

**WILTSHIRE COUNCIL'S CHIPPENHAM SITE ALLOCATIONS PLAN
(CSAP)
INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION**

HEARINGS PROGRAMME (Draft V.1)

Venue:- Chippenham Town Hall, High Street, Chippenham SN15 3ER.

WEEK 1

Tuesday 10 November 2015 at 10.00

Opening Session – Inspector's introductory remarks and Opening Statement by the Council

Matter 1: Legal requirements

Issues

- Has the CSAP been prepared in accordance with the Local Development Scheme?
- Has consultation been compliant with the requirements of the Statement of Community Involvement?
- Has the Plan been subject to Appropriate Assessment in accordance with the Habitats Directive?
- Is the Plan compliant with national planning policy?
- Has the Duty to Co-operate been properly discharged?

Matter 2: Site Selection Procedure

Issues

- Has the selection process resulted in the most appropriate Development Strategy?
- Has the ranking of the Core Strategy (CS) criteria been properly justified?
- Does the narrative for selecting the preferred strategic areas properly reflect the relative weight of the CS criteria?
- Has the balance between the assessment against the CS criteria and the results of the Sustainability Analysis resulted in the most appropriate proposals for including in the CSAP?

Participants

Rep	30	Wilts & Berks Canal Trust (Area D)
	46	Gleeson Strategic Land (incl. Area D)
	101	David Mannering
	513	Chippenham 2020 LLP
	544-545	Richard Hames CAUSE2015 (incl. Area D)
	546-547	Helen Stuckey CAUSE2015 (incl. Area D)
	548-549	CAUSE2015 (Cllr Caswill)
	560	Marilyn MacKay (ECOS)
	563	Stephen Eades (incl. Area D)
	550-551	Bremhill PC* (CAUSE2015 incl. Area D)
	574	Kim Stuckey (Area D)

Tuesday 10 November 2015 at 14.00

**Matter 3: Sustainability Appraisal
Issues**

- It is a requirement that the Sustainability Appraisal should be adequate: does the methodology provide an adequate framework for assessing the sustainability of the alternative strategic areas?
- Does the high level nature of the first assessment provide adequate justification to exclude Area D from further consideration?
- Has sufficient consideration been given to the options included for the second assessment?
- Are the results robust in the absence of any weighting of SA objectives?
- As an example, Area D is summarised as having significant adverse effects on air pollution and noise, performing worse than Area C against SA Objective 4, yet the detailed assessment tables have almost identical wording: does this indicate that the results are not robust?

Participants

Rep	47	Gleeson Strategic Land
	513	Chippenham 2020 LLP
	555	Kim Stuckey

Wednesday 11 November 2015 at 10.00

**Matter 4: Transport and Accessibility
Issues**

- Does the evidence provide a convincing case for an Eastern Link Road (ELR)?
- Is there sufficient evidence to justify a development strategy based to a significant extent on performance in terms of transport and accessibility?
- Has there been adequate justification in transport and accessibility terms to justify exclusion of Area D from the Stage 2 Analysis?

Participants

Rep	27	Steve Riley
	101	David Mannering
	143	Hallam Land Management
	231-234	Robert Hitchens Ltd
	513	Chippenham 2020 LLP
	504	Mrs Jaime Doggett
	544-545	Richard Hames CAUSE2015
	546-547	Helen Stuckey CAUSE2015
	548-549	CAUSE2015 (Cllr Caswill)
	550-551	Bremhill PC* (CAUSE2015)

560 Marilyn MacKay (ECOS)
574 Kim Stuckey

**Matter 5: Flood risk
Issues**

- Has sufficient regard been had to the flood risk information, and particularly to the surface water management issues identified in the Evidence Paper 6?
- Is the potential impact of infiltration resulting from SUDS a significant concern?
- Has sufficient weight been afforded to the high ranking of the strategic areas (notably B & C) having the most flood risk area and location upstream of the built-up area?

Participants

Rep	27	Steve Riley
	562	Steve Perry CAUSE2015
	537-538	Richard Hames CAUSE2015
	546-547	Helen Stuckey CAUSE2015
	548-549	CAUSE2015 (Cllr Caswill)
	556 – 557	Bremhill PC* (CAUSE2015)
	560	Marilyn MacKay (ECOS)

Wednesday 11 November 2015 at 14.00

**Matter 6: The Development Strategy and Proposals
Issues**

- Does the Development Strategy provide adequate justification for updating the Core Strategy's housing and employment requirement?
- Has the methodology for determining the Strategy been properly justified?
- Does the Development Strategy truly reflect the priority given to new employment provision acknowledged by the Core Strategy and has this translated into an 'employment-led strategy'?
- Is the development strategy too narrowly focused by omitting consideration of small sites?

Participants

Rep	28	North Chippenham Consortium
	101	David Mannering
	231-234	Robert Hitchins Ltd
	304	KBC Developments LLP
	476	Barratt Developments
	537-538	Richard Hames CAUSE2015
	546-547	Helen Stuckey CAUSE2015
	548-549	CAUSE2015 (Cllr Caswill)
	556 – 557	Bremhill PC* (CAUSE2015)
	560	Marilyn MacKay (ECOS)

West of A350

75	Mrs Tracey Barrow
79-80	Miss Mel Moden
85-86	Brig Howard Ham
529-530	Irad Kennedy
531-532	Cllr Elizabeth Kennedy
539	Stephen Eade

Thursday 12 November 2015 at 10.00

Matter 7: Policy CH1

Issues

- Area E is the first preferred choice: is this fully justified by the evidence?
- Can the choice be robust when delivery of a significant part of the site is dependent on the provision of infrastructure elsewhere and outside the control of the developer?
- Are sufficient safeguards in place to ensure the future protection of the Rowden Park Conservation Area?
- Has there been sufficient consideration of the environmental issues regarding the Patterdown Rifle Range?
- Is the extent of the allocation appropriate?
- The more extensive Option E3 has been rejected: are the reasons for the rejection robust and soundly based?

Participants

Rep	30	Wilts & Berks Canal Trust
	138	Crest Nicholson & Redcliffe Homes
	143	Hallam Land Management

Thursday 12 November 2015 at 14.00

Matter 8: Policy CH2

Issues

- Is the necessary infrastructure deliverable to support development of Rawlings Green within the envisaged timescale?
- Has adequate account been taken of the potential harmful traffic impact on congested corridors?
- Has the complexity of the extent and form of risk posed by flood risk zones been fully explored prior to allocation?
- Has sufficient consideration been given to the prominence of the area in the wider landscape?
- Compared to Options B1 and B2, the chosen configuration for the allocation has no specific employment site: is this fully justified by the evidence?

Participants

Rep	48-49	Gleeson Strategic Land
------------	--------------	-------------------------------

106	Marcus Rhodes
304	KCB Developments LLP
331	Mr & Mrs Thomas
403	Mrs Lisa Powrie
476	Barratt Developments
496	Vincent Bryant
537-538	Richard Hames CAUSE2015
546-547	Helen Stuckey CAUSE2015
548-549	CAUSE2015 (Cllr Caswill)
556 – 557	Bremhill PC* (CAUSE2015)
560	Marilyn MacKay (ECOS)
570	Steve Perry ECOS (Chippenham Community Voice) CAUSE2015

Friday 13 November 2015 at 10.00

Omission sites

Participants

Rep	50	Gleeson Strategic Land (Forest Farm)
	143	Hallam Land Management (East of Showell Farm)
	204	Strategic Land Partnerships (site at Salterford Lane)
	231-234	Roberts Hitchens Ltd (N & W of Barrow Farm)
	257-258	R F Moody & Ptnrs (Patterdown Farm)

WEEK 2

Tuesday 17 November 2015 at 10.00

Matter 9: Policy CH3

Issues

- Area C is acknowledged to bring about a marked change to the setting of the town: how can this be justified?
- Is there robust evidence that the impact of development will be acceptable when it is acknowledged the area is visually prominent over a wide area of countryside?
- How can the flood risks associated with the River Avon in this locality be equated to the extensive development proposed, given the statement that the measures needed have not been investigated in detail?
- Can the area's separation from the town be overcome to any degree by a new road connection across the Avon, given its location and direction?
- The chosen Option allows for a scale of development almost twice that required in order to meet the balance of the housing requirement: how can this be justified?
- The choice of Area C as the third preferred area appears to be based – to a substantial degree – on the provision of an Eastern Link Road: since it is acknowledged this would, in turn, have the potential to adversely impact on SA Objective 4, has there been sufficient analysis of the consequences of this choice?
- Is the use of the Eastern Link Road to provide a visual boundary to the town properly justified as a concept?
- How can the proposal to include a housing allocation in the acknowledged open landscape to the north of the North Wiltshire Rivers Route be justified?
- Can a substantial allocation of employment land which will not be developed within the Plan period be justified?
- Has any consideration been given to protecting the rural nature of the North Wiltshire Rivers Route?

Participants

Rep	9	Ian Palmer
	16	Nicholas Burdett
	50	Gleeson Strategic Land
	101	David Mannering
	105	Marcus Rhodes
	245	Adrian Sweetman
	293-295	Alistair Millington (Sustrans) TBC
	331	Mr & Mrs Thomas
	347	Andrew Stevenson
	404	Steve Riley
	472	Barratt Developments
	504	Mrs Jaime Doggett

513 Chippenham 2020 LLP
537-538 Richard Hames CAUSE2015
546-547 Helen Stuckey CAUSE2015
548-549 CAUSE2015 (Cllr Caswill)
556 – 557 Bremhill PC* (CAUSE2015)
560 Marilyn MacKay (ECOS)
567 Miss Chloe Doggett
569 Miss Sophia Doggett
570 Steve Perry ECOS (Chippenham Community Voice) CAUSE2015

Wednesday 18 November 2015 at 10.00

Site visits

Thursday 19 November 2015 at 10.00

Matter 10: Policy CH4

Issues

- Does the Policy provide adequate guidance to ensure the provision of the Country Parks?
- Is there adequate identification of the Country Parks areas within the Plan?
- Should the flood risk areas where new buildings or structures are to be prohibited be delineated on the Plan?
- Should key new rights of way and enhanced routes be identified on the Plan?

Participants

Rep 24 Michael Sprules
37-43 Sport England

Matter 11: Settlement Boundary

Issues

- Is the revised Settlement Boundary justified by the evidence?
- Can the exclusion of the strategic site allocations from the Settlement Boundary be justified?

Participants

Rep 204 Strategic Land Partnerships
263-264 R F Moody & Ptnrs
513 Chippenham 2020

Matter 12: Monitoring and Implementation

Issues

- In the light of declining housing completions in recent years is the housing delivery trajectory realistic?

- Does the delivery trajectory reflect realistic rates of delivery for each of the strategic sites?
- Does the Plan include an adequate monitoring framework to ensure delivery of key infrastructure is co-ordinated with development requirements?
- How can the statement that the Viability Assessment concluded the site allocations are deliverable within the current policy context be true when it does not support compliance with the Core Strategy Policy 43 so far as the provision of affordable homes is concerned?

Participants

Rep	45-46	Gleeson Strategic Land (Tables 4.1 & 4.2)
	138	Crest Nicholson & Redcliffe Homes
	143	Hallam Land Management
	231-234	Robert Hitchens Ltd
	513	Chippenham 2020 LLP

Friday 20 November 2015 at 10.00

Site visits

***Bramhill PC will be represented by: Colin Pearson, Kim Stuckey & Mrs Isobel McCord**

Note: *This is a draft programme for the public hearing stage of the Examination of the. It is based on the request to participate (Question 8) on the representation form and should include all those who have requested the opportunity to participate. Please check the programme and contact the Programme Officer if your name has been omitted, or if you have been included for an inappropriate session.*

Patrick Whitehead (Inspector)
13/10/2015