I object to the planning application on the following grounds:

1. The proposed development does not support Core Policy 10, Criteria 3 and 4 of the ‘Chippenham Strategic Sites Assessment Framework’, which requires new developments to:
   “Offer wider transport benefits for the existing community, have safe and convenient access, etc) (Criterion 3); and
   “Improve accessibility by alternatives to the private car to the town centre, railway station, schools and colleges and employment.” (Criterion 4).

Explanation of Reasons:

The proposed development is located on the edge of Chippenham. It is essential that such a development should maximise the opportunities for non-car access to local facilities, including the town centre, schools, employment and other neighbourhoods.

The proposal does not satisfy this requirement. If the development is to be any different to previous new housing and employment developments in Chippenham which have been overwhelmingly dependent on car travel (for example, outer west Chippenham, where cycling is only 1.1% of work trips), then it will need first class cycling and walking facilities.

(A) The Rowden Mile: The proposal does not adequately deal with non-car access to the site. The main non-car transport proposal is for a 3m wide shared walking-cycle route (the ‘Rowden Mile’) leading to Avenue La Fleche and then the town centre. This proposal is inadequate for the following reasons:
   (i) 3m shared use is not sufficient for a main cycling/walking route – it should be segregated, with 3-4m for cyclists and 2-3m for pedestrians.
   (ii) It is not clear how it will cross Avenue La Fleche. An at-grade crossing is not suitable as shown on the indicative master plan and Riverside Park plan, as visibility splays will not be acceptable on the bend. A path under the road bridge will be submerged when the river is high.
   (iii) It is not clear how the ‘Rowden Mile’ will enter the town centre, particularly at the flood barrier where the pedestrian path is less than 1m wide.

(B) Tunnel under the railway leading to Saltersford Lane: The proposal does not deal adequately with connections to the Hunters Moon development and the west side of Chippenham. The railway is a major barrier to non-car travel, and the railway tunnel at the B4528 will be the main link for pedestrian and cycle movement between the development and south-west Chippenham. The proposed development has no clear plans as to how cyclists will negotiate this busy road; nor is it clear whether there is sufficient width through the tunnel for a
footpath.

(C) Facilities for pedestrians and cyclists along B4634 Patterdown Road. The planning application does not show how this busy road will be made suitable and attractive for pedestrians and cyclists. This is potentially a strategic walking and cycling route. There should be off-road provision for pedestrians and cyclists on both sides of the B4634, along its whole length from Showell Farm to the A4 mini-roundabout.

(D) Walking and cycling links to Pewsham: The planning application does not provide clear cycling and walking links between the proposed development and Pewsham, including Abbeyfield School. A cycle/footbridge across the river Avon is shown in the Transport Scoping Report (Fig. 4.2), but it is not shown in the Riverside Park Green Infrastructure Strategy drawing (drawing no. 2513-090), which raises questions whether this is a serious proposal. The non-motorised links between the proposed development and Pewsham/ south-east Chippenham are crucial, otherwise all traffic will be car-based. A cycle/footbridge over the river Avon just north of the South West Water water treatment plant would be a better option (grid ref. 51.26.28 north by 2.07.11 west).

Conclusion
In conclusion, the proposed development contains no serious proposals that would significantly increase levels of walking and cycling in Chippenham. The proposed development cannot be considered as ‘sustainable’, and should therefore be rejected.
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