyed all green spaces within the town in 2019/20 and subjected them to a set of criteria based on the above to reach a shortlist of 48 sites it considers should be designated as Local Green Spaces. These sites will be shared with the general public when the Neighbourhood Plan goes out to public consultation in Spring/Summer this year, and we welcome future views/feedback from the public on this.