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INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS)\(^1\) requires that approximately 5,090 new homes should be provided in the Chippenham Community Area and that ‘at least’ 4,510 of these should be at Chippenham.

1.2 The policy goes on to require allocations for strategic sites to be identified in the Chippenham Site Allocations Development Plan Document (Chippenham Site Allocations Plan) to accommodate approximately 26.5ha of land for employment and at least 2,625 new homes.

1.3 This paper explains how sites in the draft Chippenham Site Allocations Plan have been selected. Part One summarises the Council’s methodology and Part Two the Council’s reasoning and justification for the sites selected.

---

\(^1\) Wiltshire Core Strategy, Wiltshire Council, January 2015, Core Policy 10 ‘Spatial Strategy – Chippenham Area
PART ONE: METHODOLOGY

The Wiltshire Core Strategy

Scale of development requirements

2.1 The Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) requires a scale of development at Chippenham of at least 4,510 dwellings and 26.5ha over the plan period 2006 to 2026. A number of dwellings have been built since 2006 and there are planning permissions (including resolutions to grant planning permission) either awaiting commencement or under construction for a further amount.

2.2 Core Policy 10 of the WCS states that the Chippenham Site Allocations Plan should look to allocate strategic mixed use sites to accommodate 26.5ha of employment land and at least 2,625 dwellings.

2.3 The situation when surveyed in April 2014\(^2\) is set out below. This latest data includes proposals for sites known as Hunters Moon and North Chippenham for which there are Council resolutions to grant planning permission. The scale of development needing to be accommodated on strategic sites has therefore reduced from 2,625 in Core Policy 10 to 1,936.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement 2006-2026</th>
<th>Built 2006-2014</th>
<th>With planning permission or under construction</th>
<th>Strategic site requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,510</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>1,936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 A number of dwellings will be built within Chippenham, generally on small sites, by redevelopment within the urban area. However, an assessment of such opportunities using Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment data shows this source, given the size of the settlement, to be quite modest and opportunities limited. By seeking to meet the remainder to be identified to meet plan requirements, through the allocation of strategic sites on the edge of the town, the Chippenham Site Allocations Plan can better ensure a supply of deliverable land and the flexibility to meet demand.

2.5 The WCS also establishes a set of six criteria to guide the town’s expansion (Core Policy (CP) 10 criteria) as set out below:

\(^2\) Housing Land Supply Statement (April 2014), Wiltshire Council, July 2014
1. The scope for the area to ensure the delivery of premises and/or land for employment development reflecting the priority to support local economic growth and settlement resilience

2. The capacity to provide a mix of house types, for both market and affordable housing alongside the timely delivery of the facilities and infrastructure necessary to serve them

3. Offers wider transport benefits for the existing community, has safe and convenient access to the local and primary road network and is capable of redressing traffic impacts, including impacts affecting the attractiveness of the town centre

4. Improves accessibility by alternatives to the private car to the town centre, railway station, schools and colleges and employment

5. Has an acceptable landscape impact upon the countryside and the settings to Chippenham and surrounding settlements, improves biodiversity and access and enjoyment of the countryside

6. Avoids all areas of flood risk (therefore within zone 1) and surface water management reduces the risk of flooding elsewhere

2.6 These form the central basis for selecting ‘strategic sites’ expanding the town. A Strategic Site Assessment Framework\(^3\) has been developed to define how the CP10 criteria will be interpreted.

**The Strategic Site Assessment Framework**

2.7 The Chippenham Strategic Sites Assessment Framework sets out in more detail how each of these criteria are used. It lists elements by which an area or site should be assessed against each of the CP10 criteria, the rationale explaining why it is included and what evidence will be used to describe how well a site or area performs against that measure.

2.8 The Strategic Site Assessment Framework has been informed through consultation including with parish and town councils, as representatives of their local community and those with development interests at the town. It also took account of previous consultation undertaken as a part of preparing the Core Strategy. A draft was consulted on in June 2014 and amended in the light of comments received\(^4\).

2.9 A series of evidence papers describe the results of the evidence gathered in accordance with the Strategic Site Assessment Framework for each of the ‘strategic areas’ identified in the Core Strategy. Each provides evidence relevant to the six CP10 criteria.

2.10 The evidence papers therefore cover\(^5\):

---

3 Chippenham Strategic Site Assessment Framework, Wiltshire Council, December 2014
4 Chippenham Site Allocations Plan : Consultation on Chippenham Strategic Site Assessment Framework, Wiltshire Council, December 2014
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- Evidence Paper 1: Economy
- Evidence Paper 2: Housing and Community Facilities
- Evidence Paper 3: Transport and Accessibility (Parts 1 and 2)
- Evidence Paper 4: Landscape Assessment
- Evidence Paper 5: Biodiversity
- Evidence Paper 6: Flood Risk and Surface Water Management

2.11 The evidence papers summarise information collated or commissioned by the Council, feedback from the community gathered, not only in the process of preparing this plan, but also the Core Strategy, and the information the Council has received from prospective developers, generally in the course of promoting specific sites for development. Transport and landscape assessments have been undertaken by specialist consultants.

Strategic areas

2.12 The WCS identifies, diagrammatically, a set of strategic areas east of the A350 as potential directions for future expansion. The ‘strategic areas’ are defined by barriers such as main roads, rivers and the main railway line. Strategic sites will be allocated in one or more of the strategic areas; referred to as the ‘preferred areas’ later in this report.

Figure 1: Chippenham Strategic Areas
The Core Strategy indicates that strategic sites will be east of Chippenham (strategic areas A – E, identified in the diagram above). Areas west of the Town have not been defined. The reasoning for this is set out in a briefing note explaining the selection of these strategic areas.

**Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment**

Sustainability appraisal works alongside the Strategic Site Assessment Framework. Sustainability appraisal performs a similar task and reports on likely environmental, social and economic effects of the options in order to inform decision making. This work is being carried out independently to the council. A sustainability appraisal framework and a set of questions form the basis for reporting on each of the effects of the different options.

The sustainability appraisal incorporates assessment and reporting on the environmental effects of different options as required by Strategic Environmental Assessment regulations for all plans and projects likely to have significant environmental effects.

**Ranking Core Policy (CP) 10 criteria**

The selection of a preferred area is guided by the criteria in CP10 of the Core Strategy. The process involves comparing areas and site options one against the other.

During consultation on the content of the Strategic Site Assessment Framework there was some discussion about how the Council would compare the criteria and indicators in the framework and come to a decision. It was suggested that the framework might make explicit the importance of each criteria and indicator and there should be a clear mechanism to give scores for each.

The Strategic Site Assessment Framework does not weight the criteria or indicators since it simply lists evidence requirements for each of the CP10 criteria. However by taking people’s views into account and solely in terms of comparing one area with another, the evidence then gathered as a result suggests that the criteria should be ranked in importance and this has influenced conclusions on selecting preferred areas. The ranking of the criteria is explained below.

**Employment (CP 10 Criterion 1)**

The Core Strategy is an employment-led strategy. The area strategy for Chippenham in particular places a priority on economic growth. The Strategic Economic Plan
prepared by the Wiltshire and Swindon Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), highlights the north of the County’s connection to the M4 corridor for much of its growth prospects. The potential is extended to other parts of the County by the role played by the A350, part of the County’s National Primary Route Network, and enhancing its efficiency is a focus for public investment\textsuperscript{12}.

2.20 The town’s position in relation to the M4 and A350 offers significant potential for growth\textsuperscript{13}. Managing the town’s expansion requires a good range and choice of sites to meet the needs of new and existing business. The evidence\textsuperscript{14} shows that office and some light industrial uses can be accommodated in the town’s central area and opportunities that have been identified through the vision and master plan work that has now been completed\textsuperscript{15}.

2.21 Uses with a hungrier appetite for land such as warehousing and distribution will need different locations, often needing bespoke sites directly related to the primary road network.

2.22 However, the evidence suggests that there is a definite need to make land available for employment development for general industrial use (B2) and light industrial uses (B1)\textsuperscript{16}. Surveys show some existing local employers are intending to expand to new premises and without land being made available their future in the town may be at risk. The lack of land available that is geared toward their need is a shortfall that needs remediating quite urgently. It is also a shortfall that will inhibit the town’s ability to attract new employment. Therefore, given the disparity between the town’s potential, the established priority for employment-led growth, and the barriers to realise it, of the six criteria, criterion one, focussed on the provision of land for employment development, carries the most weight.

Flood risk (CP 10 Criterion 6)

2.23 The River Avon corridor undoubtedly has the potential to be better exploited as an asset to the town as a whole for formal and informal open space. It also offers potential for walking and cycling access to the countryside or to the town centre from outside it. However, the over-riding priority must be the need to protect or reduce flood risks to both existing and future residents and their property\textsuperscript{17}. This is supported by comments from the public who have drawn attention to flooding as an issue\textsuperscript{18}. National policy requires the Council to follow a risk based approach to selecting areas for development. All built development on strategic sites proposed by the Chippenham Site Allocations Plan will be in flood risk zone 1, the areas with the very least risk, as directed by national policy. Criterion 6 is weighted second because some strategic areas could involve development next to areas with a greater risk, or areas that are

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{12} Swindon and Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership, Aligning Local Innovation With Government Ambition, Strategic Economic Plan March 2014, Swindon and Wiltshire LEP, pp 46-57
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{13} Swindon and Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership, Aligning Local Innovation With Government Ambition, Strategic Economic Plan March 2014, Swindon and Wiltshire LEP para 1.6
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{14} Evidence Paper 1 : Economy, Wiltshire Council, December 2014, paragraph 6.44
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{15} Chippenham Central Areas Draft Masterplan 2013 is available at http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/masterplan_work/chippenham_draft_masterplan
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{16} Evidence Paper 1 : Economy, Wiltshire Council, December 2014, paragraph 6.44
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{17} National Planning Policy Framework, DCLG, March 2012, para 100
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{18} Consultation on Chippenham Strategic Site Assessment Framework, Wiltshire Council, December 2014
\end{footnotesize}
part of the functional flood plain. Evidence since the strategic flood risk assessment\(^{19}\), shows properties have flooded at Monkton Park as well as the High Street. Some properties in these areas remain at risk. The concern is therefore the indirect effects of development and managing surface water drainage from a development site. Potentially, development may reduce flood risk, but a more cautious approach might suggest avoiding a greater reliance on engineered solutions.

**Transport – roads (CP10 Criterion 3)**

2.24 The area strategy for Chippenham contained in the Core Strategy sets the objective for Chippenham to become a more self contained and resilient community in the years to come\(^{20}\); a smaller proportion of residents should commute to work in other towns, more of local spending power should instead be spent in Chippenham itself; improving local shops, services and facilities for everyone.

2.25 Investment in the town’s highway infrastructure is a significant decision that can produce two main benefits:

- improved connectivity to markets, underpinning economic growth and encouraging inward investment\(^{21}\) and

- tackle points of local congestion that detract from the town’s attractiveness in order to encourage rather than deter people to spend more time and money in the town. This would benefit bus and taxi travel as well as private vehicles.

2.26 It is recognised that investment in the town’s highway infrastructure could also improve connections to a range of workplaces elsewhere and it has already been recognised that Chippenham’s good location in terms of both road and rail make it ideal for commuting. However, on balance, because of the opportunity to support economic growth and address congestion issues, investment in major roads and therefore criterion 3, ranks third in priority.

2.27 The capacity to offer wider benefits for the existing community is a particular aspect of the CP10 criteria. Given the dependencies identified by transport assessment\(^{22}\) the strategic areas have been assessed in the light of three long term development scenarios each with a different geographic basis and road infrastructure:

- dispersed, with development distributed evenly around the town without any new road infrastructure

- focussing development north-east of the town with an eastern link road connecting the A4 to the A350, and

- south with development focussed here with a southern link road connecting the A4 to the A350.

\(^{19}\) Evidence Paper 1: Flood risk and surface water management, Wiltshire Council, December 2014, paragraph 3.13

\(^{20}\) Wiltshire Core Strategy, Wiltshire Council, January 2015 para 5.47

\(^{21}\) Swindon and Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership, Aligning Local Innovation With Government Ambition, Strategic Economic Plan March 2014, Swindon and Wiltshire LEP, paras 3.8 - 3.9

\(^{22}\) Evidence Paper 3: Transport and Accessibility (Part 1), Atkins, December 2014, Chapter 7
Landscape, heritage and biodiversity (CP 10 Criterion 5)

2.28 The town’s expansion into the countryside brings about a fundamental change in the character of an affected area, from rural to urban. The scale of development proposed makes this inevitable. Properly designed and managed growth can actually achieve positive benefits for local biodiversity. In addition, strategic sites can be identified and developed in a way that protects existing valued or sensitive landscape and historic features or assets. Masterplanning sites and development management can realise open spaces that can ensure large areas retain a rural sense and appearance despite urbanisation encroaching into the countryside. A number of villages each with their individual character, lying within strategic areas, all need to retain their separate identity, their character and setting.

2.29 There are notable features of such a scale and importance that they do play a significant role in the selection of preferred strategic areas; such as Rowden Conservation Area and Birds Marsh Wood. There are views of Chippenham to consider, featuring the spires of St Paul’s and St Andrew’s Churches. There is also the need to prevent intervisibility between Chippenham and outlying settlements; such as Tytherton Lucas and Langley Burrell, in order to protect their separate identity and sense of rural remoteness. However, most of the decisions as far as criterion 5 is concerned, revolve around the detailed extent of sites and the development of options in greater depth, rather than how to choose one strategic area over another. The evidence shows that, even though none contain formal landscape designations, all the areas have attractive aspects and all the strategic areas would normally be protected from development by planning policies protecting the countryside if there was not an over-riding need to provide land for new jobs and homes. Compared to other criteria 1, 3 and 6, criterion 5 has less weight.

Housing and Community Infrastructure (CP10 Criterion 2)

2.30 Strategic sites at Chippenham are of such a scale that much of the infrastructure and community facilities (such as schools, open space and local shops) necessary to support them will be provided as a part of the development itself. They would provide a mix of homes and facilities to support new neighbourhoods. Abnormal development costs, identified ‘up front’, focus on road bridges to the river Avon and the main railway line but extend to undergrounding grid national power lines, sustainable urban drainage measures and the preservation of listed buildings. The potential benefits from only road investments fall generally under criterion 3 above. Other evidence indicates that some areas may involve marginally less infrastructure costs in terms of utilities and services than others and this is a factor to be weighed in the selection of a preferred strategic area.

2.31 Any development scheme needs to be viable to the private sector by providing a reasonable return to developers and land owners. The result of abnormal costs may result in difficulties funding the infrastructure or development necessary to fully meet a

---

23 Heritage assets are defined in the National Planning Policy Framework, DCLG, March 2012, Annex 2: Glossary

24 Evidence Paper 4: Chippenham Landscape Assessment, TEP, December 2014, Baseline Assessment


26 Evidence Paper 2: Housing and Community Infrastructure, Wiltshire Council, December 2014, Section 4
range of other local needs, such as the proportion of affordable homes. A lot depends upon the value of development being created, but inevitably exceptional development costs may be a cause for concern.

2.32 A critical distinction to draw between areas is their deliverability, not so much in terms of cost, as timing. Costly infrastructure, central to enabling development, can be complex, involve greater uncertainty and can therefore be time consuming to deliver, potentially delaying the completion of new homes. This can then have implications beyond the site’s own delivery, particularly where it is related to the development of other sites. The ability to provide necessary infrastructure in a predictable and timely way; not least in order to avoid undue pressures on existing infrastructure provision, may be important. The lower the capacity there is already to accommodate development the more acute the timing of new infrastructure provision becomes.

2.33 However, the evidence suggests that, notwithstanding some specific abnormal development costs, no one area stands out with insurmountable barriers or extraordinary advantages compared to others. The scale of development envisaged on strategic sites is also sufficiently large to provide a range of on-site community facilities. All areas appear capable of providing a good mix of homes, including affordable housing. Therefore, though important, compared to the other criteria this has less weight overall.

Transport – non car travel (CP 10 Criterion 4)

2.34 This criterion assesses the suitability of areas according to how they may influence the potential for travel by non-car modes. Many public comments questioned the realism of the implied objectives underpinning criterion 4 implying themselves that no amount of investment would provide a significant enough incentive to reduce the proportion of trips preferred to be carried out by car. The evidence offers indications of how strategic areas perform in terms of their accessibility to common destinations and their relative performance varies depending upon where in the town each of these destinations are located. Promoting safe and convenient access on foot, cycle and public transport is an important aspect of sustainable development and an essential element of master planning any large mixed use site. However, in terms of comparing the merits of one strategic area to another, other criteria are given a higher priority.

2.35 As led by the evidence a ranking in importance of the criteria is

1. Employment development (Criterion 1)
2. Flood risk (Criterion 6)
3. Transport – ‘road travel’ (Criterion 3)
4. Landscape, heritage and biodiversity (Criterion 5)
5. Housing and infrastructure (Criterion 2)
6. Transport – ‘non car travel’ (Criterion 4)

27 Evidence Paper 2: Housing and Community Infrastructure, Wiltshire Council, December 2014, Section 4
28 Consultation on Chippenham Strategic Site Assessment Framework, Wiltshire Council, December 2014
29 Evidence Paper 3: Transport and Accessibility (Part 1), Atkins, December 2014, Chapter 3
Assessment and site selection

2.36 The process is described in Briefing Note 1: Site Selection Methodology. Each of the strategic areas were assessed to see how they perform against the CP10 criteria and were also subject to sustainability appraisal. From these assessments a preferred area was selected.

2.37 A set of site options were then generated within the preferred area. Site options have detailed boundaries defined on an ordnance survey base. Each site option needs to be capable of delivery and includes the individual infrastructure requirements necessary to support their development (like schools and open spaces) plus other place shaping or environmental requirements (such as protecting important historic assets or landscape features). The performance of detailed site options was also assessed against the CP10 criteria, the Strategic Site Assessment Framework, as well as sustainability appraisal. A site option was then selected.

2.38 If, the overall scale of development required for Chippenham was not achieved within the first preferred area, the two stage process was repeated. The next preferred area was selected in the light of proposals emerging from the previous preferred area, taking account of, for instance, the scope for transport and/or other links between them.

2.39 Once the overall scale of development proposed in the Core Strategy had been reached, no more preferred areas were identified.

2.40 The Core Strategy sets the scale of employment and housing growth at Chippenham as a minimum within the time period 2006-2026. Detailed site options may exceed this overall scale where there is a clear justification, for example, to ensure wider infrastructure benefits to the town and/or to ensure that the proposed level of growth can be delivered during the plan period.
PART TWO: SELECTING THE PREFERRED OPTION

Summary

3.1 The assessment of strategic areas (set out in more detail in the remainder of this document) weighs up the most appropriate broad directions for Chippenham to expand. The result of the assessment has shown that immediately north and south represent the first preferred strategic areas for growth, areas A and E.

3.2 The Council is already disposed to grant consent for a significant development north of Chippenham (located in Area A - see above) for a mix of uses including up to 750 new homes (Land at North Chippenham). This development would have access to the A350 and it would provide a road built to a distributor road standard offering the opportunity for it to have a wider role in the network. This road can also provide a clear visual and man-made boundary to the town. The evidence suggests that further development north would have detrimental landscape and ecological effects and fails to meet Criterion 5 of CP10 without offering significant benefit over and above the development already permitted.
3.3 The Council is also disposed to grant to consent for a significant development adjoining Area E (see above) for up to 450 new homes (Hunters Moon).

3.4 **The first preferred area:** Within Area E landscape impacts are acceptable and land for employment development is well located and can be brought forward relatively quickly. A strategic site is identified for 1,000 new dwellings and 18ha land for employment at SW Chippenham. This is in the mid-range of site capacity options examined. The housing trajectory indicates that about 850 dwellings could be built in the remainder of the Plan period, looking to 2026.

3.5 **The second preferred area** is Area B north east of the town at Rawlings Green. While this area performs well against CP10 criteria 3 and 4, it is a prominent area where development may have a wide landscape impact. Detrimental effects would need to be mitigated by an appropriate design and layout.

3.6 Within Area B, a site option for a low density of development and extensive strategic landscaping is identified for development at Rawlings Green. This would be capable of accommodating up to 650 new dwellings and 5ha of land for employment generating uses. Up to 200 new homes could be accommodated before a new link road is needed to connect the site over a new railway bridge to the distributor road provided as part of the North Chippenham development in Area A. The preferred option is to continue this new road link through the site to Monkton Park, which would provide a new access route to the A350 for the north of the town avoiding the town centre. It will serve the development itself and relieve current congestion that might otherwise worsen unacceptably on routes into and out of the town centre.

3.7 These proposals (preferred Area E and second preferred Area B) mirror the locations selected previously as a part of preparing the Wiltshire Core Strategy. Together these sites provide land for 1,650 new homes. The housing trajectory indicates that 1,500 of these homes can be built within the plan period which is less than the number needed to meet the housing requirements. A third preferred area is therefore required to ensure 1,936 homes can be delivered by 2026.

3.8 Area C, east Chippenham represents the third preferred area. This area, especially north of the cycleway, represents an area that is open and, like Rawlings Green, will have a wider landscape impact. In particular, considerable work will be needed to avoid increased flood risks to the Town and elsewhere. Indeed development should reduce such risks.

3.9 This area has no obvious features that form a logical natural boundary. The chosen site option creates a new potential boundary by taking a new distributor road to form a landscaped corridor that would provide visual containment following a similar approach used for the existing Pewsham area in the south of the Town and as proposed at North Chippenham. The site identified at East Chippenham can accommodate 850 new dwellings and approximately 20ha of land for employment use, partly recognising this will contribute to meeting employment land needs beyond 2026. As a part of its development it will provide a distributor standard road crossing to the River Avon and
complete an Eastern Link Road for the town connecting the A4 to the A350, mitigating much of the congestion that would otherwise occur.\(^{30}\)

3.10 The three sites to be allocated can accommodate a total of 2,500 homes of which around 2,350 may be built within the plan period to 2026. The remainder will contribute to meeting housing requirements for the next plan period and reduce the potential for a fall off in housing supply while a new plan is emerging for the period beyond 2026.

3.11 The amount of land allocated results in a scale of development that therefore exceeds the requirements set out in the Wiltshire Core Strategy. It is justified by the need to provide a flexible choice of deliverable sites in terms of a range of potential house builders and locations around the town. It also acknowledges that not all large strategic sites will be completed in the Plan period. A main justification is that by so doing, the Plan provides a framework which will deliver road infrastructure necessary to support the Town’s long term growth potential, safeguarding the role of the Town Centre and the functioning of the A350 in the County’s economy by addressing the potential for congestion that is an inevitable by product of housing and employment development.

3.12 Each of the proposals involve the building of new roads in step with the additional development proposed, in order to ensure there are no unacceptable traffic impacts and so that the wider benefits to the network are achieved as soon as possible. The proposals also include large new areas along the River Avon for country parks. These will provide easier and direct public access to the countryside for all residents and visitors. They will also include areas set aside to be managed, to protect and improve their nature conservation value. As a substantial corridor of land, the country parks also provide opportunities for new and improved cycle and pedestrian links around the town, as well as to and from the town centre. These proposals go a substantial way to fulfilling a longstanding aspiration to capitalise on the River Avon as an asset to the town.

Structure of Part Two of this report

3.13 The remainder of the report is structured to follow the method outlined in Part One, as illustrated in the following table:

---

\(^{30}\) See Chippenham Site Allocations Plan Evidence Paper 3, Transport and Accessibility (Part 2) Atkins, January 2015, Appendices
### Section One: Selecting a first preferred strategic area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Site Assessment Framework: Key characteristics of strategic areas</th>
<th>Description of particular comparative merits of strategic areas as derived from the various Evidence Papers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal (SA) assessment</td>
<td>What the assessment says about the economic, social and environmental effects of potential strategic sites in each strategic area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of preferred area</td>
<td>Reasoned argument and justification for selection by reference to Strategic Site Assessment Framework and Sustainability Appraisal assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section Two: Selecting Sites in the first preferred area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site options</th>
<th>Rationale for and description of specific site options; long term and short term.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA assessments of site options</td>
<td>What the Sustainability Appraisal says about the economic, social and environment effects of each site option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of strategic site</td>
<td>Reasoned argument and justification for selection by reference to Strategic Site Assessment Framework and Sustainability Appraisal assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.14 The cycle and structure is repeated for a second and third preferred area, taking account of the choices made for the preceding decisions to create sections 4 to 6.
SECTION ONE: SELECTING A FIRST PREFERRED STRATEGIC AREA

Strategic Site Assessment Framework: Key characteristics of strategic areas

4.1 This section describes the significant comparative merits of each of the strategic areas in terms of the six criteria within the Strategic Site Assessment Framework.

Area A

4.2 A main distinguishing feature is Birds Marsh Wood and the need to safeguard its amenity and ecological value. Development in this area would also need to avoid extending the Town to a point that there are unacceptable impacts upon the character and setting to the villages of Langley Burrell and Kington Langley.

4.3 Planning consent has been granted (subject to legal agreements) for a mixed use scheme comprising up to 750 Dwellings and approximately 2.7ha of land for employment development (B1, B2, and B8)\(^3\). An illustrative masterplan (below) shows the development within a distributor road creating an urban edge. The landscape, biodiversity and informal recreation value of Birds Marsh Wood is intended to be protected by a buffer area from harmful urban encroachment.

Figure 3: Indicative master plan for North Chippenham

\(^3\) Planning application N/12/00560/OUT, Turley Associates, February 2012
4.4 Compared to the other areas, the following characteristics represent potential negative impacts or constraints:

- further encroachment impinging upon Birds Marsh Wood harming its value (CP10 criterion 5) "The landscape extending eastwards from Birds Marsh Wood County Wildlife Site to the railway line includes large areas of wood pasture and neutral grassland, a high density of ponds, copses, mature trees, small watercourses and a network of mature hedgerows, and is known to support populations of protected species, including Great crested newt, and Lesser and Greater horseshoe bats. This part of the area is significant and is likely to be particularly sensitive to change."\(^{32}\)

- encroachment into the countryside separating Langley Burrell and Kington Langley village from Chippenham jeopardising their separate identities. (criterion 5).\(^{33}\)

- the new road link to the A350 (distributor road) would be necessary before significantly more land for development could be delivered in this area because of the traffic congestion this might otherwise cause. This would potentially delay the provision of further new and for employment development (Criteria 1 and 3).

4.5 Compared to other areas, the following characteristics represent potential benefits and positive impacts:

- the Area performs well in terms of overall highway access and network impacts (Criterion 3). It performs well across all three key themes of the transport assessment\(^{34}\), demonstrating the following favourable transport and accessibility attributes:

  - Strong or moderate potential for easy access to the area from public transport networks, and to/from Chippenham town centre (rail station, college and retail) and key services (education and employment) by walking and cycling [Theme 1 of Evidence Paper 3, linked to criterion 4 Core Policy 10];

  - Strong or moderate potential for suitable access to the area from the highway network, minimising the potential for compromising highway network functionality [Theme 2 of Evidence Paper 3, linked to criterion 3 Core Policy 10]; and

  - a high or medium likelihood that development would offer wider transport and accessibility opportunities to those living in existing communities across Chippenham [Theme 3 of Evidence Paper 3, linked to criterion 3 Core Policy 10].

- Good, short links to the A350, once the consented scheme has been built, benefit its attractiveness as a potential location for business (Criterion 1)

- In terms of flood risk, the area performs the best because it has no flood risk areas. It is entirely Zone 1, designated with the least risks. (Criterion 6)


\(^{33}\) Chippenham Site Allocations Plan : Evidence Paper 4 : Chippenham Landscape Assessment, TEP, December 2014, paragraph 6.4 and 6.10-11

\(^{34}\) Chippenham Transport and Accessibility Evidence Paper 3 (Part 1), Atkins, October 2014 para 6.4
Area B

4.6 The main distinguishing features to this area are the main railway line running to the north-west and the River Avon to the south east.

4.7 Compared to the other areas, the following characteristics represents potential negative impacts or constraints:

- Development of the area is at least partially dependent upon the development first of Area A, potentially delaying the provision of land for employment development (Criteria 1 and 3). Specifically, the peripheral (north-eastern) parts of Area B are likely to be dependent on development taking place in Area A, to provide a suitable highway connection to the A350. Without this connection, nearly all traffic to or from Area B would need to route via Cocklebury Road and the town centre in order to connect with the Primary Route Network.\(^{35}\)

- A developable area abuts flood risk zones 2 and 3 representing a potential to increase flood risk. This risk is accentuated by being directly upstream of the existing built up area. (Criterion 6)\(^{36}\)

- The Area is the most prominent in the wider landscape. The impact of development would be difficult to mitigate because of the area’s raised position (Criterion 5). Therefore development would extend the urban edge of the town into countryside in a way that is potentially the most visible over the widest area. “The area is visually prominent from westerly views from the River Avon floodplain, Tytherton Lucas and the limestone ridge. It also has a rural and remote character and would be difficult to develop without adversely affecting that character and increasing the visual prominence of Chippenham.”\(^{37}\)

- provision of railway bridge represents an abnormal cost potentially reducing the capacity to fund an acceptable form of development alongside other supporting infrastructure requirements (Criterion 2)

- relatively close proximity to known congested road corridors suggests the potential for unacceptable traffic impacts upon the existing road network (Criterion 3)

4.8 Compared to other areas, the following characteristics represent potential benefits and positive impacts:

- the Area can deliver a new road and rail crossing as the main part of a Cocklebury Link road\(^{38}\) and potentially a key link for an A350-A4 eastern link road that would connect Areas A and C (Criterion 3)\(^{39}\).

---

\(^{35}\) Chippenham Transport and Accessibility Evidence Paper 3, Atkins, December 2014 para 7.6


\(^{37}\) Chippenham Landscape Assessment, TEP, December 2014, paragraph 6.13

\(^{38}\) The Cocklebury Link Road provides road access from the Monkton Park area to the A350 without traffic having to travel around central area of Chippenham

\(^{39}\) Chippenham Strategic Areas Assessment: Transport and Accessibility, Atkins, August 2014 paragraph 6.5
• the Area performs well in terms having a strong sustainable access potential (Criterion 4)

• the Area would achieve good links to the primary road network, though not offering so direct access to the A350/M4 as Areas A and E road access would be reasonably direct and connecting north of the town, benefiting its attractiveness as a potential location for business (Criterion 1)

Area C

4.9 A main distinguishing feature of Area C is its separation from the built up area by the River Avon. Development in this area would also need to avoid extending the Town to a point that there are unacceptable impacts upon the character and setting to the villages of Tytherton Lucas and East Tytherton.

4.10 Compared to other areas, the following characteristics represent potential negative impacts and constraints:

• A developable area abuts flood risk zones 2 and 3 representing a potential to increase flood risk. This risk is accentuated by being directly upstream of the existing built up area. (Criterion 6)

• provision of river crossing represents an abnormal cost potentially reducing the capacity to fund an acceptable form of development alongside other supporting infrastructure requirements (Criterion 2)

• Development in this Area has the potential to reduce separation between Tytherton Lucas and Chippenham which would reduce its remote and tranquil character. In addition development would be visually prominent from surrounding high ground and could make this edge of Chippenham considerably more notable in the surrounding countryside. (Criterion 5)

• development of the Area is to a degree dependent upon prior development of both Areas A and B in order to provide necessary roads. Until there is an attractive direct link to the A350, through an eastern link road, there could be a delay in the provision of employment generating development (Criterion 1). Without an eastern link road in place, nearly all traffic to or from Area C would need to route through or around Pewsham, and through Chippenham town centre. (Although this dependency has been identified, it may be viable to develop limited southern parts of Strategic Area C as an extension to Pewsham) (Criterion 3).

4.11 Compared to other areas, the following characteristics represent potential benefits and positive impacts:

• the area can deliver a new river crossing as part of an A350-A4 link road connecting development permitted in Areas A and B and once completed, the performs well in terms of overall highway access and network impacts (Criterion 3)

---

40 Chippenham Landscape Assessment, TEP, December 2014, paragraph 6.25
41 Chippenham Transport and Accessibility Evidence Paper 3, Atkins, October 2014 para 7.6
The area has a high potential to provide new attractive walking and cycling links around the town, such as to Abbeyfield School and sports facilities, that will be of use to existing residents\textsuperscript{42} (Criterion 4)

- the area can deliver significant areas of formal and informal open space for the wider benefit of the town (Criterion 5)

- the development of this area in particular has the potential opportunity to reduce flood risks for the existing built up area by development expanding the river’s existing capacity to safely store flood water (Criterion 6)

\textit{Area D}

4.12 The main distinguishing feature of Area D is its separation from the main built up area of the town and its distance to the town centre. The River Avon to the west adds to the area’s separation.

4.13 Compared to other areas, the following characteristics represent potential negative impacts and constraints:

- A developable area abuts flood risk zones 2 and 3 representing a potential to increase flood risk. These risks are however less by being downstream of the existing built up area. (Criterion 6)

- large scale development and the provision of a river crossing would represent an exceptional cost potentially reducing the capacity to fund an acceptable form of development alongside other supporting infrastructure requirements (Criterion 2)

- Significant development of the area is largely dependent upon prior development of Area E in order to provide necessary roads access, representing a significant delay to the provision of land for employment development (criterion 1). Although this dependency has been identified, it may be viable to develop limited parts of Strategic Area D adjacent to the A4 as an extension to Pewsham.

4.14 Compared to other areas, the following characteristics represent potential benefits and positive impacts:

- The area can deliver a new river crossing as part of an A350-A4 link road connecting development in Area E (Criterion 3). However, the benefits of this link road are less than a north eastern route (Area A through to Area C)\textsuperscript{43}.

- The area has been assessed as having a number of transport weaknesses and cannot be said to demonstrate any of the three desirable transport and accessibility attributes\textsuperscript{44}. (Criteria 3 and 4)

\textsuperscript{42} Chippenham Transport and Accessibility Evidence Paper 3, Atkins, October 2014 para 6.6
\textsuperscript{43} Chippenham Transport and Accessibility Evidence Paper 3 (Part 1), Atkins, October, 2014 para 7.11
\textsuperscript{44} Chippenham Transport and Accessibility Evidence Paper 3 (Part 1), Atkins, October 2014 para 6.7
- Development in this Area has the potential to reduce separation between Chippenham and Derry Hill and the limestone ridge (Naish Hill) and the area is visually prominent from the A4 (Pewsham Way) and Naish Hill which would reduce its remote and tranquil character. In addition development would be visually prominent from surrounding high ground and could make this edge of Chippenham considerably more notable in the surrounding countryside. (Criterion 5)

_Area E_

4.15 A main distinguishing feature of this Area is Rowden Conservation Area and the River Avon.

4.16 Compared to other areas, the following characteristics represent potential negative impacts and constraints:

- A developable area abuts flood risk zones 2 and 3 representing a potential to increase flood risk. These risks are however less by being downstream of the existing built up area. (Criterion 6)

- Area E includes Rowden Manor grade II* listed building and scheduled monument, the land around these assets is also designated a conservation area. (Criterion 5)

- Land within Area E is safeguarded against development in order to protect known mineral reserves (Criterion 2)

- Although the Area performs well in several aspects of transport and accessibility there is weak pedestrian and cycling links to existing secondary schools (Criterion 4)

4.17 Compared to other areas, the following characteristics represent potential benefits and positive impacts:

- The area has direct connection to the A350 which benefits its attractiveness as a potential location for business, although it is more distant to junction 17 of the M4 compared to all other areas except area D (Criterion 1)

- The area performs well in terms of overall highway access and network impacts (Criterion 3). It performs well across all three key themes of the transport assessment$^{45}$, demonstrating the following favourable transport and accessibility attributes:

  - Strong or moderate potential for easy access to the area from public transport networks, and to/from Chippenham town centre (rail station, college and retail) and key services (healthcare and employment) by walking and cycling [Theme 1, linked to criterion 4 Core Policy 10];

  - Strong or moderate potential for suitable access to the area from the highway network, minimising the potential for compromising highway network functionality [Theme 2, linked to criterion 3 Core Policy 10]; and

---

$^{45}$ Chippenham Transport and Accessibility Evidence Paper 3, Atkins, October 2014 para 6.4
The First Preferred Area

1,936 dwellings required

- A high or medium likelihood that development would offer wider transport and accessibility opportunities to those living in existing communities across Chippenham [Theme 3, linked to criterion 3 Core Policy 10].

- The western part of Area E has been ascribed a moderate-high development capacity as relative to some of the other strategic areas, the land is not visually prominent and is screened from views from the west by the wooded Great Western railway embankment. Views from the east are largely screened by the rising landform of Area D. (Criterion 5)

- The area can deliver significant areas of formal and informal open space for the wider benefit of the town (Criterion 5)

Sustainability Appraisal (SA) assessment of strategic areas

5.1 Due to the high level nature of this assessment it was not possible to discount any areas entirely, however it is clear that some Strategic Areas perform better than others against the SA objectives and will allow Wiltshire Council to determine which of Areas A-E should be developed. The SA objectives and summary findings from the report are set out below:

- No areas contain absolute sustainability constraints that cannot be mitigated
- The options perform broadly similarly against the SA objectives, despite them being located in different geographical areas with respective opportunities and constraints.
- The worst performing Area is Area D. This has significant adverse effects on air pollution and noise (SA objective 4), greenhouse gases (SA objective 5) and as part of the area is located within Flood Zone 3, upon SA objective 3.
- Area C is the next worst performing area. It has significant adverse effects against SA Objective 3 with a large part of the area being located within Flood Zone 3 (high probability of flooding). It has significant adverse effects against SA objective 5 due to the potential additional traffic and congestion in the town centre.
- With regards to Area B, two significant adverse effects have been identified. One is against SA Objective 3, as part of the area being located within Flood Zone 3. The other is against SA Objective 2 due to the loss of higher quality agricultural land including grade 1.
- Area E also has a potential significant adverse effect against SA Objectives 3; this is due to a section of the area falling within Flood Zone 3 (high probability of flooding).
- Area A also has a significant adverse effect against SA Objective 2 due to the loss of higher quality agricultural land, including grades 1, 2 and 3.
- Area A is the only area to have a potentially significant adverse impact against SA Objective 1; this is due to the potential adverse impacts upon Bird Marsh Wood County Wildlife Site.
- Areas A and C may result in adverse impacts against SA Objective 9 whereas B, D and E are not expected to have an impact against that SA objective. This is due to the potential harm that development in Area A may cause to Birds Marsh Wood which is a
valued recreational resource for the local community and Area C is not easily accessible to public transport.

- Areas C and D perform worse against SA Objective 12, against which the other areas have no impacts. Distance from the A350 suggests these areas are the least attractive to business. Parts of Areas C and D, at least until new roads might improve access, do not have reasonable pedestrian links to the existing local public transport network and main existing locations for employment.

- Areas B and E have mixed impacts against SA Objective 10 where the transport and accessibility assessments produce mixed results whereas Areas A, C and D perform slightly worse and have slight adverse effect against this objective

- All Areas score positively, with no adverse impacts, against SA objectives 8 and 11 in relation to reducing poverty and promoting more inclusive communities and encouraging a vibrant and diversified economy..

5.2 A summary table shows the results of the assessment graphically:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Area A</th>
<th>Area B</th>
<th>Area C</th>
<th>Area D</th>
<th>Area E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Protect and enhance all biodiversity and geological features and avoid irreversible losses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ensure efficient and effective use of land and the use of suitably located previously developed land and buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Use and manage water resources in a sustainable manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improve air quality throughout Wiltshire and minimise all sources of environmental pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Minimise our impacts on climate change and reduce our vulnerability to future climate change effects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Protect, maintain and enhance the historic environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Conserve and enhance the character and quality of Wiltshire’s rural and urban landscapes, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in good quality, affordable housing, and ensure an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The First Preferred Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1,936 dwellings required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>types and tenures.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Reduce poverty and deprivation and promote more inclusive and self-contained communities.

10. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices.

11. Encourage a vibrant and diversified economy and provide for long-term sustainable economic growth

12. Ensure adequate provision of high quality employment land and diverse employment opportunities to meet the needs of local businesses and a changing workforce.

Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not suitable for development</th>
<th>Absolute sustainability constraints; exclude this option.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant adverse impact on...</td>
<td>Sustainability issues; mitigation considered problematic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited adverse impact on...</td>
<td>Sustainability issues; mitigation considered achievable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No adverse impacts or mixed effects...</td>
<td>No sustainability constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No adverse impacts and opportunities to...</td>
<td>Development will support sustainability objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of First Preferred Area

6.1 Area E is the first preferred area.

6.2 It performs well in terms of delivering jobs, flood risk and its visual impact in terms of development capable of being accommodated into the landscape. It has no exceptional development costs in terms of road infrastructure.

6.3 This area provides an early opportunity to provide land for employment development that is well located to the A350. It can provide suitable land for B2 uses. In terms of

---

46 Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Review 2011 Table 6.1 and Table 6.2 Pages 69-73 available at
flood risk a developable area abuts flood risk areas but the form of risk is different to other areas that are upstream of the town\textsuperscript{47}.

6.4 Area E can accommodate sufficient developable land for a strategic site without unacceptable impacts upon the environment in terms of landscape, biodiversity and heritage\textsuperscript{48}. It is possible to for new building to avoid sterilising potential mineral reserves as they are mainly outside a developable area. The evidence shows that the value of both Rowden Conservation Area and the setting to Lacock village can be preserved\textsuperscript{49}. It can provide significant amounts of open space. The area has the potential to provide informal or formal open space that can be a benefit to the wider town community\textsuperscript{50}. Infrastructure costs, compared to other areas, appear to be less\textsuperscript{51}.

6.5 Sustainability appraisal has not revealed fundamental differences between any of the strategic areas in terms of the effects reported under each of the SA objectives. Differences are at the margins. In overall terms Area E ranks top of the strategic areas because of its better assessment than other areas on objectives 1 and 3. It also has the least scope for adverse impacts.

6.6 The other areas perform less well against the ranked criteria for the following main reasons.

6.7 Area A also performs well compared to other choices, including in terms of sustainability appraisal, but is already set to accommodate a large mixed use scheme. The question is whether it could accommodate significant further development.

6.8 The evidence suggests that there are environmental constraints to further large scale development; detrimental impacts upon Birds Marsh Wood and potentially unacceptable landscape and visual impacts (Criterion 5).

6.9 Extensive development in close proximity to Birds Marsh Wood, even allowing for a buffer to distance it, would bring considerable local pressures for informal recreation and the potential to diminish its nature conservation value, as well as its rural detachment and sense of tranquillity. In particular:

“The landscape extending eastwards from Birds Marsh Wood to the railway line includes large areas of wood pasture and neutral grassland, a high density of ponds, copses, mature trees small watercourses and a network of mature hedgerows, and is known to support populations of protected species. This part of the area is significant and is likely to be particularly sensitive to change.”\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{47} Chippenham Site Allocations Plan Evidence Paper 6: Flood Risk and Surface Water Management, Wiltshire Council, December 2014, paragraphs 4.32 – 4.34

\textsuperscript{48} Chippenham Landscape Assessment, TEP, December 2014, A3 proforma, pages 44-45

\textsuperscript{49} Chippenham Landscape Assessment, TEP, December 2014, Appendices D and L


\textsuperscript{51} Chippenham Site Allocations Plan : Evidence Paper 2 : Housing and Community Facilities, Wiltshire Council, December 2014, pages 34 - 47

\textsuperscript{52} Chippenham Site Allocations Plan : Evidence Paper 5 : Biodiversity, Wiltshire Council, December 2014, pages 5 -6
6.10 Significant development northwards would also bring a marked change to the setting and visual impact of the approach to Chippenham from the north along the A350.

6.11 Evidence states:

"Given the landscape sensitivities and qualities to be safeguarded, the development capacity for Area A1 (North of the committed development) has been ascribed a low development capacity in the area east and north of Bird’s Marsh due to the importance of separation between Chippenham and Kington Langley."^53

6.12 Any significant extension is also limited by the need to preserve the setting and separate character and identity of Langley Burrell village^54.

6.13 Extending development in this area does not add to wider transport opportunity as development committed in Area A will already be providing a distributor standard road as a part of its construction^55 (Criterion 3). A further extension to the urban area, increases cycling and walking distances to destinations like the railway station and the town centre, thus diminishing accessibility by alternatives to the private car (Criterion 4). It would however appear to be capable of development for a mix of new homes without being overly burdened by abnormal costs and therefore meets Criterion 2 of Core Policy 10.

6.14 The landscape evidence suggests parts of the area immediately to the north and east of Barrow Farm could have some capacity for development in terms of parcels of land where development could be more readily accommodated, although evidence states:

"Along Maud Heath’s Causeway there is the potential for greater intervisibility between Chippenham and Langley Burrell through development up to the edge of the road and this should be resisted"^56.

6.15 However, more urbanisation would add further recreational pressures in addition to the 750 new homes already committed and this would result in a more definite threat to its ecological value. Also, situated on the lower slopes to Birds Marsh Wood significant development would harm the visual impact of the wood’s setting.

6.16 It would still be the case, for this portion of Area A, that further development over and above what has already been committed at North Chippenham would need to be a later phase to that already agreed and this would delay whatever employment land might be provided (Criterion 1). Compared to other potential areas, in market terms it is not an opportunity for a fundamentally different choice of location for house buyers or business to that already committed at North Chippenham. Such development would not meet criterion 1 of the CP10 criteria.

6.17 In terms of supporting the town’s economic growth, development so far promoted seems overly dominated by residential development and has less scope for

---

^53 Chippenham Landscape Assessment, TEP, December 2014, Paragraph 6.5
^54 Chippenham Landscape Assessment, TEP, December 2014, Pages 44 - 45, Appendix G
^55 Planning application N/12/00560/OUT, Turley Associates, February 2012
^56 Chippenham Landscape Assessment, TEP, December 2014, page 47
employment; although this could simply be the particular aspiration of one developer and not evidence by itself of a substantive constraint.

6.18 Area A performs well but really only in so far as confirming the acceptability of the development at North Chippenham already committed.

6.19 Both Areas B and C perform less well in terms of early provision of employment development given that providing the most attractive land for investment is at least partially dependent upon good road links to the A350 and that depends upon development in Area A providing a new road link. There are also concerns over their landscape impact. Like Area A, the development capacity of Area B is also impeded by landscape considerations. Ultimately both Areas B and C require new road connections to serve large mixed use sites which, although these can provide wider opportunities and benefits, represent an abnormal development costs (Criterion 2).

6.20 Each area has developable land that also directly abuts flood risk zones that are upstream from the town. In this respect Area C is markedly more sensitive than B57.

6.21 Area C contains the larger part of flood storage that protects properties in the town from flooding. Town properties have been flooded and remain at risk. Addressing surface water management at Area C is more complex and potentially higher risk than other areas. The challenges are not insurmountable and it is quite possible, that a well designed scheme might reduce existing flood risks and provide significant open space.

6.22 In isolation, Area D appears the least logical extension to the town. Similar to Areas B and C, extensive, large scale mixed use development of Area D is at least partially dependent upon the development of Area E58. Developable land also abuts flood risk areas, although downstream of the town itself59. It is therefore possibly a longer term prospect having a lesser priority due to a southern link road from the A350 to the A4 having less benefit than a northern route.

58 Chippenham Strategic Areas Assessment: Transport and Accessibility, Atkins, August 2014 para 7.6
SECTION TWO: SELECTING A SITE IN THE FIRST PREFERRED AREA

Site options

7.1 One of the main reasons this area performed well compared to other areas was its ability to provide employment land. The area bounded by the B4528, A350 and main railway line offers a logical boundary for an employment area well related to the primary road network and with relatively easily created access.

7.2 Elsewhere there are extensive areas of flood risk along the River Avon. The area is also cut across by smaller tributaries and these define separate areas that may be developed with distinct characters. Safeguarding Rowden Conservation Area and other historic assets is essential but development also provides opportunities to invest in protecting their long term future by improving their setting and interpretation. There is also the opportunity to provide greater access to these assets, the river valley and wider countryside by the creation of a riverside park. A riverside park also provides a corridor for walking and cycling connecting new and existing development to the town centre.

7.3 There is a broad corridor of developable land north south toward the western side of the area. In deciding the extent of a strategic site southwards there are three main options. Landscape evidence describes the potential to extend development as far south as West Cepen Way roundabout. It also indicates the increasing remoteness and rural character of the area the further you travel southwards. The options therefore revolve around how far south it is appropriate to propose a strategic site and where there may already be the basis for a potential visual boundary to the town.

7.4 Indicative layouts for each option are shown in Figure 4:

---

60 Chippenham Landscape Assessment, TEP, December 2014, pages 58-61
61 Chippenham Site Allocations Plan: Evidence Paper 6: Flood Risk and Surface Water Management, Wiltshire Council, December 2014, Figure 1
62 Chippenham Landscape Assessment, TEP, December 2014, page 44, A3 Proforma recommendations
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Figure 4: SW Chippenham Site Options
SA assessments of site options

7.5 Sustainability appraisal reports that Options E1-3 all perform similarly. The difference in proposed housing numbers has had the biggest impact upon results with Option E2 and E3 performing worse against SA Objective 7 as these extend further south where the landscape character is more attractive and remote than in the northern part of the area. Therefore development on this section of the site would lead to significant adverse effects upon the local landscape. Of the three options, E3 performs worst and has an additional adverse effect against Objective 10, as the southern area of proposed housing site is more remote and therefore not as accessible. Option E1 therefore performs best against SA objectives in Area E.

Selection of strategic site

7.6 All three options appear capable of providing a good mix of housing types and have broadly similar infrastructure requirements. Each option largely avoids areas safeguarded for their mineral reserves.

7.7 In terms of transport criteria, the smaller E1 option performs relatively well in terms of accessibility by alternatives to the private car. Relatively speaking, the larger options perform adequately in terms of impacts upon the local road network with more direct access to West Cepen Way.

7.8 All options will involve built development outside flood risk areas. Pudding Brook dissects the northern part of all the options, but in terms of land take has a greater proportionate impact upon the smaller E1 option in terms of deliverability and viability. A second tributary south is considered to have less of an impact. However the larger options have longer boundaries to the flood risk areas along the River Avon. On this basis in terms of managing flood risk, Option E3 should be less favoured than option E2.

7.9 Landscape evidence does not identify existing mature features that are an obvious basis for a strong visual boundary to the development of the town. Option E3 offers a substantial extension. Landscape evidence points to the fact that more generally Area E does not extend a large distance beyond the overall footprint of the town. Option E3 would seem to press this advantage to its limit. The landform is broadly level but does rise to woodland south of the West Cepen Way roundabout. Although even at this point south there is little risk of intervisibility between the settings of Lacock and Chippenham, the landscape evidence identified a need to ensure a sense of openness between the village and the town to retain the sense of remoteness currently experienced in the village. Development would create more marked urban incursion than a boundary based around the existing buildings made up largely by a nursery and the boundary hedgerow and planting.

63 Chippenham Landscape Setting Assessment, TEP, December 2014, A3 Proforma Area E
64 Chippenham Landscape Setting Assessment, TEP, December 2014, Appendix L
7.10 Although the sustainability appraisal suggests Option E1 performs best of the three, this seems largely to be on the basis that it represents the least encroachment into the countryside. Balancing the need for new homes and the most suited scale and location for employment development along the A350, Option E2 remains based more within the broad footprint of Chippenham’s built up area. Option E2 also corresponds with the extent of a built up area defined by land set aside for employment use and has some shielding by existing development. Option E2 provides additional developable land and offers the basis for a stronger boundary to development by encompassing the existing southern boundary to the Nursery.

7.11 Option E2 therefore represents the preferred strategic site. A more detailed assessment of this option identifies three different logical areas. Altogether 1,000 homes could be provided within this site along with employment land, a site for 2 form entry primary school, local centre and extensive riverside parkland. Approximately 850 dwellings will be built in the plan period (See Appendix 1).

7.12 The following section presents a proposal and supporting text for inclusion in the Plan.

Proposals

Approximately 171ha of land at South West Chippenham, as identified on the policies map, is proposed for a mixed use development to include the following:

- 1,000 dwellings;
- 18ha of land for employment (B1, B2, and B8 uses of the Use Classes Order);
- Land for a 2 Form Entry primary school;
- A local centre;
- 104ha as a riverside country park
- strategic landscaping and open space to retain and reinforce existing hedgerows and establish new areas of substantial planting
- No more than 800 homes to be completed before the Cocklebury Link Road (from the A350 to Cocklebury Lane) is open for use

Development will be subject to the following requirements:
1. surface water management that achieves equivalent or less than current Greenfield rates of run-off
2. financial contributions toward provision of new schools
3. serviced land for employment is available for development before the completion of the 50th dwelling
4. a pedestrian and cycle route across the River Avon connecting to the town centre
5. a design and layout that preserves the importance and settings to designated heritage assets
6. measures to enhance the character of the Rowden Conservation Area
7. Design and layout of development must not prohibit a potential future road connection to land to the east

Development will take place in accordance with a masterplan for the site approved by the Council prior to commencement.
7.13 The development of this area requires a comprehensive treatment to the western side of the River Avon valley south of Chippenham.

7.14 A key element of these proposals is the early release of serviced land for employment development for a range of uses. With easy access to the A350 and M4 premises within an attractive environment will accommodate existing local businesses looking to expand and attract inward investment from further afield. The Council with its partners will play a proactive role in partnership with developers in order to ensure development can take place, by marketing the site, brokering discussions with interested business and exploring other initiatives in collaboration with the Local Enterprise Partnership. Development of the site will deliver serviced land, with road access, utilities and communications infrastructure, as a part of a first phase of development.

7.15 The site divides into three distinctive areas that will each help to retain the mature network of hedgerows and trees which with areas of greenspace will provide linkages through development to the wider countryside and retain the distinctive enclosed mature setting to the landscape. Detailed design should recognise the generally higher level of the road to the town. It should maintain this to provide some separation from development in order to help retain the rural character of the approach to the town, affecting the road users perception, and maintain some of the wider views of the rural landscape.

7.16 To help limit traffic impacts housing development will commence adjacent to the B4528 between Showell Farm and Milbourne Farm toward the south of the allocation. Improvements will be necessary to the A350 junction alongside other off-site measures necessary to mitigate the impacts of development. This will help to alleviate impacts on the local road network around the town centre and the Lowden Hill area.

7.17 The proposals include provision of a large area of informal open space that includes the historic features and landscape setting to the Rowden Conservation Area. Enhancing the attractiveness and improving access to this area will realise this area’s potential as an asset to the town for informal recreation and leisure. This includes interpretation of the Civil War battlefield and the buildings and setting to Rowden Manor.

7.18 Land will be reserved within the scheme for a two form entry primary school. The estimated needs generated by the development itself do not by themselves require two forms of entry but reserving land allows for future expansion likely beyond the plan period.

7.19 A footbridge should be located as sensitively as possible to avoid impact on riparian habitats and provide improved pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre avoiding busy roads. A riverside country park will be managed to promote good pedestrian and cycle access to and from the town centre.

7.20 The riverside park should be designed and considered as part of the development proposals, including ecological surveys and assessments, protection and retention of existing valuable habitats, creation and restoration of floodplain and riparian habitats, and provision of wildlife corridors across the site from east to west. The most obvious
east to west connection corridors for wildlife are the Pudding Brook and the Holywell stream (watercourse running from Holywell House).

7.21 The Pudding Brook area should be protected from development. The brook should be retained and enhanced through appropriate management and include a footpath or cycleway to the green space in the east. The Holywell stream to the south of Milbourne Farm is also a locally significant ecological feature. This should be retained and enhanced as part of development. An area in the northwestern part of the site around Patterdown should also be left undeveloped and incorporated into green space, enhanced for great crested newts through the creation of ponds and other wetland habitats, scrub and woodland.

7.22 Flood risk areas (zones 2 and 3) must remain undeveloped. This includes areas around smaller water courses within the site for which flood risk will also need to be assessed alongside the main river. Pudding Brook is one such area. Rates of surface water run off to the River must also remain at current levels or less in order to reduce the risk of flooding elsewhere. Consideration of flood risk and necessary improvements to the drainage network must precede detailed development proposals. This must involve determining accurate boundaries to flood risk areas and a set of effective sustainable urban drainage measures.
SECTION THREE: SELECTING A SECOND PREFERRED AREA

Relationship to the first preferred strategic area

8.1 Some of the distinguishing features of each of the remaining strategic areas both negative and positive may have a different significance when assessed in combination with the development of the strategic site selected in Area E. This is set out below for each strategic area.

8.2 The provision of a substantial scale of land for employment development in Area E, specifically geared to B2 uses and which can be developed relatively soon, reduces the urgency to provide such land in other areas. Employment land provision in other strategic areas therefore becomes more geared to the goal of providing a better choice of premises and offering a variety of locations.

Area A

8.3 The distinguishing features and characteristics are unaffected by the potential development of Area E.

Area B

8.4 The distinguishing features and characteristics are unaffected by the potential development of Area E. Transport work has investigated the increased congestion from the development of Area E. It identifies the need for measures to improve the road network. Evidence suggests that a Cocklebury Link Road, through Area B as a part of a possible Eastern Link Road, may well be one of the most beneficial.

Area C

8.5 The Area’s potential benefit in possibly providing large areas of formal and informal open space is diminished by the prospect of provision in Area E. However, the goal is for the town to benefit from the whole riverside. The implication is therefore marginal, but for instance, if a specific requirement for formal space is met within Area E then the benefit from developing in Area C is correspondingly less because space has been provided elsewhere.

8.6 Other features and characteristics are unaffected.

Area D

8.7 Development in Area E creates a more definite prospect for the development of this area. However, the strategic site selected in Area E is on the western side of the area. This might create some uncertainty over the deliverability of a road connection across Area E on land excluded from development proposals and the viability of ultimately also providing a river crossing over the Avon.

8.8 Other features and characteristics are unaffected.

**Sustainability Appraisal assessment**

8.9 Development proposals and sustainability appraisal of site Option E2 does not change the assessment of strategic Areas A to D. These areas continue to have the same constraints and opportunities as previously identified (see paragraphs 5.1 – 5.2). It should also be noted that the sustainability appraisal of strategic areas A to D indicates no strategic areas with absolute sustainability constraints that cannot be mitigated should development be proposed within these areas.

**Selection of a second preferred area**

9.1 Comparing the effects likely to arise from locating in either Areas A or B, Area B is preferred.

9.2 Further development of Area A would not involve exceptional abnormal costs in the same way that Area B requires new road infrastructure and a railway bridge (Criterion 2). Area A is also in zone 1 in terms of flood risk (Criterion 6). There must be doubts about whether either is suited for the construction of large industrial buildings because of their visual impact. Area B performs well in terms of accessibility to the town centre (Criterion 4) and in the context of a focus toward smaller scale building types appears more suited to employment types suited to such a location and form of building. However provision of employment land in Area E reduces the priority to provide land for employment development (Criterion 1).

9.3 The potential for harm from further large scale development in Area A beyond that already committed is the detrimental impact upon Birds Marsh Wood and other biodiversity interests and the likely impacts of development harming the character and setting to Chippenham and the wider landscape. (Criterion 5). A more limited development in Area A in a less sensitive part carries less risk but performs poorly for the reasons already given (see paragraph 6.14 to 6.16). On balance, the potential harm involved in further development at Area A outweighs the benefits.

9.4 Area B does not involve the potential for harm to biodiversity interests that Area A does. Generally, there also appears to be greater scope to accommodate a significant scale of development in terms of landscape impact. It also has greater potential to encourage more sustainable modes of travel by being located closer to services and facilities in the town centre (Criterion 4). Detailed assessment indicates that the extent of flood risk areas to be slightly smaller than thought previously and that at least current rates of run off can be achieved alongside development. Nevertheless, a developable area will abut flood risk areas compared to Area A where this would not be the case (Criterion 6). To provide greater security, ample land would need to be set aside in Area B to allow for sustainable urban drainage measures. Importantly,
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development of Area B has the benefit of offering the opportunity of providing a road link road to Monkton Park that would improve the road network’s resilience and help tackle congestion (Criterion 3).

9.5 Area B is therefore the second preferred area. Area C is more highly dependent on development preceding it in both Areas B and A in terms of providing linking roads to serve large scale development. Area B can accommodate sufficient developable land for a strategic site without unacceptable impacts upon the environment in terms of landscape, biodiversity and heritage.

9.6 The Area would achieve good links to the primary road network via the committed development in Area A and is the next preference in overall transport terms after Areas A and E. In view of the level of constraints to further development of Area A over and above that already committed, Area B represents a logical next step. It provides good connections to the A350 attractive to business. The Area also has particular potential to develop a greater reliance on sustainable travel modes.

9.7 It does however share several challenges with remaining areas, notably the management of flood risks and surface water up stream of the built up area and involves building a bridge as well as accommodating existing electricity pylons. However, broadly speaking, each of these aspects appears capable of resolution.

9.8 Just as it has potential for better travel choices, one of the potential disadvantages of developing Area B is the potential for harmful traffic impacts upon the existing road network because of its proximity to corridors that are already congested. One of the benefits of developing Area B would be a link road that would help to relieve congestion pressures and benefit the town centre.

9.9 Sustainability appraisal assessment of the effects of development shows that Area B performs slightly better than Areas D and C. A distinctive likely effect is the Area’s potential to promote more sustainable modes of travel.

9.10 Area C is at least partly dependent upon the development of Area B because of traffic impacts without the completion of an eastern link road. The extent of flood risk zones and the form of risk involved is a more complex constraint than other areas whilst the benefit of formal and informal open space is diminished by the prospect of land also being provided in Area E.

9.11 Area D’s relative isolation from the town is not overcome by the selection of a strategic site on the western side of Area E. Extensive development would only seem acceptable alongside or with the prospect of a southern link road. The cost and challenges of delivering a southern A350-A4 link using Areas E and D need to be set
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against the forecast that this link has less traffic benefits than a link north of the town (Areas A-C)\textsuperscript{70}.

PART FOUR: SELECTING SITES IN THE SECOND PREFERRED AREA

Site options

10.1 The most important constraint to development within Area B is its visual prominence. The Area is on sloping ground forming the edge to the broader River Avon floodplain and as such is prominent in the wider landscape. It forms a backdrop for westerly views from the River Avon floodplain, public rights of way, Tytherton Lucas and the Limestone Ridge to the east. Site selection must avoid adversely affecting the rural and remote character immediately around the area and increasing the visual prominence and urban influence of Chippenham over a much wider area.

10.2 There are two site options resulting from landscape evidence. Landscape work identifies a belt of mature hedgerow running east west south of Peckingell Farm. This offers a visual barrier that can be augmented by planting to provide the most effective screening to new development. A northern boundary to a strategic site option bounded by this belt, the railway line, river and existing urban area provides an enclosed and logical site area. Whilst any land beyond this is sensitive and difficult to mitigate, landscape evidence shows a further area north of this belt alongside the railway that is less prominent where landscape impacts with mitigation could be limited\textsuperscript{71}. A second option could therefore encompass this area as well as land south.

10.3 Indicative layouts for two options are shows in Figure 5 below:

\textsuperscript{70} Chippenham Site Allocations Plan : Transport and Accessibility Evidence Paper 3 : Atkins, October 2014, page 43
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10.4 The indicative land uses show large areas of greenspace alongside land employment and dwellings reflecting the landscape evidence that suggest strategic planting as well as open space along the northern and eastern boundaries of site options to reduce the visual impact of development. An approximate area of employment land is shown at the most accessible location to the primary road network.

SA assessments of site options

11.1 Sustainability assessment (SA) considers that both site options perform similarly against the SA Objectives, with the main differences in score relating to the additional housing on Option B2. Option B2 performs slightly worse due to the significant adverse effect against Objective 1, relating to biodiversity, this is because the additional land required for housing in Option B2 is located in an ecologically sensitive area. In addition, the development of Option B2 is likely to have a significant adverse effect on SA Objective 6, as the proposed residential development to the north of the site is likely to have an impact on the setting of the Grade II listed buildings at Rawlings Farm and at Upper Peckingell Farm.

Selection of strategic site

12.1 Both options appear capable of providing a good mix of housing types and have broadly similar infrastructure requirements. Similarly each site has similar levels of risk in terms of flood risk. The additional land in Option B2 is clearly separate from flood risk areas.
12.2 The decisive factor in selecting which option is the potential visual impact of each. Landscape evidence highlights the prominence of much of this area as well as the need to preserve as much as possible the rural and remote character of the surrounding area. Sustainability appraisal highlights the visual impacts upon the setting to listed buildings, as well as effects upon biodiversity.

12.3 On this basis, Option B1 is the preferred option as it has least visual impacts. In terms of Core Policy 10 differences in most other criteria are marginal but there are more marked differences in terms of Criterion 5 relating to landscape, heritage and biodiversity effects. However, this choice has implications for the form and scale of employment needs a development might provide.

12.4 The additional area to the north could provide additional land for development but much of the area would be needed to mitigate landscape impacts from views to the north aside from views to the east. There are no existing features on which to build and adequate screening could take a considerable time to establish. Keeping development within the existing framework of hedgerows, and in particular behind the mature hedgerow south of Peckingell Farm, results in a much stronger visual and immediate screen to development. Option B1 is therefore the better option.

12.5 A country park between the urban edge and the countryside would also provide a transition between the two. It could soften further the visual impact of development as well as provide a recreational resource for a new neighbourhood that could benefit the town as a whole, connecting to the river valley it would help to realise wider access to the countryside along the river corridor.

12.6 The prominence of the site however suggests that, as far as employment development, large industrial buildings would by unduly obtrusive. The range of employment uses should therefore clearly exclude B8, warehousing and distribution uses that are likely to result in buildings on this scale. Potentially narrowing the scope for employment use reduces the site’s performance against SA objectives 11 and 12 relating to economic effects, but employment evidence points to a greater need and benefit from providing land for B1 and B2 uses. Focussing more toward B1 (non main town centre uses) and B2 aligns strongly with the Plan’s objectives.

12.7 Removing B8 uses from the potential range of employment uses also suggests that a total area for employment development should be reduced to reflect the rejection of more land hungry and large-building business. A different style and scale of employment considered alongside this particular area's good location in relation to central Chippenham, suggests a different employment generating potential and a more flexible approach to provision and delivery could be considered alongside housing development.

12.8 Transport evidence suggests that this site will be highly accessible to the facilities and services provided in the town centre. For instance the proximity of this area to the railway station presents a particular advantage for the site to accommodate a wider set of non B Class employment generating uses such as residential and non-residential
institutions or leisure uses provided they do not comprise main town centre uses for which town centre or edge of centre sites are viable and suitable\textsuperscript{72}. The site’s proximity to the town centre would also suggest that a local centre would not be justified.

12.9 Whilst selecting Option B1 this initial proposal should be amended to have a slightly smaller scale of land-take for employment and wider range of employment uses. The governing principles for business development should be that they involve buildings of a more domestic scale and should not involve uses more suitably located in the town centre.

12.10 Landscape evidence suggests an approach to reduce the visual impact of developing this area. These are a necessary part of plan proposals. They suggest that a minimum of 20\% of the gross site area should be maintained for strategic landscape treatment\textsuperscript{73}. Much of this land may also be required to provide measures for sustainable urban drainage and therefore ensure greenfield rates of water run-off are achieved without undue difficulty.

12.11 The gross site area of 40ha is therefore reduced to 30ha net. Approximately 5ha is reserved for employment generating uses. A further allowance for land to provide for a primary school, distributor standard road and to enhance biodiversity produces an estimated net area of approximately 20ha. The impact of further mitigation measures will result in lower than average net densities of residential development. As a result the site would accommodate a minimum of 600 new dwellings. Land earmarked for biodiversity and reserved for a link road may also double as areas for strategic landscaping. A more realistic estimate of the site’s capacity is therefore approximately 650 new dwellings.

12.12 Transport assessment indicates that at this scale of development a direct road link to the A350 involving crossing the railway will be required in order to prevent unacceptable impacts upon the local highway network. This infrastructure would need to be in place by the occupation of the 200\textsuperscript{th} dwelling. This will therefore form a requirement of development proposals.

12.13 The following section presents a proposal, indicative plan and supporting text for inclusion in the Plan.

\textsuperscript{72} In accordance with National Planning Policy Framework, DCLG, March 2012, paragraph 23
\textsuperscript{73} Chippenham Landscape Setting Assessment, TEP, December 2014, page 52
Proposals

Figure 6: Option B3 Rawlings Green Indicative Plan

Approximately 50ha of land at Rawlings Green, as identified on the policies map, is proposed for a mixed use development to include the following:

- 650 dwellings
- 5ha of land for employment generating uses (B1, B2, C2, D1 and D2 of the Use Classes Order)
- Land for a 2 Form Entry primary school
- Distributor standard road from the B4069 to the eastern boundary of the site, including connection over the main railway line, and a road from this distributor standard road to Darcy Close (Cocklebury Link Road)
- strategic landscaping and open space to retain and reinforce existing hedgerows and establish new areas of substantial planting
- a 10ha Country Park along the northern edge of new development linking to the existing recreation areas along the river to Monkton Park area

Development will be subject to the following requirements:
1. surface water management that achieves equivalent or less than current Greenfield rates of run-off
2. the connection to Darcy Close and a road crossing of the railway to be open for use before the completion of the 200th dwelling
3. financial contributions toward provision of new schools
4. a low density design and layout that preserves the setting and importance of listed buildings on the site

All other aspects of development will take place in accordance with a masterplan for the site approved by the Council prior to commencement.

13.1 The area slopes down to the River Avon. Flood risk areas (zones 2 and 3) must remain undeveloped. Rates of surface water run off to the River must also remain at
current levels or less in order to reduce the risk of flooding elsewhere. Connection to the drainage network will also require enhancements off site. Consideration of flood risk and necessary improvements to the drainage network must precede detailed development proposals. This must involve determining accurate boundaries to flood risk areas and a set of effective sustainable urban drainage measures.

13.2 The site is prominent to a wide area. It forms a backdrop for westerly views from the River Avon floodplain, public rights of way, Tytherton Lucas and the Limestone Ridge. Development must avoid adversely affecting the rural and remote character immediately around the site and increasing the visual prominence and urban influence of Chippenham over a much wider area. A strategic landscape scheme should:

- Retain and reinforce planting along the edges of Chippenham (and along the North Wiltshire Rivers Route) to filter and reduce views of the urban edge from the wider countryside. Especially views from public rights of way close to Tytherton Lucas to help maintain the rural and remote character of this village;

- Extend and manage linear woodlands and tree cover along the railway and towards the edge of the River Avon to help with screening, filtering and backgrounding of views towards existing (Chippenham) and proposed development;

- Create bold landscape structure by reinforcing existing field boundaries with new hedgerow and tree planting and where possible creation of copse and linear woodlands. Development to be inserted within the bold landscape structure;

- Seek opportunities to reinforce the riparian character along the River Avon and small tributaries flowing through the strategic area including retention/creation and future management of waterside meadows, pollarding willow trees, new areas of tree planting and multifunctional green links to new SuDS areas;

- Development to be aligned to the grain of topography and existing contours through careful location of buildings and infrastructure avoiding unnecessary cut and fill earthwork operations;

- Maintain the network of PRoW, set within green corridors though the landscape to preserve the existing good links from Chippenham to the river and countryside to the east and to help integrate proposed development within the landscape;

- Conserve and enhance the setting to the listed buildings at at Rawlings Farm; and Upper Peckingell Farm.

13.3 Development is envisaged within a strong landscape framework and the capacity of this site has been estimated using a low density of 30 dwellings per net hectare.

13.4 Large industrial buildings are unduly obtrusive because of the prominence of the site. The range of employment uses should therefore clearly exclude B8, warehousing and
distribution uses that are likely to result in buildings on this scale. Removing B8 uses suggests a different style and scale of employment. Alongside this particular area’s good location in relation to central Chippenham, there is therefore a different employment generating potential and a more flexible approach to its provision and delivery alongside housing development.

13.5 A new railway bridge represents an opportunity to enhance the value of the railway line to flora and fauna. Tree and shrub planting should help to create woodland, hedgerows and scrub to create or extend new habitats including roosting bat and nesting bird features within the bridge itself. This will create a wooded corridor along the western boundary. Southern boundary woodland should be extended to re-connect habitats to this area so there is an uninterrupted corridor east and west.

13.6 Land will be reserved within the scheme for a two form entry primary school. The estimated needs generated by the development itself do not by themselves require two forms of entry but reserving land allows for future expansion likely beyond the plan period.

13.7 The site is reasonably well located in relation to the town centre and development should include measures to enable as many trips as possible to the town centre to take place on foot, cycling or by public transport. Open space will provide a connection to the river as a corridor for pedestrian and cycle access to the town centre. Nevertheless the site’s location will inevitably place strains upon existing traffic corridors into and out of the existing built up area, parts of which are already congested. The completion of new traffic routes including a bridge over the railway will do much to address such problems and ultimately should improve existing conditions. This new road infrastructure structure therefore needs to be provided as soon as possible.

13.8 Traffic modelling shows there would be unacceptable harm if development of the site exceeded 200 dwellings without completion of road infrastructure. A precise point below the occupation of the 200th dwelling when road infrastructure must be fully delivered will be set as a condition of planning permission and will be agreed as a part of negotiations with a developer.
PART FIVE: SELECTING A THIRD PREFERRED AREA

14.1 At least a further 1,936 dwellings need to be delivered in the remainder of the Plan period to 2026 in order to support the town’s growth. Proposals for Area E identify land that could accommodate 1,000 dwellings. It is estimated that around 850 of these can be built by 2026 (See paragraph 7.11). All 650 dwellings at Area B are expected to be built in the plan period. Taking account of commitments (see paragraph 2.3) since the core strategy was drafted, land for at least a further 436 dwellings needs to be identified.

Relationship to the first and second preferred strategic areas

14.2 Some of the distinguishing features of each of the remaining strategic areas both negative and positive may have a different significance when assessed in combination with the development of the strategic site selections in Areas B and E. This is set out below.

14.3 The provision of a substantial scale of land for employment development in Area E, specifically geared to B2 uses and which can be developed relatively soon, reduces the urgency to provide such land in other areas. Employment land provision in other strategic areas therefore becomes more geared to the goal of providing a better choice of premises and offering a variety of locations.

Area A

14.4 The distinguishing features and characteristics are unaffected by the potential development of Area E and Area B.

Area C

14.5 The Area’s potential benefit in possibly providing large areas of formal and informal open space is diminished by the prospect of provision in Areas E and B. The implication is more significant when two and not just one strategic site are considered. However, the goal is for the town to benefit from the whole riverside and with land proposed in Area B there is scope for a more comprehensive approach to the riverside immediately north and east of the town both sides of the river.

14.6 Development in Area B creates a more definite basis for the development of this area since the proposals for Area B can also provide a link road to the eastern boundary of the site creating the possibility for two points of access to support development and a direct connection from Area C to the A350 primary road network (Criterion 3).

14.7 The provision of road infrastructure in other areas progresses wider transport benefits that accord with criterion 3 specifically in terms of opportunities to tackle congestion and providing key parts to a potential eastern link road. Transport assessment has
tested long term development scenarios\textsuperscript{74}. Whilst development in Areas A, B and E may not be unreasonable in highway terms there may well be a local perception of increasing congestion. This may encourage some to travel by alternatives to the private car but it is far more likely to deter travel into the town centre altogether, contrary to objectives of the core strategy.

14.8 Provision of a completed eastern link road\textsuperscript{75} (through Areas A-C) is forecast to lead to average journey times which are approximately 30-50\% shorter than journey times if development was dispersed around the town without either an eastern or southern link road. It is forecast to provide 15-20\% shorter journey times than with a southern link road\textsuperscript{76}. Time spent queuing on approaches to The Bridge Centre is also forecast to be considerably lower with an eastern link road. The analysis demonstrates that it would be possible to capitalise on the dependencies which exist between Areas A, B and C to deliver growth and supporting infrastructure which is advantageous, in transport and accessibility terms.

14.9 Other features and characteristics are unaffected.

Area D

14.10 Development in Area E creates a more definite prospect for the development of this area. However, the strategic site selected in Area E is on the western side of the area. This might create some uncertainty over the deliverability of a road connection across Area E on land excluded from development proposals and the viability of ultimately also providing a river crossing over the Avon.

14.11 Other features and characteristics are unaffected by development in Area B.

**Sustainability Appraisal assessment**

15.1 It is considered that the sustainability appraisal of Site Options E2 and B3 does not change the assessment of strategic Areas A, C and D. These areas continue to have the same constraints and opportunities as identified in the high level sustainability appraisal. It should also be noted that the sustainability appraisal of strategic Areas A, C and D indicates no strategic areas with absolute sustainability constraints that cannot be mitigated should development be proposed within these areas.

**Selection of a third preferred area**

16.1 Area C is the third preferred area.

16.2 Development east of the River Avon raises two main issues in terms of Core Policy 10 criteria. First and foremost are the flood risks associated with this particular stretch of

\textsuperscript{74} Chippenham Strategic Areas Assessment: Transport and Accessibility, Atkins, October 2014 page 43

\textsuperscript{75} This is based on the performance of an Eastern Link Road alone and not in combination with a Cocklebury Link Road

\textsuperscript{76} Chippenham Strategic Areas Assessment: Transport and Accessibility, Atkins, October 2014, page 43 paragraph 7.11
the River Avon because of the extent of important flood storage immediately upstream of the town (Criterion 6)\textsuperscript{77}. Second is the impact of significant development on the landscape where the evidence suggests that much of the area is prominent over a wide area of the countryside and therefore where development may have a detrimental visual impact (Criterion 5)\textsuperscript{78}. This is mirrored by the results from sustainability appraisal where the Area performance is weak.

16.3 On other criteria, this Area compared to Area D also does have capability for reasonable links to the town centre and in time could potentially supplement needs allied but not in conflict with main town centre uses\textsuperscript{79}. Only once an eastern link road is completed might this area represent a strong attraction to inward investment looking to capitalise on the town’s national road links. However, the great bulk of estimated employment land needs form part of proposals in Area E. (Criterion 1).

16.4 The Area has the capacity to provide a good mix of homes. Abbeyfield School located at the southern end of the area has capacity for additional pupil numbers and would be highly accessible\textsuperscript{80}. Large scale development would need to be supported by an eastern link road connecting the Area to both the A4 and A350. This represents a significant abnormal cost largely because of the need to construct a crossing over the River Avon. Measures needed to reduce flood risk have not been investigated in detail. They may be more likely to be complex and time consuming because of the particular risks attached to this area even if the scale, form and cost of the measures required is ultimately much the same as other areas. Area C also contains an extensive length of national grid overhead pylons which would be costly to place underground\textsuperscript{81}.

16.5 The Area’s separation from the existing town would be largely overcome by a new road connection across the River Avon. This is essential to integrating the Area with the town centre and other destinations. The Area would also then be reasonably accessible by alternatives to the private car, in conjunction with the existing North Wiltshire Rivers Way. There are also extensive rights of way which could be improved to better include destinations east of the river, for instance improving accessibility to Abbeyfield School. The evidence suggests the Area has a high potential for an attractive walking and cycling routes\textsuperscript{82} (Criterion 4).

16.6 Development of this Area therefore has a number of challenges. The objective for flood risk will be a requirement to reduce existing flood risks involving this Area and elsewhere; in particular the town centre and parts of Monkton Park. This implements national policy to use opportunities offered by new development to reduce the causes
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and impacts of flooding\textsuperscript{83} and initial work suggests this may well be possible in principle.

16.7 Development in this Area would inevitably bring about a marked change to the setting of the town. Landscape assessment evidence shows that whilst there are sensitive areas east of Chippenham there are adequate amounts of land capable of providing for development without unacceptable impacts. The town’s expansion could avoid intervisibility with Tytherton Lucas and in so doing preserve the setting and the character of historic assets such as Hardens Farm and the Tytherton Lucas conservation area. However, the landscape evidence does suggest areas that are much less sensitive and capable of development generally to the south and east of the North Wiltshire Rivers Route compared to areas north toward the Marden River where any development would need to be carefully considered\textsuperscript{84}.

16.8 Even though there are clear challenges, the Area performs better than Area D and Area A outside the committed development.

16.9 By comparison Area D appears the most disconnected to the town and most difficult to properly integrate. It would be much less attractive to inward investment for employment uses. Landscape evidence shows generally that this Area is also more difficult in terms of visual impact and there is therefore less scope to provide a good mix of building types to meet business, community needs and homes\textsuperscript{85}. A link road south of the town from the A4 to the A350, should this be deliverable, provides less transport benefits than an eastern link road\textsuperscript{86}.

16.10 Based on landscape evidence some parts of Area A may seem capable of accommodating the remaining scale of development necessary to meet strategic requirements for new homes. It is in flood zone 1, reasonably accessible to the town centre by alternatives to the private car and business would have good access to the strategic road network. However, the arguments against extending the area for development still outweigh the likely benefits (see paragraphs 6.14 to 6.16); it does not offer wider transport opportunities in terms of potential improvements to the road network as other areas can; it is largely dependent on a new link road that itself is dependent on development already committed in Area A in order to be acceptable in traffic terms; it does not offer a fundamentally different choice of location for either home buyers or business; it would affect the setting to Birds Marsh Wood and possibly most of all, cumulatively, it would result in recreational pressures on Birds Marsh Wood that would ultimately harm its value.

\textsuperscript{83} National Planning Policy Framework, DCLG, 2012, paragraph 100
\textsuperscript{84} Chippenham Landscape Setting Assessment, TEP, December 2014, page 44 A3 Proformas
\textsuperscript{85} Chippenham Landscape Setting Assessment, TEP, December 2014, page 44 A3 Proformas
\textsuperscript{86} Chippenham Site Allocations Plan : Transport and Accessibility Evidence Paper 3 : Atkins, October 2014, paragraph 7.11
PART SIX: SELECTING SITES IN THE THIRD PREFERRED AREA

Site options

17.1 Extensive areas of flood risk are included as land for informal and formal recreation and are common elements and would be common to site options in this Area. Road access to commence the development of this Area would initially need to be provided from the south, from the A4. An area immediately adjacent to the North Wiltshire Rivers Way would allow a range of business premises to benefit from some of the immediate screening this route can already offer and also provides it with convenient access by foot and cycle to and from the town. This too would be a common element of site options.

17.2 The landscape is generally open with a perceived wooded character created by the combination of hedgerows, hedgerow trees and trees along watercourses in the foreground of views. Landscape assessment evidence indicates that the most sensitive parts of this Area are north from the North Wiltshire Rivers Route to the River Marden and land approaching Chippenham south of Stanley Lane. In general the area does not have any strong features or characteristics that can form the basis for visual boundaries to contain a potential strategic site. Site options are instead defined by new components created as a part of development.

17.3 A first option, Option C1, takes the route of overhead national grid power lines that run north south over much of this Area as a basis for a potential site boundary. These lines provide a sensible corridor for a new distributor standard road that would ultimately form an eastern link road. Such a road corridor, reinforced by planting and landscape works, would form a boundary to the town in similar fashion to the treatment of the A4 diversion around Pewsham. Taking these lines as a boundary avoids the need to underground them and the significant abnormal costs to a scheme that this might involve. This site option would enclose an area that could accommodate 850 dwellings and up to 20ha of employment land.

17.4 A second option, Option C2 proposes one large area that corresponds to the pattern of land holdings and the extent of land promoted by prospective developers. It would involve a scale of development of approximately 2,380 dwellings and 26ha of employment land. This site option alone comprises significant development in excess of what needs to be provided during the Plan period. As the third preferred area this would therefore establish a much longer term direction of growth extending the boundary to the edge of Chippenham well beyond the plan period.

17.5 The discussion of sites so far has focused on the release of housing land to meet the core strategy requirement by 2026. A site in the third preferred area needs to deliver 436 homes by 2026. The discussion of employment land has related to providing land as speedily as possible and on a range and choice of sites in terms of both use and

87 Wiltshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, Output Report 2012, Wiltshire Council, February 2014, Sites 506 and 458
location. The core strategy requirement for employment land is 26.5 ha. The choices made so far will deliver the following against this requirement:

**Committed developments**

- Hunters Moon: 2.3 ha
- North Chippenham: 2.7 ha

**Proposed Allocations**

- South West Chippenham: 18.0 ha
- Rawlings Green: 5.0 ha

**Total: 28 ha**

*Figure 7: Employment Land Provision (First and Second Preferred Areas)*

17.6 In considering a site for allocation within the third preferred area, consideration also needs to be given to whether additional employment land, above that required by the core strategy, is needed to provide further choice and additional job potential given the number of homes proposed potentially over the plan requirement.

17.7 Much of the employment land in Chippenham is currently focused on and accessed from the A350 corridor. The selection of an employment site within the third preferred area would provide an opportunity to introduce an alternative choice of location of a scale corresponding to the scale of site proposed.

17.8 Site Options C1 and C2 therefore include an indicative area for employment development of some 4-6 ha immediately adjacent to the A4 which could be brought forward during the plan period to 2026 and a further area of approximately 16-18 hectares safeguarded for potential future employment use beyond the 2026 plan period to reflect the potential attraction of this location once an eastern link road is complete to meet future employment needs.

17.9 Options are shown in Figure 8
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Option C1

Option C2

Figure 8: East Chippenham Site Options

Sustainability Appraisal of Site options

18.1 As is the case for the Strategic Area’s Options, Options C1 and C2 perform similarly. The difference in proposed housing numbers and the land required to accommodate them has had the biggest impact upon results within C1 and C2.

18.2 Option C2 performs worse against Sustainability Appraisal Objective 2, efficient and effective use of land given that a greater quantity of BMV agricultural land is required in the northern part of Option C2.

18.3 Although both Options have been delineated to avoid flood risks zones 2 and 3, the boundaries of the sites should be reviewed to ensure that they match current Environment Agency mapping as there appear to be parts of the site within these flood zones. The introduction of new development over such a large extent of land is likely to increase impermeable areas which will lead to negative effects against Sustainability Appraisal Objective 3 use and manage water resources in a sustainable manner, particularly for Option C2.

18.4 The introduction of new development over such a large extent of land, together with the new link road, has the potential to introduce considerable new car based traffic, which may adversely and significantly impact upon Sustainability Appraisal Objective 4 air quality and pollution. This is likely to be worse for Option C2, where the link road goes through the Option and exposes a greater number of receptors to noise, air and light pollution.
18.5 Both options may involve adverse effects on the setting of retained assets such as Harden’s Farm. This means that there would be significant adverse effects against Sustainability Appraisal Objective 6, the historic environment.

18.6 Option C2 also performs worse against Sustainability Appraisal Objective 7 as the larger size of development has a more adverse effect upon the local landscape. Both options involve significant greenfield landtake and whilst it is recognised that some localised mitigation may be implemented and the contribution the riverside park may make, there would be a loss of open aspect and views into Chippenham.

18.7 Given the amount of new housing and new employment areas and the introduction of the link road, both Options within Area C perform well against Sustainability Appraisal Objective 8-12, although it is recommended that further provision of facilities in the form of a local centre is provided to ensure a more self-sufficient and sustainable community.

Selection of a strategic site

19.1 Sustainability appraisal compares the sites. The thrust of conclusions on the effects of each option appear to reflect their difference in scale with both adverse and positive effects being greater with the larger of the options.

19.2 The scale of land requirements at this stage does not suggest a need for a large scale of development justified by strategic requirements. Both options could result in rates of development for Chippenham that exceed those envisaged in the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

19.3 Option C2 represents a scale of development approaching the whole indicative need for homes for the remainder of the Plan; as much of this development would be built beyond 2026 as before. It is an option that would provide certainty over the longer term to the community and developers and could offer economies of scale. However, circumstances and needs may well change in the future and this option may restrict flexibility to respond appropriately.

19.4 Option C2 is capable of providing more land for employment uses quite early in the plan period on the location close to the A4 but this location is potentially of limited attractiveness until such time as an eastern link road is completed. At that point, each option appears capable of providing for a mix of employment uses in a broadly similar location. Large scale employment premises such as B8 uses would not generally be suitable to either option because of the visual impact of large and bulky buildings in the landscape.

19.5 Both Options appear capable of providing an appropriate mix of homes and the community infrastructure necessary to support the needs they will generate. Option C2 might necessitate expansion of Abbeyfield School whilst Option C1 would not. Option C1 has also been designed to avoid any need to underground overhead power lines and potentially the costs this would involve. Option C2 inevitably generates greater financial security to the respective land owners and developers and possibly greater security over the timely provision of infrastructure needs and viability.
19.6 Both Options seem capable of providing wider transport opportunities with each site’s development completing an eastern link road to the town, although by virtue of the scale of development involved in Option C2 there could be greater certainty of provision alongside other infrastructure requirements. There are no significant benefits to Option C2 in terms of improving accessibility by alternatives to the private car. Option C1 can improve important links from the town to areas like Abbeyfield School just as well as Option C2. Option C2 may provide such a scale of development that it could be a significant boost to public transport, but how much so is uncertain given the main pre-requisite of a bridge over the River Avon is provided by both options. There appears little to distinguish one from the other in terms of criteria 3 and 4 of CP10.

19.7 Again both options require a developer to establish a visual boundary to contain the impact of development on the wider countryside. Simply by being larger it is fair to say that Option C2 will be more difficult to manage and to carry out effective mitigation. Nevertheless this is a matter for detailed design and implementation. In principle there should be no profound differences. However, it is reasonable to note that using a road corridor has already proved effective in containing Chippenham within a boundary to its urban area and in this respect Option C1 has the benefit compared to Option C2 of following an accepted precedent.

19.8 Option C2 involves areas of land in the River Marden valley that are identified as sensitive in landscape terms. If there is no pressing need to do so then logically this should be avoided. Option C1 therefore clearly performs much better in terms of criterion 5 as regards landscape and heritage impacts.

19.9 Again Option C2 involves a substantial area north of the North Wiltshire Rivers Way where development drains to the River Marden. Community input points to the frequency of flood events increasing for both the River Avon and the River Marden. This potentially complicates effective management of flood risks requiring a detailed understanding of both rivers’ regimes and managing how they interact. On the other hand, a larger scale of development may provide the basis for a comprehensive approach to managing surface water and scope for more resources to reduce flood risks, but, following a risk based approach, on balance Option C1 appears more easily and safely deliverable.

19.10 Option C1 therefore represents the preferred strategic site. Around 850 homes can be provided on this site with approximately 20ha of land for employment development, a site for a two form entry primary school, local centre and extensive riverside parkland.

19.11 The following section presents a proposal and supporting text for inclusion in the Plan.

**Proposals**

*Approximately 91ha of land at East Chippenham, as identified on the policies map, is proposed for a mixed use development to include the following:*

---

---
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- 850 dwellings
- approximately 5ha of land for employment (B1 and B2 of the Use Classes Order) with a further 15ha safeguarded for employment development beyond 2026
- Land for a 2 Form Entry primary school
- A Local centre
- 2.5ha safeguarded for the expansion of Abbeyfield School
- Distributor standard road from north-western boundary of the site to the A4, including connection over the River Avon (an Eastern Link Road)
- strategic landscaping and open space to retain and reinforce existing hedgerows, establish new areas of substantial planting and landscaping and to provide a visual boundary to the town along the route of the Eastern Link Road
- a 35ha Country Park along the western side of new development
- No more than 400 homes to be completed before the Cocklebury Link Road is open for use

Development will be subject to the following requirements:
1. surface water management that can achieve less than current Greenfield rates of run-off and decreases flood risks
2. a road crossing of the River Avon open for use before the completion of the 400th dwelling
3. the Eastern Link Road open for use by completion of the 750th dwelling
4. serviced land for employment is available for development before the completion of the 50th dwelling
5. financial contributions toward provision of new schools
6. a design and layout that preserves the setting and importance of listed buildings on the site

All other aspects of development will take place in accordance with a masterplan for the site approved by the Council prior to commencement.

20.1 A site is identified beyond the valley of the River Avon east of Chippenham. Flood risk areas (zones 2 and 3) that separate it from the town must remain undeveloped. This area plays an important role providing water storage that helps to protect the town from flooding. In recent times the town’s protection has failed and development is a means to reduce risks for existing residents and business as well as protect the new uses that will occupy this site. Rates of surface water run off to the River must be less than current levels in order to reduce the risk of flooding elsewhere. Connection to the drainage network will also require enhancements off site. Consideration of flood risk and necessary improvements to the drainage network must precede detailed development proposals. This must involve determining accurate boundaries to flood risk areas and a set of effective sustainable urban drainage measures.

20.2 Two areas of land are proposed for employment generating uses. A smaller area will provide for needs within the Plan period to 2026 and a second larger area is safeguarded for development focussing on needs up to and beyond 2026. The timing of its development and attractiveness to the market will depend upon a road connection to the A350 and M4 via completion of that part of an Eastern Link Road.
20.3 The Council with its partners will play a proactive role in partnership with developers in order to ensure employment development can take place, by marketing the site, brokering discussions with interested business and exploring other initiatives in collaboration with the Local Enterprise Partnership. Development of the site will deliver serviced land, with road access, utilities and communications infrastructure. A southern area accessed via the A4 will be a first phase of development.

20.4 The site is in a landscape which is strongly associated with the River Avon. Its development also needs to provide a new rural edge to east Chippenham when viewed from surrounding footpaths in the landscape and from higher ground. Large scale woodland is not characteristic of this landscape but would be required to adequately screen large scale employment development and provide a strong visual boundary to the site. Development should avoid high ground, retain the rural approach along Stanley Lane and reinforce a wooded and riparian character along the Avon valley.

20.5 A strategic landscape scheme should:

- Reinforce planting along the existing edges of Chippenham and adjacent to the North Wiltshire Rivers Route to reduce the glimpses of the urban edge from the wider countryside and especially in views from public rights of way close to Tytherton Lucas to help reinforce its rural and remote character;
- Extend and manage linear woodlands along the edge of the River Avon to help with screening, filtering and backgrounding of views towards existing (Chippenham) and proposed development;
- Create bold landscape structure by reinforcing existing field boundaries with new hedgerow and tree planting and where possible creation copses and linear woodlands. Development to be inserted within the bold landscape structure;
- Seek opportunities to reinforce the riparian character along the River Avon and River Marden including waterside meadows, areas of tree planting and areas for SuDS;
- Maintain the network of Public Rights of Way, set within green corridors though the landscape to preserve the existing good links from Chippenham to the river and countryside to the east and to help integrate proposed development within the landscape;
- Conserve and enhance the setting to the listed building at Harden’s Farm; and
- Conserve and enhance the setting (including mature trees) of New Leaze Farm located on higher ground.

20.6 Development is envisaged within a strong landscape framework. Land north of the North Wiltshire River Route is particularly sensitive in landscape terms and the capacity for developing in this area should be considered using a lower density of 30 dwellings per net hectare.

20.7 Development should include a hedgerow, woodland or tree-lined corridor from the stream adjacent to Abbeyfield School to the stream to the east near Hither Farm in order to restore ecological connectivity. It should also enhance the North Wiltshire Rivers Route for biodiversity gains through appropriate planting and management.
20.8 The Riverside Park offers an opportunity to restore riparian and floodplain habitats, including the field boundary hedgerows, which appear to have been lost in most of the fields between Harden’s Farm and the River Avon. All floodplain habitats should be restored and enhanced through appropriate management. Parts may have reduced public access in some more sensitive areas in order to safeguard protected species.

20.9 The River Avon (Bristol) County Wildlife Site must also be protected from development (and associated impacts such as pollution).

20.10 Land will be reserved within the scheme for a two form entry primary school. The estimated needs generated by the development itself do not by themselves require two forms of entry but reserving land allows for future expansion beyond the plan period. There is some capacity to accommodate additional students at Abbeyfield School, the nearest secondary school. This school may also need to expand in the future, in all likelihood beyond the plan period. To prevent losing this opportunity some land should therefore remain reserved to prevent the campus becoming restricted by new development.

20.11 The site is reasonably well located in relation to the town centre and development should include measures to enable as many trips as possible to the town centre to take place on foot, cycling or by public transport. The riverside park would be central to creating attractive routes for walkers and cyclists. The pedestrian and cycle network should also be improved, in particular to increase the accessibility of Abbeyfield School, Stanley Park and the riverside to the existing urban area.

20.12 Development is expected to commence from a southern access to the A4. This will inevitably put an additional burden on this corridor into the town. Completion of a Cocklebury Road link and an eastern link road around the town to the A350 north of the town will do much to tackle pressures from additional traffic. Transport assessments suggest that up to 400 new dwellings should be provided before the Cocklebury Road Link should be in place. A new bridge over the River Avon can then connect to this infrastructure and rates of development can then increase. An Eastern Link road to the A4 will be built in step with development and need to be in place by the completion of the 750th dwelling.

20.13 Evidence on the impacts of development of this site and elsewhere shows that new road infrastructure needs to be provided as soon as possible in order to prevent unacceptable impacts on the network. Consequently, to ensure timely delivery, a road bridge across the River Avon should in place by the occupation of the 400th dwelling and an eastern link road connecting to the A4 by the occupation of the 750th.
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436 homes required
Appendix 1: Housing Trajectory

Figure one shows the likely pace and timing of housing development of the preferred option. The contribution from each site is shown individually. It shows a significant increase in rates of housing development compared to recent years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW Chippenham</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawlings Green</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Chippenham</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>2130</td>
<td>2350</td>
<td>2450</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: Housing trajectory 2015-2026
This document was published by the Spatial Planning team, Economic Development and Planning, Wiltshire Council.

For further information please visit the following website:

www.wiltshire.gov.uk/planninganddevelopment/planningpolicy/
chippenhamsiteallocationsplan.htm