

## Vision & Objectives

Ref. No.	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
P/V/1	p. 28 Transport	Lack of car access for walking-impaired people who cannot use bicycles, and who are discouraged during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, from using public transport.	Understood. However, promoting car use cannot be a sustainable objective of the Transport Vision. Policy T4 promotes development for disabled people and those with reduced mobility.
P/V/2	Vision & Objectives	Many people do not have the resources to change to hybrid or wholly electric vehicles in the short or even, medium, term.	Phasing out of petrol vehicles is Government policy so it is important to have infrastructure for electric vehicle charging
P/V/3	Objectives	Train travel to Bristol and Bath are not good solutions, the railway stations in those places are too far from many destinations within the cities.	The locations of these railway stations are outside of Neighbourhood Area
P/V/4		Scooters should not be allowed in Chippenham. The chaos in Bristol is bad enough. Already, in Chippenham, youths can be seen dodging around on the town centre roads with no regard for pedestrians or drivers. These illegal practices will soon result in serious 'accidents'. There seems little enforcement, if any.	Outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan
P/V/5	p. 28 Town Centre Vision & Objectives	Shopfronts are, in almost all cases, NOT in keeping with the architecture in the town.	Objective 2 of the Town Centre Vision seeks to ensure that new shopfronts are sympathetically and sensitively designed. The application of Policy TC6 and the Shopfronts Design Guide would achieve this objective as shop ownerships change and/or planning applications are submitted over time.
P/V/6	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	Agree totally. The focus on climate change is absolutely essential. Sustainability is vital for long term success of the town.	Support noted
P/V/7	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	Chippenham is Full!	Noted
P/V/8	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	Chippenham should not extend beyond its natural boundaries nor impact on sssi.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot determine the location of any strategic land allocations, that may or may not extend outside of the Neighbourhood Area. Such allocations are to be determined by the Emerging Wiltshire Local Plan, which would also have to assess the impact of any such allocations on nearby SSSI's.
P/V/9	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	Climate change! This is hysterical non-scientific apocalyptic nonsense; you are essentially endorsing a political ideological position without evidence, insisting and forcing it upon people as an expensive, tax raising, buddy / cash enriching system to deliver things that aren't needed whilst preventing people from living as they choose. 'Carbon neutral' is a case in point, as were your disastrous 'cycle paths' on Bristol Road, & your building left right and centre over green areas! Absolutely farcical, emperor's new clothes stuff. It's all about money, green lobby, and has no consistency. There is no 'emergency'. And until you prove it, stop wasting public money on it. You are allowing buildings to proliferate around the town, across green sites, and filling up the county with more and more residents.	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan's Vision and policies are based on robust and widely held scientific evidence that global climate change is anthropogenic and that planning policies can be an effective tool to minimise carbon emissions from new development. Evidence is led by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the United Nations body for assessing the science related to climate change.</p> <p>The Town Council are not responsible for introducing 'cycle paths' on Bristol Road, nor are they the Local Planning Authority for Chippenham.</p>
P/V/10	p. 28 Transport Vision & Objectives	The town centre needs free parking, not expensive car parks like Monkton Park eyesore! How is that looking after the aesthetic look of the town? It's perfectly monstrous. There is no need to reduce traffic in town, it's hardly an issue. This is green nonsense. People don't want to cycle: this is not the Netherlands. See your cycle path projects again. Nor do we need 'diversity and inclusion' buzzwords. We need things to be accessible, clean, well serviced, well delivered, cheap/value for money, and environmentally minded / not apocalyptic fantasy based ideology.	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Vision Survey (Appendix 1 of the Draft Plan) found traffic and parking was an issue, being the most important topic mentioned amongst the Chippenham community. It also found that the Chippenham community want to see improved cycling and walking opportunities in the town. Reducing through traffic in the town would improve the environment (noise, air pollution), and experience for pedestrians and cyclists as per Objective 4 of the Transport Vision.</p> <p>Public car park charges are outside of the remit of the Town Council and/or Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
P/V/11	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	Concerned as to how these will be achieved when Housing developers, in particular, ride roughshod over local wishes.	The Neighbourhood Plan would become part of the development plan for Chippenham and the Local Planning Authority would have to give its policies weight in the determination of planning applications in Chippenham Parish.
P/V/12	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	Creating "Green spaces" whilst building houses on our countryside is counter intuitive. Building new houses without solar, heat source pumps & other green energy sources would be a missed opportunity	Creating green spaces in the urban environment is essential for the recreation, health and wellbeing of existing and future residents, and the natural environment (Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 6 of the Green and Blue Infrastructure Vision). The Neighbourhood Plan cannot determine the location of any strategic land allocations that may extend outside of the Neighbourhood Area or into the countryside. These are to be determined by the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan. Agree that new houses should incorporate renewable energy sources, as referred to in the Housing Vision and Objectives.
P/V/13	p. 28 Transport Vision &	Cycle Lanes	It is not clear if this comment is in favour of, or against, cycle lanes

P/V/14	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	Fine words... ie on reviving Town Centre but then why allow so much development on the edge of town for instance?	Support noted for Town Centre Vision. The Wiltshire Core Strategy and Chippenham Site Allocations Plan set out existing development allocations, some of which are edge of town. The Neighbourhood Plan does not contain any land allocations and therefore does not 'allow' future development on the edge of town.
P/V/15	p. 27 Housing Vision & Objectives	Housing Development section woefully inadequate, where in the plan does it describe the 1000's of new houses being built in the southern part of the Neighbourhood area, and what their impact will be?	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot determine the location of any strategic housing allocations. This is to be determined by the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan, which is in its early stages of development. Housing numbers and sites are not yet fixed. The Neighbourhood Plan sets out the context for potential future strategic housing allocations and explains that Policies H1 and H2 will be able to influence housing need and housing design respectively.
P/V/16	p. 27 Housing Vision & Objectives	Housing Needs Assessment calculations do not seem to be clearly defined. The extent of future housing development will have a negative impact on some of the Vision and Objective statements	Please refer to the Chippenham Housing Needs Assessment, where calculations are explained in full. Future housing development in the Neighbourhood Area will have to align with the Neighbourhood Plan policies, which in itself have emerged from the Vision and Objectives.
P/V/17	p. 27 Housing Vision & Objectives	As well as carbon neutral, new housing should include renewable energy options such as heat pumps and solar panels.	The Housing Vision refers to incorporating energy efficiency and renewable energy generation, with Objective 4 to 'Ensure that all new housing development is net zero carbon...'. Policy SCC2 requires new development to be sustainably constructed and is therefore likely to include renewable energy options. The Chippenham Design Guide (Section I) sets out domestic building design principles which require renewable energy options.
P/V/18	p. 28 Town Centre Vision & Objectives	More needs to made of the frontage onto the river	Objective 1 of the Green Infrastructure Vision refers to the River-Green Corridor as being a focal point for the town. However, the Town Centre Vision does not refer to the River Avon, despite Policy TC2 seeking to achieve a more active frontage on to the River Avon. Amend last sentence of Town Centre Vision from:  <i>'The special historic character of the town centre will be preserved and enhanced'</i> to: <i>'The distinctive identity of the town centre, which has been shaped by its varied and special historic architecture, and by the River Avon, will be at the core of its regeneration.'</i>  Add additional Objective 6: <i>'Enhance the River Avon frontage as a place-shaping feature for the regeneration of the town centre'</i>
P/V/19	p. 27 Green Infrastructure Vision & Objectives	I agree with the preservation of green spaces.	Support noted
P/V/20	p. 27 Housing Vision & Objectives	I agree with the vision re housing, however, I am concerned about the potential excess house building in the area between Pewsham and the old canal.	Support for Housing Vision noted. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot determine the location of any strategic housing allocations. This is to be determined by the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan sets out the context for potential strategic housing allocations and explains that Policies H1 and H2 will be able to influence housing need and housing design respectively. Policy GI3 seeks to establish Green Corridors along the old Canal and River Avon to protect these important natural assets.
P/V/21	p. 27 Green Infrastructure Vision & Objectives	I am concerned about the so called "green corridors"	Noted, but unsure of your concerns.

P/V/22	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives  Para. 3.38	I feel that an important issue has been omitted from the NP's overall vision. This is the role of agriculture on the farmland within the neighbourhood area going forward. Given the enormous challenge we face in opposing WC's plans to excessively develop farmland to the south of Chippenham, I am also disappointed with the suggestion that 'houses will have to be built on 'less sustainable greenfield land ie farmland''. Whilst the plan recognises the importance of agricultural farmland in helping to create 'the town's character and environment' it is woefully neglected as a topic in most of the report. Farmland after all makes up a large part of the planning area, perhaps as much as a third or more.	Agree that the Neighbourhood Plan should provide a greater emphasis on the role of farming in its Vision & Objectives, recognising that farmland surrounds the town and a third of the Parish comprises of farmland. New paragraph added after 3.1 explaining that farmland surrounds the town. Also reference added to farmland in Paras. 3.3 and 3.18. New paragraph added after 3.38 to explain the importance of agricultural land for employment, green infrastructure and sustainable food production.  First sentence of Para. 3.38 amended to remove 'need to' from text 'will need to occur on less sustainable greenfield land' and add additional text referring to future growth needing to be balanced against the loss of farmland.  New Objective 5 added to Chippenham Identity Vision to recognise the importance of farming in shaping the future of the town.  Reference added to agro-ecological model in Green Infrastructure Vision.  Recognition of agricultural sector added to Economy Vision text. New Objective 4 added to Economy Vision to reference support to the agricultural sector in the Parish as a provider of local employment and training opportunities, and local farm produce.
P/V/23	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	I really appreciate the emphasis on sustainability and green. Once green space goes it never comes back, you cant recover from it.	Support noted
P/V/24	p. 27 Green Infrastructure Vision & Objectives	I support the idea of the river green corridor however, I have serious doubts whether this is achievable, given the volume of ongoing development to the north and southwest. Apropos the development, the growth is not sustainable or distinct, additionally there has been no improvement in infrastructure to support any of the new development in the southwest.	Support noted for Objective 1 of Green Infrastructure Vision. The Neighbourhood Plan recognises the River Avon Corridor is vital as a 'strategic green corridor' for human and wildlife movement in any expanded Chippenham as set by Policy GI3. The Neighbourhood Plan recognises that past/ongoing strategic housing development in Chippenham has not always been sustainable or distinct. Hence the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan seek to ensure that future housing development is sustainable as far as the remit of neighbourhood planning allows.
P/V/25	p. 28 Town Centre Vision & Objectives	I support any attempts to revive a very tired town centre. Where independent traders are concerned, Chippenham could learn lessons from both Devizes and Corsham	Support noted
P/V/26	p. 29 Community Infrastructure Vision & Objectives	Community? Chippenham hasn't been a community for a very long time - Chippenham has encouraged commuters but to date, has made no effort to provide indoor or outdoor facilities, for any age group.	Objective 2 of the Community Infrastructure Vision seeks to encourage the community to come together by providing a range of indoor and outdoor meeting places and event spaces. The Community Infrastructure Topic Paper (Appendix 19 of the Draft Plan) evidences existing indoor and outdoor facilities and groups/organisations, but Policy CI1 recognises the need for further community infrastructure as Chippenham's population increases
P/V/27	p. 27 Green Infrastructure Vision & Objectives	I think as many green spaces as possible should be preserved because once they are lost to buildings they are gone forever.	Support noted
P/V/28	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	I think it is a well thought out plan, particularly around the redevelopment of the town centre, the war memorial area and the river Avon. Chippenham has the potential to be a lovely town, I hope the plans come to fruition.	Support noted
P/V/29	p. 27 Housing Vision & Objectives  p. 29 Economy Vision & Objectives	I think more needs to be done to ensure Chippenham grows organically. We need local employment, with good quality jobs, so that people can work locally rather than commute out to far off towns. We need affordable housing so our young people can afford to live and work here and keep the town vibrant. We do not need large scale commuter belt housing that simply entices people to move here for lower house prices, then commute back out, adding congestion and pollution, and causing more issues for the people that live here. I agree with the 'employment led' development expressed in the vision but development seems to have been housing target led up to now. I also agree that we need a positive vision and policies that address climate change.	Comments on housing noted. Support for Economy Vision and policies that address climate change noted.
P/V/30	p. 27 Green Infrastructure Vision & Objectives	I think that the green space we have in and around Chippenham is very precious as it provides tranquility in a stressful and busy world. That the plan aims to protect these areas is a good thing for all of us.	Support noted
P/V/31	p. 28 Town Centre Vision & Objectives	I think the Bath Car Park would be amazing if it was to become a market that embraced local produce.	Objective 1 of the Town Centre is to develop the Bath Road Car Park/Bridge Centre site for mixed use development which may include shopping and leisure. The public square envisaged at the heart of this site under Policy TC1 would be an ideal space to accommodate a local produce market, although not at the expense of the existing market.

P/V/32		I also think the town centre could really benefit from more independent retailers/services.	Noted
P/V/33	p. 28 Transport Vision & Objectives	Small thing, but road signs are often faded (in regard to infrastructure)	Comment referred to Wiltshire Council Highways
P/V/34	p. 28 Town Centre Vision & Objectives	I also think there is a huge opportunity around the evening economy too	Noted.
P/V/35	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	It helps put town take back some control and this can only be a good thing!	Support noted
P/V/36	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	It is essential that this is linked to an 'outcomes' action plan	Agree. Paragraph 13.2 explains that the Town Council will investigate an appropriate governance process for monitoring and review of whether the Neighbourhood Plan objectives are being met and its policies being adhered to.
P/V/37	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	It is great to see a desire to improve the environment and quality of life for all that live in Chippenham	Support noted
P/V/38	p. 29 Community Infrastructure Vision & Objectives	It is hugely dedicated to the environment. Whereas this is obviously important, the section on community infrastructure seems to have been reduced to 3 pages, which is inadequate. It feels like there has been one focus which has dominated the whole project.  Whereas climate change and sustainability are clearly very important, there is a heavy emphasis in the report on this topic and very little on community infrastructure	Community Infrastructure is an important aspect of the Neighbourhood Plan and in some topic areas, such as Community Infrastructure, the Topic Group had less scope to create a number of different planning policies because of the need for any such policies to be based on land use and planning. The Community Infrastructure Topic Group fully explored the role neighbourhood planning could play in new community infrastructure and devised Policy C11 accordingly.
P/V/39	p. 28 Transport Vision & Objectives	It talks a lot about improving cycle routes which is great but there are rumours about getting rid of the cycle route to Lacock near Avenue la fleche and destroying a few farms to make way for a new road. I hope this doesn't happen as it would be a real shame for Chippenham.	Support noted for Objective 1 of the Transport Vision. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot determine the location of any strategic land allocations. These are to be determined by the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan. Similarly, plans for any new road fall outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.
P/V/40	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	It would be good to see some more specific wording across the whole document. The whole document seems very vague 'work with. look towards' etc.	Noted. Policies have been worded to try and be as specific as possible, but the wording also has to be flexible enough to allow for changes in legislation, circumstances, viability etc. for the period up to 2038.
P/V/41	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	It's a very clear & comprehensive document, and I like the way that it is set out. I appreciate that there's always going to be a trade-off between different imperatives, such as transport & housing needs on one hand and environmental & sustainability objectives on the other. I particularly liked the Policy on Green Corridors, which I think is a low cost way to enhance the quality of the environment, and life, within Chippenham. I guess my concern is that there will always be some tension between different aspects of the Plan, and I'm concerned about how this will be managed & appropriate compromises arrived at. How & when will this consultation take place?	Support noted, in particular for Policy G13. The planning process is about the Local Planning Authority balancing those different tensions or different policies and applying what they consider the appropriate weight to be to each policy in determining each different planning application. Public consultation on planning applications is normally required and a means to identify those planning issues. A further public consultation (Regulation 16 consultation) will be carried out on the draft Neighbourhood Plan in due course this year.
P/V/42	p. 28 Transport Vision & Objectives	Largely agree, but I disagree with the transport aim of making the town easy to get around by car. If we make the town easy to get around by car, this a) encourages more driving and b) with limited land available, comes at the cost of more sustainable transport means, including walking, cycling and public transport.  The car is the past, and we need to reduce cars and car-dependency in the town through the planning policies. If 'getting around easily by car' is kept in the plan, it will make it too easy to lock in car dependency for many more generations.	Agree. First sentence of Transport Vision modified from: <i>'Chippenham will be a town where people can move around easily on foot, bicycle, car or public transport.'</i> to: <i>'Chippenham will be a town where people can move around easily on foot, bicycle, motorcycle or public transport as an alternative to travelling by car'</i>
P/V/42	p. 27 Housing Vision & Objectives	More houses needed, market demand is the local needs so section 7.4 should be deleted.	The Housing Vision recognises that Chippenham will experience housing growth. Market demand forms a part of local needs, but not solely, as 40% of new housing on schemes of 10 or more houses are required to be affordable housing under the Wiltshire Core Strategy. Local need for affordable housing is also evidenced by the Chippenham Housing Needs Assessment (Appendix 11 of the draft Plan). Section 7.4 retained.
P/V/43	p. 27 Housing Vision & Objectives	More social housing	Objective 2 of the Housing Vision refers to the need to provide affordable housing and it is not considered necessary to specifically refer to social housing as one of several different types of affordable housing within the Vision or Objectives.

P/V/44	p. 27 Green Infrastructure Vision & Objectives	My heart sinks when green corridors are mentioned. Easy access to open countryside is what I want. Corridors sound like what we hope to preserve of our countryside once Wiltshire Council has built all over it! Having said that I think that within the present town preservation and development of green space is needed.	Support noted
P/V/45	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	Pump track	Noted
P/V/46	p. 28 Town Centre Vision & Objectives	Seems that some common sense has been applied to the regeneration of our town centre, pretty social areas and making the most from our river rather than fill the area full of carparks, lets hope it really happens this time.	Support noted
P/V/47	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	Strengthen the aspiration that Chippenham should be more than a commuter town and the aspiration to develop community activities for children and young people with a commitment to get behind these and make them work and relevant.	The Economy Vision refers to Chippenham being ' <i>less of a commuter town</i> '. The Community Infrastructure Vision states ' <i>It will provide a range of sport, recreation and leisure opportunities, and amenities for the whole community, including specific facilities for young people.</i> ' The Neighbourhood Plan cannot develop community activities per se, as planning can only deal with land use or buildings.
P/V/48	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	The above question is too binary to be meaningful. There are elements of the Vision & Objectives that I both agree and disagree with.  One observation about the language of the document is that it is overly complex and needs to be simplified in keeping with plain English guidelines. For example the phrase "protect the town's identity by preventing coalescence with surrounding settlements."!	Noted. The comments section allowed responders to qualify which areas they agreed with or disagreed with.  Where appropriate the Plan has been modified to simplify language. However, this is also a technical planning document, where technical planning language has to be used in order for policies to be interpreted and applied correctly by the LPA and Applicants.
P/V/49	p. 27 Green Infrastructure Vision & Objectives	The green space linking is essential	Support noted
P/V/50	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	The language used generally could be easier to understand - choice of complex words is poor.	Where appropriate the Plan has been modified to simplify language. However, this is also a technical planning document, where technical planning language has to be used in order for policies to be interpreted and applied correctly by the LPA and Applicants.
P/V/51	p. 28 Transport Vision & Objectives	Transport- how will you remove unnecessary commercial traffic without building ring roads?	Removing unnecessary traffic crossing through the town centre' is part of the Neighbourhood Plan's Transport Vision, which can also be realised through 'softer' measures to deter commercial traffic passing through the town centre such as: greater pedestrianisation, downgrading of roads, and highway signs to direct traffic to use alternative outer routes such as the A350
P/V/52	p. 27 Housing Vision & Objectives  p. 29 Economy Vision & Objectives	There is little which addresses the existing poorly connected housing estates and focus on employment/ retail on the western edges of the town.	Agree that some existing housing estates on the western edges of the town are poorly connected to the town centre, but don't agree that this should be referenced in the Vision, as the Vision is about setting out a positive future vision for Chippenham. Text added to paras. 3.42 and 7.6 to make reference to existing poorly connected housing estates.  The allocation of employment/retail land is a strategic issue which the Neighbourhood Plan cannot deal with and will be considered by the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan. Agree that employment land is currently disproportionately focused on the western edges of the town. However, employment land is likely to be more evenly distributed in the future as employment allocations are built out at North Chippenham, Rawlings Green and South West Chippenham.  Text added to para. 8.1 to refer to out of town retail parks on the western edges of the town.
P/V/53	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	The objectives are great especially carbon neutral housing development but I think this will be difficult to achieve especially given the scale of the current proposal to build 4,000 new homes on green land which would be better left as it is. In terms of transport Chippenham is still too dominated by cars so I hope the ambition to improve other forms of transport can be realised.	Support noted
P/V/54	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	The objectives generally are vague and lack evaluation of existing roads, transport, employment, housing and farming options.	Do not agree that the objectives are 'vague'. They are intended to set the foundations for the more specific planning policies which follow and which are backed up by evidence.

P/V/55	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	Despite the area containing farm land, there doesn't appear to be any reference to it.	<p>Agree that the Neighbourhood Plan should provide a greater emphasis on the role of farming in its Vision &amp; Objectives, recognising that farmland surrounds the town and a third of the Parish comprises of farmland. New paragraph added after 3.1 explaining that farmland surrounds the town. Also reference added to farmland in Paras. 3.3 and 3.18. New paragraph added after 3.38 to explain the importance of agricultural land for employment, green infrastructure and sustainable food production.</p> <p>First sentence of Para. 3.38 amended to remove 'need to' from text 'will need to occur on less sustainable greenfield land' and add additional text referring to future growth needing to be balanced against the loss of farmland.</p> <p>New Objective 5 added to Chippenham Identity Vision to recognise the importance of farming in shaping the future of the town.</p> <p>Reference added to agro-ecological model in Green Infrastructure Vision.</p> <p>Recognition of agricultural sector added to Economy Vision text. New Objective 4 added to Economy Vision to reference support to the agricultural sector in the Parish as a provider of local employment and training opportunities, and local farm produce.</p>
P/V/56	p. 26 Chippenham Identity Vision & Objectives	The reference to a "green buffer" is restrictive.	Preventing the town merging with adjoining settlements was a key issue that was identified as being important to adjoining parishes. Policy G15 has been substantially amended in light of comments received and now relates to a single green buffer to the north east of the allocated Rawlings Green site.
P/V/57	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	The report contains a huge amount of detail and I am concerned many residents have been put off commenting by the length and complexity of the report. I agree with some parts of the vision/objectives but not all and therefore cannot answer yes or no.	<p>Noted. There is always a balance to be struck between writing a technical and evidenced-based document that will be used by planners and developers, but one which is still legible and accessible to the public.</p> <p>The comments box was intended to be where responders could explain which parts of the Vision/Objectives they agreed with, or did not agree with.</p>
P/V/58	p. 28 Transport Vision & Objectives	<p>The Vision and Objectives are largely positive with the exception of Transport provision. There is no mention of car charging points, all new spaces should have this facility.</p> <p>Secondly there is no consideration or encouragement of the use of motorbikes, which (particularly when electric) are very eco friendly and take up a small footprint on the road when in and when parked.</p>	<p>Agree. Transport Vision Objective 2 amended from: <i>'Incorporate sustainable infrastructure for car users into new development and in public places'</i> to: <i>'Incorporate electric vehicle charging infrastructure into new development and in public places'</i></p> <p>First sentence of Transport Vision modified from: <i>Chippenham will be a town where people can move around easily on foot, bicycle, car or public transport.'</i> to: <i>'Chippenham will be a town where people can move around easily on foot, bicycle, motorcycle or public transport as an alternative to travelling by car'</i></p>
P/V/59	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	To stop urban sprawl and save and protect Avon valley estate.	Support noted
P/V/60	p. 27 Green Infrastructure Vision & Objectives	<p>Too large an input of houses on green space especially by river</p> <p>We need our green spaces for health and mental well being and environmentally</p>	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan is not proposing any housing allocations. Objectives 1-3 of the Green Infrastructure Vision seek to protect and enhance existing green spaces in the town. Objective 1 of the Green Infrastructure Vision seeks to <i>'Protect, enhance and extend the River-Green Corridor as a focal point for the town..'</i>
P/V/61	p. 27 Green Infrastructure Vision & Objectives	Too many houses spoiling much used green spaces	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan is not proposing any housing allocations and Objectives 1-3 of the Green Infrastructure Vision seek to protect and enhance existing green spaces in the town.
P/V/62	p. 28 Town Centre Vision & Objectives	<p>Town centre; I would like to see the riverside in the town centre protected from development. It is an important area for birds, including ducks, geese and swans which have been visiting the town centre for many decades.</p> <p>These birds give a great deal of pleasure to many people and it is important that they are not forced out.</p>	Noted. Reference is already made to protecting, enhancing and extending the River Avon Corridor (Objective 1 of Green Infrastructure Vision). In the town centre, the Neighbourhood Plan recognises that the River Avon frontage needs to be enhanced. Please refer to Ref. P/V/18 for amended Vision text and new Town Centre Objective 6 relating to the River frontage in the town centre.
P/V/63	p. 27 Green Infrastructure Vision & Objectives	Very important to keep Chippenham's green & open spaces	The Green and Blue Infrastructure Vision seeks to protect and enhance green spaces.

P/V/64	p. 26 Chippenham Identity Vision & Objectives	We support and welcome most aspects of the Vision & Objectives but we are unable to support the vague concept of 'climate change mitigation' and don't support making this integral to the Chippenham Identity.	Reference retained to 'climate change mitigation' with regards to new development. It would not be possible to list all the specific measures that new development can incorporate in order to mitigate against climate change in a Vision or Objective. Specific measures are referred to elsewhere in the Plan policies and Chippenham Design Guide.
P/V/65	p. 26-29 Vision & Objectives	Whilst most of it is entirely reasonable, the excessive building of new houses on green belt land is going to be detrimental to the attractiveness of Chippenham	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan is not proposing any housing allocations, this is for consideration by the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan. Neighbourhood Plan policies seek to ensure that new development would be attractive where <u>development proposals come forward in the Neighbourhood Area</u> .
P/V/66	p. 27 Green Infrastructure	You talk of improving the river, the best way to do this is to bring boats on.	Suggestion noted, but would likely require major infrastructure works to the River and agreement from the Environment Agency, which are beyond the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. There may also be negative <u>environmental consequences of allowing boats on the River e.g. water pollution</u> .
P/V/67	Vision & Objectives	There was once a plan to join the canal to the river in the eastern developments, this would give a further green corridor, this idea should be looked at. It would also provide cycle links with a tow path.	CP53 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy identifies a future link between the Wilts & Berks Canal and River Avon, currently referred to as a 'Protected Route of the Wiltshire & Berkshire Canal'. This link lies outside of the Neighbourhood Area <u>in Bremhill Parish</u>
P/V/68	p. 28 Transport Vision & Objectives	Transport Objective 1: We do not need to improve current walking and cycling networks and infrastructure - nobody wants your green nonsense. Look after and service what we have - sure. The river needs tidying, it's a terrible mess atm. Lots of fallen trees and branches.	Disagree. Evidence from the Pre-Vision Survey Results (Appendix 1 of the Pre-Submission Draft Plan) found that walking and cycling opportunities was the 6th (out of 17) most important topic for Chippenham. Comment on maintenance of River Avon referred to Town Council's Head of Environmental Services.

## Policy SCC1 - Net Zero Carbon Development

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/SCC1/1	A policy should only exist when it is known can be achieved. Currently no processes exist that can really claim net zero carbon.	It is acknowledged that there are different definitions of net zero carbon. The definition used by Policy SCC1 is 'net zero carbon operational energy' as defined by the UK Green Building Council. The definition is included within this section of the Neighbourhood Plan. It is possible, and viable, for developers to achieve net zero carbon in new development based on this definition.
P/SCC1/2	Again this can only be a positive step in the right direction	Support noted
P/SCC1/3	Although new construction and build emission rates might be achieved, it's unlikely any off the thousands of properties which are planned will make use of any renewable technologies. None of the existing or proposed properties to the southwest of the town have any renewable contingencies and all are mains gas and electric.	Policy SCC1 allows for net zero carbon to be achieved either through reduction in emissions rates or by renewables or by offsetting. It is arguably more important that net zero carbon is achieved, than the method(s) used to achieve this. New sentence added to Policy to state 'New developments should not be connected to the gas grid.'
P/SCC1/4	Appears to ignore the huge new build in the southern part of the Neighbourhood area	Policy SCC1 would apply to any new houses built in the Neighbourhood Area, including the southern area referred to.
P/SCC1/5	At a high level, I agree with it. It needs to be left to those with expertise in this field to judge whether this wording is the most robust way to reach net zero.	Noted
P/SCC1/6	Can be achieved...but will they be so.	The Neighbourhood Plan will likely monitor Policy SCC1 to make sure that it is being implemented at planning application stage, although appreciating that it will not be possible to monitor new buildings once privately occupied.
P/SCC1/7	Could the energy efficiency standard be even higher?	Section of Policy SCC1 deleted referring to reductions in Building Regulations standards due to Part L Building Regulations coming into operation in June 2022, and further reductions via the Future Homes Standard in 2025. These will ensure higher energy efficiency standards. Policy SCC1 prioritises fabric energy efficiency in order to achieve net zero carbon. However, additional text added to Paragraph 5.21 to state support for schemes that go above and beyond current/future Building Regulations standards.
P/SCC1/8	Could there be some associated guidance on how renewable energy can be achieved on site?	There needs to be some flexibility retained for applicants to be able to choose the most appropriate/viable renewable energy infrastructure if they cannot meet net zero carbon through fabric energy efficiency. A guide could potentially be produced on adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan if it is considered helpful and necessary.
P/SCC1/9	How have the 15% ,36% targets been decided upon? Will this stand the test of time - based on 2013 figures ??	Section of Policy SCC1 deleted referring to reductions in Building Regulations standards due to Part L Building Regulations coming into operation in June 2022, and further reductions via the Future Homes Standard in 2025. These will ensure higher energy efficiency standards.
P/SCC1/10	No mention of conversion of existing buildings.	This is referred to in new Figure 5.2 of Policy SCC2.
P/SCC1/11	I agree with the majority of what is included but I worry that it doesn't go far enough to ensure developers make new buildings fit for a carbon-free future. Off-setting will lead to higher prices for the customer and not encourage better planning. What is cheaper for the developer? It's like the sewage issue we have with the river. The Water Company can take the penalties as it's cheaper than actually fixing the problem. What about the new homes being built right now? We need to act fast to ensure reliance on gas is removed and proper insulation included.	It is considered that Policy SCC1 goes as far as possible without being superseded by future uplifts in the Building Regulations (noting they have already been updated in 2022, and will be updated further under the Future Homes Standard in 2025 to achieve higher energy efficiencies).  Reference to off-setting retained as it allows flexibility and viability for the developer to be able to achieve net zero carbon. However, text added to Paragraph 5.21 to confirm that this is the least preferable option.  New sentence added to Policy to state 'New developments should not be connected to the gas grid.'
P/SCC1/12	I am concerned that offsetting can be used too broadly. I suggest a maximum permissible offset ratio is adopted to ensure we have embedded sustainability in the local environment	Reference retained to off-setting as it allows flexibility and viability for the developer to be able to achieve net zero carbon. There is no guidance or evidence as to what might form a maximum permissible offset ratio. However, text added to Paragraph 5.21 to confirm that this is the least preferable option.
P/SCC1/13	I am concerned that the proposed large scale housing will be the same as current housing and have no energy efficiency.	Even without Policy SCC1 the energy efficiency of new housing will be required to be greater as a result of the 2002 uplift in Building Regulations and 2025 Future Homes Standard.
P/SCC1/14	I understand that insulation is an important part in improving energy efficiency but could not see mention of it in the document?	The installation of insulation in itself does not require planning permission and is therefore not referred to in the Neighbourhood Plan, which only deals with new development requiring planning permission.
P/SCC1/15	Given that there will not be a legal requirement to net carbon build till 2025 it will be extremely difficult to ensure that developers build to these standards. ( especially those who are rushing to get planning permission in place before then so they don't have to comply)	Many local plan policies already require developers to build to net zero carbon and developers are already moving in this direction.
P/SCC1/16	I would like to see policy addressing net zero enhancements to existing housing stock. For example, schemes to fit district heating to existing homes or fitting heat pumps to every house in street or area.	The Neighbourhood Plan can only deal with new development which requires planning permission.
P/SCC1/17	In principle this is good but am concerned at the slow pace, hundreds if not thousands of houses have been built in and around Chippenham in recent years without a solar panel to be seen!	Noted
P/SCC1/18	In view of the current crisis in the Ukraine and the knock on effect to energy prices/availability, I co sided a headlong rush be carbon neutral totally unrealistic in the time frame suggested.	Noted



P/SCC1/19	It will never be achieved	The definition of net zero carbon used in Policy SCC1 is 'net zero carbon operational energy' as defined by the UK Green Building Council. The definition is included within this section of the Neighbourhood Plan. It is possible, and viable, for developers to achieve net zero carbon in new development based on this definition.
P/SCC1/20	Net Zero is pure fantasy politics	The definition of net zero carbon used in Policy SCC1 is 'net zero carbon operational energy' as defined by the UK Green Building Council. The definition is included within this section of the Neighbourhood Plan. It is possible, and viable, for developers to achieve net zero carbon in new development based on this definition.
P/SCC1/21	New buildings in Chippenham should be obliged to have solar panels and double glazing with minimum EPC of a B. Also house renovations/extensions to be approved, should also have this in consideration to be approved by the council. Also the number of houses approved in the city should be reduced with an associated increment on green spaces in between the houses.	This aspect is best governed by Building Regulations.  The emerging Wiltshire Local Plan will set out future strategic housing allocations for Chippenham.
P/SCC1/22	No building is an island - you have to get to the building. Planting around the building and on roofs can have an environmental impact. The nature of surrounding surfaces can also cause heat to be absorbed or reflected	Paragraph 63 of the Chippenham Design Guide encourages natural features to be incorporated within the design of new homes.
P/SCC1/23	Not stringent enough. Chippenham should be setting an example to other authorities by demonstrating that higher targets should be achieved. For example, current 'Future Chippenham' proposals fall too far short of meaningful sustainability	Section of Policy SCC1 deleted referring to reductions in Building Regulations standards due to Part L Building Regulations coming into operation in June 2022, and further reductions via the Future Homes Standard in 2025. These will ensure higher energy efficiency standards. Policy SCC1 prioritises energy efficiency reductions in order to achieve net zero carbon. However, additional text added to Paragraph 5.21 to state support for schemes that go above and beyond current/future Building Regulations standards
P/SCC1/24	Offsetting needs to be proven robustly before build starts. To many times the council buys the nonsense promised & by the time its proven to not work its to late.	Noted.
P/SCC1/25	Offsetting should not be used as a get out.	Off-setting has been adopted in other local plan policies and is widely considered to be a reasonable approach to achieving net zero carbon, offering the developer some flexibility and ensuring that a scheme can remain viable. However, text added to Paragraph 5.21 to confirm that this is the least preferable option.
P/SCC1/26	See previous comment, but also Net Zero is, again, a farcical aspirational delusional tax system for incompetent, over spending councils/govts. Net Zero is dead in the water, and you need to stop trying to prevent people living their lives, getting to work, and having autonomy over their lives. Buildings should not be made to be 'carbon neutral' - in large part because it's absurd and unachievable. I reject all of your green ideology. All of it. You don't protect our shared common lands, but raising costs of buildings, and pursuing carbon neutral / net zero policies is supposed to somehow make things better? It's a mafia based racket	The definition of net zero carbon used in Policy SCC1 is 'net zero carbon operational energy' as defined by the UK Green Building Council. The definition is included within this section of the Neighbourhood Plan. It is possible, and viable, for developers to achieve net zero carbon in new development based on this definition.
P/SCC1/27	Should apply to all building works and infrastructural changes too. E.g. new roads and new developments.	Part of Policy SCC1 applies to all new buildings. It would not be possible to apply this policy to roads or new infrastructure since these do not emit carbon from their structure once built.
P/SCC1/28	The energy efficiency and demand reduction envisioned here is good sense and essential to our Net Zero aim.	Support noted
P/SCC1/29	The increase in requirement for energy efficiency etc in line with new legislation is important.	Support noted
P/SCC1/30	The more the better, and perhaps offsetting as the least worst option.	Support noted
P/SCC1/31	The problem with offsetting is that it is better not to produce the carbon emissions in the first place so it is a false assumption that this contributes to net zero carbon.	Off-setting has been adopted in other local plan policies and is widely considered to be a reasonable approach to achieving net zero carbon, offering the developer some flexibility and ensuring that a scheme can remain viable. However, text added to Paragraph 5.21 to confirm that this is the least preferable option.
P/SCC1/32	The sooner the better	Support noted
P/SCC1/33	There should be follow up to ensure buildings comply throughout their life and that offset elements remain in place.	Ideally this would be the best scenario. However, rightly or wrongly, it is not within the remit of the planning sector to oversee construction or make post-development checks.
P/SCC1/34	They also need to demonstrate that they could not have been built on a brownfield site for any new construction.  Priority should be given to renovation and reuse of existing buildings and sites.  Any new construction should - minimise the impact on surrounding countryside - be of an appropriate design to secure the general attractiveness of the town is maintained or improved	Paragraphs 119-120 of the NPPF already advocate as much use as possible of brownfield land/re-use of buildings. The Neighbourhood Plan should not duplicate national policy guidance.  Policies GI3 and H2, and the Chippenham Design Guide, seek to minimise the impact of new construction on the surrounding countryside and ensure high quality design.
P/SCC1/35	We are in a climate emergency - this should be government policy now!	Noted
P/SCC1/36	We cannot achieve net zero carbon in the timescale at an affordable price	There are already some net zero carbon schemes for social housing being built out e.g. East Manchester
P/SCC1/37	We don't need more buildings and houses in Chippenham	The Neighbourhood Plan is not promoting more buildings and houses in Chippenham. This is best left to the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan to deal with this strategic issue.

P/SCC1/38	<p>We would like to see a greater emphasis on energy efficiency as a means towards improved resilience and energy security. We do not support the relentless and blinkered 'net zero' race and believe it to be misguided, even if well-intentioned. Instead, we believe there should be a much greater emphasis on energy efficiency by design. We strongly support the Passivhaus standard and the whole-building approach to energy efficient design. We believe that this should be mandatory for all new residential development and that carbon off-setting should be discouraged and phased out as a valid mitigation measure.</p>	<p>Policy SCC1 prioritises energy efficiency through a fabric first approach in order to achieve net zero carbon.</p> <p>Ideally off-setting will be phased out in the future, but for the period of the Plan, and in line with other adopted local plan policies, it considered to be a reasonable approach to achieving net zero carbon, offering the developer some flexibility and ensuring that a scheme can remain viable. However, text added to Paragraph 5.21 to confirm that this is the least preferable option.</p>
P/SCC1/39	<p>Yes I agree. I think we should all have little wind turbines on our roofs and solar panels. We all never noticed television aerials when they first went up</p>	<p>Support noted</p>

## Policy SCC2 - Sustainable Design & Construction

Ref. No.	Comment	Draft Response
P/SCC2/1	Again the devil will be in the details.	Noted
P/SCC2/2	Again, as previous comment - Chippenham should be demanding more from new buildings. Current 'recognised sustainable construction standards' are very weak and are generally green-washed by volume house building development	Policy SCC2 has been substantially amended in light of this comment and others. Instead of focusing on industry standards to demonstrate sustainable design and construction, it now focuses on demonstrating sustainable design, construction materials and construction methods through submission of a Sustainability Statement.
P/SCC2/3	Again, I agree at a high level, but can this not be more ambitious, re percentage of major developments needing to meet Passivhaus standard?	The comments received from stakeholders, backed up by further research of this area by the Steering Group, are that recognised sustainable construction standards are not necessarily compatible and can cover aspects unrelated to sustainable construction materials and techniques. Therefore Policy SCC2 has been substantially amended to now focus on demonstrating sustainable design, construction materials and construction methods through submission of a Sustainability Statement.
P/SCC2/4	All minor residential development should be required to achieve the certification not be encouraged to pursue certification	The comments received from stakeholders, backed up by further research of this area by the Steering Group, are that recognised sustainable construction standards are not necessarily compatible and can cover aspects unrelated to sustainable construction materials and techniques. Therefore Policy SCC2 has been substantially amended to now focus on demonstrating sustainable design, construction materials and construction methods through submission of a Sustainability Statement.
P/SCC2/5	Any future alterations to the buildings should be fully assessed and not allowed to proceed if they do not continue to meet sustainable requirements. Any plastics used should be of recycled material.	Policy SCC2 can only be used where building alterations require planning permission. The comments received from stakeholders, backed up by further research of this area by the Steering Group, are that recognised sustainable construction standards are not necessarily compatible and can cover aspects unrelated to sustainable construction materials and techniques. Therefore Policy SCC2 has been substantially amended to now focus on demonstrating sustainable design, construction materials and construction methods through submission of a Sustainability Statement. The use of recycled materials in construction is referred to in Figure 5.2 and the Sustainability Statement is required to cover this aspect.
P/SCC2/6	As per my previous comment. Chippenham cannot just build houses in every place possible. Besides this, the TYPE of buildings standards needs to be upgraded. Also when approving extensions or refurbishment to old houses, it should require insulation to match modern standards to achieve at least EPC B. This would save the town thousands of pounds in energy consumption and reduce our carbon footprint	New Building Regulations Part L (June 2022) and the Future Homes Standard (2025) will require new extensions to be much better insulated. In the meantime, Policy SCC1 requires a 'fabric first' approach to new builds.
P/SCC2/7	Current builds have very poor insulation standards so it depends on really how sustainable the standards are.	New Building Regulations Part L (June 2022) and the Future Homes Standard (2025) will require new buildings to be much better insulated. In the meantime, Policy SCC1 requires a 'fabric first' approach to new builds.
P/SCC2/8	I have concerns that house builders will add a price premium making new properties even more unaffordable. I would like new housing to be constructed off-site in prefabricated sections for quick assembly on site, rather than traditional on-site bricks and mortar, as this may be cheaper and quicker, thus offsetting any additional costs arising from higher insulation standards etc.	New paragraph added after 5.28 to reference the benefits of modular/ pre-fabricated houses in terms of reducing embodied carbon emissions
P/SCC2/9	I have noticed a significance loss of buildings over the last 60 years of houses made with local lime stone which has resulted in a loss of local character.	Paragraph 78 of the Chippenham Design Guide requires applicants to demonstrate that locally sourced materials were prioritised. Figure 5.2 also requires the Sustainability Statement to assess use of local construction materials.
P/SCC2/10	I reject IPCC report in its entirety and I reject all Green lobby ideology. It's not environmentally minded, it is Malthusian. Stop trying to make cost of living more expensive. There needs to be a referendum on your profligate waste of money on green hobbies and virtue signalling. The IPCC plans will soon, along with net zero virtue signals be dead in the water. People are broke, they have no money, and you've just frittered away goodness knows how much on fancy covid signs and unnecessary things on the pandemic. There is no need to reduce traffic, or waste money adding cycle lines people don't want to use. We have cycle lane enough. We need parking, and accessibility to a town centre that has actual things in it rather than charity shops. We do not need to 'cut carbon emissions'. You people are quite insane: you can't control a respiratory virus, but think you can control the weather! What is the 'right' temperature in your opinion? Renewable energy is a mafia led racket. Stop wasting public money. And as for electric cars? Seriously. You want to force that on people, and yet how empty are the charging points in town / Monkton???? You need to make planning easier if you want better / more housing, not add cumbersome fancies of the green lobby in. Innovation doesn't equal ideology.	Widely held scientific evidence confirms that global climate change is anthropogenic and that planning policies can be an effective tool to minimise carbon emissions from new development. Evidence is led by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the United Nations body for assessing the science related to climate change.

P/SCC2/11	I think this policy should be mandatory, rather than just encouraged	The comments received from stakeholders, backed up by further research of this area by the Steering Group, are that recognised sustainable construction standards are not necessarily compatible and can cover aspects unrelated to sustainable construction materials and techniques. Therefore Policy SCC2 has been substantially amended to now focus on demonstrating sustainable design, construction materials and construction methods through submission of a Sustainability Statement.
P/SCC2/12	I would like to see this a requirement rather than something that was encouraged	The comments received from stakeholders, backed up by further research of this area by the Steering Group, are that recognised sustainable construction standards are not necessarily compatible and can cover aspects unrelated to sustainable construction materials and techniques. Therefore Policy SCC2 has been substantially amended to now focus on demonstrating sustainable design, construction materials and construction methods through submission of a Sustainability Statement.
P/SCC2/13	Impossible to achieve as the energy needed outweighs current schemes - pipe dream!	The comments received from stakeholders, backed up by further research of this area by the Steering Group, are that recognised sustainable construction standards are not necessarily compatible and can cover aspects unrelated to sustainable construction materials and techniques. Therefore Policy SCC2 has been substantially amended to now focus on demonstrating sustainable design, construction materials and construction methods through submission of a Sustainability Statement.
P/SCC2/14	It would be good if sustainable construction really exists?	The evidence collected for this policy suggests that it does exist.
P/SCC2/15	My previous experience of eco friendly housing estate in Chippenham simply meant a dual flush on the toilet. How will new buildings conform to a higher eco/sustainable standard.	The comments received from stakeholders, backed up by further research of this area by the Steering Group, are that recognised sustainable construction standards are not necessarily compatible and can cover aspects unrelated to sustainable construction materials and techniques. Therefore Policy SCC2 has been substantially amended to now focus on demonstrating sustainable design, construction materials and construction methods through submission of a Sustainability Statement.
P/SCC2/16	No more building construction. Think Of our green environment	Noted
P/SCC2/17	Not on Avon Valley Estate	The emerging Wiltshire Local Plan, rather than the Neighbourhood Plan, will propose locations of any future new strategic housing allocations in Chippenham.
P/SCC2/18	Not sure how it is possible to get house builders to do the right thing: they want to build cheap !!	It is hoped that a combination of mandatory government requirements requiring more sustainable buildings (2022 Building Regulations, Future Homes Standard) plus similar stronger planning policies such as SCC1 and SCC2 of the Neighbourhood Plan, and those policies in the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan, will push housebuilders to improve sustainability of new houses.
P/SCC2/20	The definition of 'Major residential development' should be clarified.	'Major residential development' is widely recognised in planning as being 10 or more dwellings. However, agree that definitions of major/minor development would be a helpful addition to the Plan. Therefore explanatory box added to Chapter 1 of <u>Neighbourhood Plan to provide definitions</u> .
P/SCC2/21	Think this is great	Support noted, but Policy SCC2 has now been substantially amended to reflect comments received, and the Steering Group consider the Policy has been further improved as a result.
P/SCC2/22	We need to make houses cheaper, not tie them up in red tape	Policy SCC2 has been substantially amended and the Steering Group do not consider that the submission of a Sustainability Statement would unnecessarily delay/add cost to a housing scheme. There are many other factors and outside influences which have a much greater impact on housing costs.
P/SCC2/23	We welcome the specific reference to whole-building standards such as Passivhaus and BREEAM Excellent.	Policy SCC2 has now been substantially amended to reflect the comments received from stakeholders, backed up by further research of this area by the Steering Group, that recognised sustainable construction standards are not necessarily compatible and can cover aspects unrelated to sustainable construction materials and techniques. Therefore Policy SCC2 has been substantially amended to now focus on demonstrating sustainable design, construction materials and construction methods through submission of a Sustainability Statement. Requirement for non-residential development to meet BREEAM Excellent is retained.
P/SCC2/24	What prevents phased development of 199 homes avoiding major development requirements. Is this likely to be mandatory when applications are considered by government appeal inspectors.	Policy SCC2 has now been substantially amended to reflect the comments received from stakeholders, backed up by further research of this area by the Steering Group, that recognised sustainable construction standards are not necessarily compatible and can cover aspects unrelated to sustainable construction materials and techniques. Therefore Policy SCC2 has been substantially amended to now focus on demonstrating sustainable design, construction materials and construction methods through submission of a Sustainability Statement. This would apply to all major developments.

P/SCC2/25	Where and when possible	Policy SCC2 has now been substantially amended to reflect the comments received from stakeholders, backed up by further research of this area by the Steering Group, that recognised sustainable construction standards are not necessarily compatible and can cover aspects unrelated to sustainable construction materials and techniques. Therefore Policy SCC2 has been substantially amended to now focus on demonstrating sustainable design, construction materials and construction methods through submission of a Sustainability Statement.
P/SCC2/26	Where is the AECB Building Standard defined? Also Passivhaus? Should this perhaps be Passivhaus Standard or equivalent, with some definition of what is acceptable (as Passivhaus per se is not always appropriate and not the only means to achieving the specified ends.	Policy SCC2 has now been substantially amended to reflect the comments received from stakeholders, backed up by further research of this area by the Steering Group, that recognised sustainable construction standards are not necessarily compatible and can cover aspects unrelated to sustainable construction materials and techniques. Therefore Policy SCC2 has been substantially amended to now focus on demonstrating sustainable design, construction materials and construction methods through submission of a Sustainability Statement.
P/SCC2/27	Without rules to enforce sustainability the community will suffer from continued inefficiency of traditional housing developers design	Unfortunately one of the flaws of the UK planning system is that it does not require post-development checks. However, it is hoped that a combination of mandatory government requirements requiring more sustainable buildings (2022 Building Regulations, Future Homes Standard) plus similar stronger planning policies such as SCC1 and SCC2 of the Neighbourhood Plan, and those policies in the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan, will push housebuilders to improve sustainability of new houses.
P/SCC2/28	You use the old cattle market buildings as an example of good buildings to base construction on but let me assure you those buildings are in a very poor state for their age. I'm a tradesman and they are providing me a lot of work!	Noted. It is still considered that there are good design elements of this scheme, but maybe this is not followed through to quality construction or regular maintenance in some cases.

### Policy SCC3 - Standalone Renewable Energy

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/SCC3/1	Agree but again, does it go far enough? More solar panels on council buildings and why not have our own wind turbine? It may seem extreme but we need as a nation to become more reliant on our own energy production. The top of Malmesbury Road on the Greenways Business Park would be a good site. What a way to set an example to other towns! We could all have the chance to buy in to the scheme and receive electric at a reduced rate?	The Town Council is installing solar panels on its non-listed buildings e.g. Stanley Park. Wind turbines are generally not compatible with being located in urban areas, such as the location referenced, because of the associated noise and amenity impacts. However, paragraph 5.37 refers to farmland within the parish as being suitable.  With regard to community energy projects, final paragraph added to Policy SCC3 to reference strong support for community energy projects. Additional bullet added to para. 5.42 to refer to community energy projects. Explanatory box added to provide definition of community energy projects.
P/SCC3/2	Although any renewable energy resources must not create a 'blot on the landscape', so careful planning and installation should be applied.	Criterion C amended to improve wording around landscape and visual impact mitigation.
P/SCC3/3	but worried about sprawling solar farms. Why can't new and existing buildings have more panels? Maybe the top floor of the new multi-storey car park, as it is never full :)	Criterion C amended to improve wording around landscape and visual impact mitigation, including any cumulative impacts.  Quite often planning permission is not required for the installation of solar panels on existing buildings. Paragraph 61 of the Chippenham Design Guide promotes the use of solar panels on new homes.
P/SCC3/4	Could not be more relevant than 2022. Getting off gas to avoid global shocks plus taking back control of our grid with home grown energy is essential. If you can support community energy projects through this as well there are even more benefits with value recycled locally.	Final paragraph added to Policy SCC3 to reference strong support for community energy projects.  Additional bullet added to para. 5.42 to refer to community energy projects.  Box added to provide definition of community energy projects.
P/SCC3/5	Council houses should all be fitted with solar panels on rooves of in gardens. These should be regularly maintained.	This would be up to Wiltshire Council as landlord to determine appropriateness, but in many cases would likely not require planning permission for installation. Comment referred to Wiltshire Council Estates.
P/SCC3/6	Development should also be carbon neutral and aesthetics considered.	Criterion C amended to improve wording around landscape and visual impact mitigation.
P/SCC3/7	Especially with the current energy crisis this is more important than ever	Support noted.
P/SCC3/8	Heat exchange in extraction fans, solar panels, grey water systems, led lights etc all can contribute towards energy reduction and sustainable production.	Paragraph 62 of the Chippenham Design Guide refers to these measures and others.
P/SCC3/9	I agree with onshore wind turbines but not solar farms. Technology has moved on since the Neighbourhood plan was started. CPRE have a current campaign for solar to be on rooftops. With solar roll available for warehouses and supermarkets the market is changing and tying into 40 years of old technology when such a small percentage goes to the community isn't good. There are currently over 900 planning applications in for large solar farms with battery storage and this isn't being regulated against need.	One of the outcomes of the Future Energy Landscape workshops was that there was general community support for solar farms, as a means of reducing carbon. Solar rolls on new warehouses or supermarkets could be used as a means of achieving net zero carbon development to comply with Policy SCC1.
P/SCC3/10	I am against fields of photoelectric panels. They should be on the top of houses along with solar thermal options integrated into house design or retro- fitted.	One of the outcomes of the Future Energy Landscape workshops was that there was general community support for solar farms. Paragraph 61 of the Chippenham Design Guide promotes the use of solar panels on new homes.
P/SCC3/11	I am surprised not to have seen suggestions with respect to harnessing energy from our part of the River Avon	Reference added to River Avon in Paragraph 5.37.
P/SCC3/12	I find this policy unrealistic at the present time	Noted
P/SCC3/13	I had very mixed feelings about the Forest Green Solar farm because the flora in those fields are so amazing. I know that such developments are needed and can be done sensitively, but construction engineers and builders in my experience have no interest in protecting our botanical heritage and this will only mean loss.....if a real way of getting across the need to protect our native plants was recognised while construction takes place the. I would support these kinds of developments more whole heartedly. At the moment I feel that roof and tile solar would be a much better proposition and needs a serious look at.	Last paragraph of Policy SCC3 amended to refer to 10% biodiversity net gain. Solar panels on new buildings could be used to comply with Policies SCC1 and SCC2, and Paragraph 61 of the Chippenham Design Guide promotes the use of solar panels on new homes.
P/SCC3/14	I'd like to see strong support of standalone renewable energy developments	Support noted.
P/SCC3/15	Ideally, solar would be placed on all suitable buildings, but as this is an emergency, it is easier and quicker to build solar farms on green fields - these are effectively temporary structures (25 year life) that will help maintain wildlife corridors/habitat and protect land from urbanisation and sprawl. At end of life the sites can then be returned to sustainable agricultural production, when hopefully more tricky/time consuming alternative energy sources will have been built.	Support for standalone solar farms noted.  New paragraph added after 5.44 to reference return of land to agricultural use on cessation of renewable energy use.
P/SCC3/16	I'd be keen to see energy from the extensive river by captured.	Reference to River Avon added in Paragraph 5.37.

P/SCC3/17	If it takes out valuable productive farming land then No I don't agree	The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group debated whether to include a requirement in Policy SCC3 that standalone renewable energy infrastructure should not be located on 'Best and Most Versatile' Agricultural Land. However the Group determined that due to the 25 year lifespan of renewable energy infrastructure development and the fact that land could be returned to agricultural use, and the importance of the climate emergency, this should not be a requirement.
P/SCC3/18	I'm all for more renewable, the current situation in Ukraine shows why we need to remove our reliance on Eastern energy sources	Support noted.
P/SCC3/19	The fact you even mention wind turbines just shows you are clueless about wildlife. Wind energy is useless. Stop trying to take us back to pre-agrarian times.	Wind energy is a valuable renewable energy source. Any future planning applications for such would have to demonstrate 10% biodiversity net gain.
P/SCC3/20	No mention of householder developments which could contribute towards the net zero goal.	Policy SCC3 is for standalone renewable energy. Householder developments would not be viable if net zero carbon policies were also applied to these.
P/SCC3/21	Not enough support for wind. On shore wind is the cheapest form of energy generation and the quickest to develop. Sorely needed in the light of the current energy crisis.	National planning policy currently restricts onshore wind development so reference added to this in Paragraph 5.37.  Specific reference to support onshore wind in first paragraph of Policy SCC3 made in the event that national policy changes.
P/SCC3/22	Not exactly sure what this means, if you mean wind turbines or covering farmland with solar panels, then I am not in favour, if you mean mini nuclear reactors then I would be in favour of those	Policy SCC3 is for standalone renewable energy such as wind turbines or solar farms, which was supported by the community as an outcome from the Future Energy Landscapes workshops. Nuclear fission or fusion is unlikely to be a suitable option within the Parish and of a strategic nature unsuitable for inclusion in a neighbourhood plan.
P/SCC3/23	Renewable energy should seek to utilise brownfield opportunities first, we a strong emphasis on using existing roof areas (particularly on large factory spaces) as primary choice for solar location.	Policy SCC3 is for standalone renewable energy development which would unlikely be suitable for brownfield sites because of amenity issues. However, Policies SCC1 and SCC2 would support the installation of solar panels on existing roof areas where planning permission was required.
P/SCC3/24	Should be more than support, should be policy to actively develop	The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group held informal discussions with solar farm operators to establish whether Policy SCC3 could refer more specifically to sites that may be attractive to those operators actively looking to develop in Chippenham. However, it was not possible, through those discussions to obtain sufficient evidence from the developer to allow for a more site specific focused policy. The Neighbourhood Plan exists to set the planning framework to allow others to actively develop such infrastructure.
P/SCC3/25	This is great we need much more renewable energy available to help local people have access to affordable renewable energy.	Support noted.
P/SCC3/26	Won't work till Nuclear Fission or Fusion achievable... tidal flow or more efficient solar/wind might work - it doesn't currently.	Standalone renewable energy developments are currently helping the grid to decarbonise. Nuclear fission or fusion is unlikely to be a suitable option within the Parish and would be at too strategic a level to be incorporated within a neighbourhood plan.

## Policy GI1 - Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/GI1/0	10% sounds too easy.	The Neighbourhood Plan does not have any evidence to suggest that it would be viable for schemes to deliver more than 10% BNG as will be required nationally in 2023. Once the national system is introduced and is tried and tested it may be appropriate to seek a higher % in any future Neighbourhood Plan review.
P/GI1/1	Biodiversity net gain target is set too low 15-20% would be nicer.	The Neighbourhood Plan does not have any evidence to suggest that it would be viable for schemes to deliver more than 10% BNG as will be required nationally in 2023. Once the national system is introduced and is tried and tested it may be appropriate to seek a higher % in any future Neighbourhood Plan review.
P/GI1/2	Would also like to see something to ensure any fencing that is put up anywhere in the town has to provide hedgehog highways	New criterion vii added to ensure that new development provides 13cm x 13cm holes in fencing for hedgehogs and other small mammals to pass through
P/GI1/3	Can objective 10 be made more robust - requiring things like green roofs, bat houses etc, rather than simply 'maximising opportunities', which leaves wriggle room for developers to not do these things.	The text for Criterion 10 has been moved to Paragraph 1 iv-vii of the Policy and the amended text strengthened to require these features to be included in the design of new development. The only exception being green roofs which are not always appropriate to incorporate, for example where they may compete for solar PV panels. Hence the wording added 'where appropriate' for green roofs.
P/GI1/4	Could the policy ask for more than the standard 10% (already required) biodiversity net gain? This is already required so redundant. Why can't we ask for better in our Local Plan?	The Neighbourhood Plan does not have any evidence to suggest that it would be viable for schemes to deliver more than 10% BNG as will be required nationally. Once the national system is introduced and is tried and tested it may be appropriate to seek a higher % in any future Neighbourhood Plan review. 10% BNG will not be adopted at the earliest until late 2023. Current planning policy only requires 1% BNG.
P/GI1/5	Development will never increase biodiversity!	Development can increase biodiversity and there are numerous such examples nationally. The law will require 10% BNG on developments when it is due to be enacted in 2023.
P/GI1/6	Don't lose our fields. Plant trees they were originally there and destroyed by farmer with district council permission when first houses built opposite	The Neighbourhood Plan is not proposing any housing allocations on greenfield land. Strategic housing allocations will be dealt with by the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan. Neighbourhood Plan Policies GI1 and GI4 support the planting of new trees.
P/GI1/7	Don't build properties, plant lots of insect friendly flowers, shrubs, etc.	The Neighbourhood Plan is not proposing to allocate land for housing. Strategic housing allocations will be dealt with by the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan. Policy GI1 requires pollinator friendly planting to be included in landscaping schemes for new development.
P/GI1/8	Due to the pandemic there are now 100% or more dogs/puppies residing in Residential areas. The problem with this is there is nowhere safe and secure to take canines to socialize with each other. Even St Vincent's Woods is not a pleasant walk any more, it's overgrown with no clear path to follow. Also the rough ground opposite St Peter's Academy Junior school could be made into a fabulous secure Dog Park without too much cost involved. There would be enough local green spaces to provide a few safe and secure dog parks as well as providing for wildlife and trees in and around the Town.	Suggestion for a Dog Park noted. It is unlikely that a Dog Park in itself would require planning permission and this would be a management/ownership issue on green spaces. Comment forwarded to Head of Environmental Services at Town Council for consideration.
P/GI1/9	Good as a concept but I think it will be difficult to implement. Housing density per acre to minimise use of green field but planting large trees in proximity to foundations	10% BNG will be implemented by law, anticipated to do so in 2023.
P/GI1/10	Great words but worthless as shown at Birds March new development where the maintenance of the wildlife habitat has been totally ignored.	Management of habitat post-development is important, and it is anticipated that this would be secured through obligation or conservation covenant when 10% BNG is introduced nationally. Further details will emerge from the Government in due course on this aspect.
P/GI1/11	Green corridors, varied vegetation and allotments all help to increase biodiversity and our environment.	Agreed.
P/GI1/12	Hedgerows should be planted and maintained to the minimum standards. Ivy should be removed from larger native trees. No tree should be cut down for developments. Developers should work around existing established hedgerows and trees. They should reinstate if they need to be removed with like for like planting.	Policies GI1 and GI4 seek the retention of trees and hedgerows of value, and where they have to be replaced this would be in line with the replacement strategy set out in the accompanying Neighbourhood Plan Tree Planting Guide.
P/GI1/13	How do you intend to enforce this?? There is a risk that this will be a box-ticking exercise that will subvert wildlife habitats	Management of habitat post-development is important, and it is anticipated that this would be secured through obligation or conservation covenant when 10% BNG is introduced nationally. Further details will emerge from the Government in due course on this aspect.
P/GI114	I am not in favour of manicured "green spaces" that have to be mown	This is a maintenance issue rather than a planning issue. The Town Council formulated a Grass Cutting Strategy in 2022 where some areas will be left unmown: <a href="https://www.chippenham.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Grass-Cutting-Strategy-2022.pdf">https://www.chippenham.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Grass-Cutting-Strategy-2022.pdf</a>
P/GI1/15	I would go further and challenge what we are losing with new development. Do we really need it and can we afford the cost	Noted. The planning process can be used to weigh up the pros and cons of developing a site or not, depending upon its existing value.



P/GI1/16	In June 2021 Chippenham Town Council declared an ecological emergency' - what is this hyperbolic nonsense? If you want people to take you seriously, stop sending out this nonsense. If you cared about green spaces, why are you letting 4-7k homes be built out the back fields by Monkton / old train line? You're already ruining the natural landscape by your mini woodland project, and the new - vegetable ? - raised beds in Monkton Park. Completely absurdly placed. It's as if children run this council.	The Neighbourhood Plan is not allocating any housing sites, this will be dealt with by the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan. At the time of writing the Town Council is on record as objecting to the Future Chippenham scheme.  The raised beds created in Monkton Park were proposed in the Monkton Park Management Plan adopted by the Town Council and drafted in conjunction with Wiltshire Wildlife Trust. Their aim was to increase biodiversity in Monkton Park and to attract pollinators. There have been positive comments, as well as some negative comments, following their implementation.
P/GI1/17	It seems to me that the integrity of the riparian strip both into and out of the town has not been discussed. It is especially important that the green belt coming from Bremhill/Titherton is cared for so that the river life remains viable.	Paragraphs 6.13 and 6.14 discuss the ecological importance of the River Avon. Policy GI2 seeks to designate Monkton Park (A) and River Avon Open Space (FF) as Local Green Spaces, and Policy GI3 seeks to protect the River Avon Corridor as a <u>Strategic Green Corridor</u> .
P/GI1/18	It would be good to see a commitment to a reduction and phasing out of the use of glyphosate and similar chemicals that the council and facilities management contractors still use, despite the known links to human health and wildlife/habitat protection.	The Town Council ceased the use of glyphosate based chemicals for general weed killing activities across Chippenham and their estate in March 2022 in line with its declared climate and ecological emergencies. However glyphosate will be used in small amounts should the need arise for specialist treatments where the Town Council are legally obliged to either control invasive species (Japanese knotweed ) or deal with tree stumps (for Japanese knotweed it would be directly injected so no danger to surrounding wildlife/humans, and for tree stumps Eco plugs would be used so no danger to surrounding wildlife/humans).
P/GI1/19	Just more push towards restoring the canal which is an easy route to creating biodiversity. Protection and expansion of woodland and plains in the area would be good	Policy GI3 identifies the Wilts & Berks Canal as a Strategic Green Corridor that would be protected and supports biodiversity enhancement at this location. Protection and expansion of woodland within the Neighbourhood Area is proposed under <u>Policy GI4</u> .
P/GI1/20	Larger percentage of protection	The Neighbourhood Plan does not have any evidence to suggest that it would be viable for schemes to deliver more than 10% BNG as will be required nationally in 2023. Once the national system is introduced and is tried and tested it may be appropriate to seek a higher % in any future Neighbourhood Plan review.
P/GI1/21	Only if less housing is built	The Neighbourhood Plan is not proposing to allocate any land for housing. Strategic housing allocations will be dealt with by <u>the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan</u> .
P/GI1/22	Please can updating IRecords <a href="https://irecord.org.uk/enter-casual-record">https://irecord.org.uk/enter-casual-record</a> and the Woodland Trust <a href="https://ati.woodlandtrust.org.uk/what-we-record-and-why/what-we-record/notable-trees/">https://ati.woodlandtrust.org.uk/what-we-record-and-why/what-we-record/notable-trees/</a> be promoted by the Council so we have year round data in advance available for all desktop studies right at the start of site investigation. Also can Wiltshire Council's <a href="https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/planning-bio-community-toolkit">https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/planning-bio-community-toolkit</a> be promoted.	New paragraph added after 6.15 to refer to the important role the community and voluntary sector in Chippenham can play in supporting the biodiversity objectives of the Plan by maintaining habitats, gathering environmental data (suggested websites referred to in footnote) and producing community environmental plans (Wiltshire Council Community Environmental Toolkit referred to in text).
P/GI1/23	Swift nest boxes on new developments.	Support for integrated bird boxes, swift bricks and bee bricks added to first paragraph vi of Policy GI1. New paragraph added after 6.19 to provide explanation of swift bricks and to reference/signpost to BS 42021.
P/GI1/24	The green area between Long Close and the river/ Baydon's Meadow should also be designated a local wildlife site or, as it is a recreational area, a designated green space	The Neighbourhood Plan does not have the necessary environmental survey evidence to propose designating this area as a local wildlife site. However, it does have the necessary evidence to be able to protect the area as a Local Green Space under <u>Policy GI2 (LGS's B and WW)</u> .
P/GI1/25	There has been a significant loss of front gardens in my area in favour of off-road parking. The lack of agreed standards has resulted in a loss of wildlife habitat, increased run off of water and deterioration of walking surfaces. I wondered if there could not be guidance published or a competition for the best example of what to do.	Unfortunately the installation of hard surfacing usually constitutes permitted development under the General Permitted Development Order and does not require planning permission. Therefore it cannot be regulated by the Neighbourhood Plan. There is already good national guidance, produced by the RHS amongst others, that encourages retention of front gardens and permeable paving.
P/GI1/26	This does not seem to fit in with Council plans for expansion of housing into proper green space on edge of town.	The Neighbourhood Plan is not proposing any land allocations for housing. Strategic housing allocations will be dealt with by <u>the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan</u> .
P/GI1/27	This is a very important and valuable element.	Support noted.
P/GI1/28	This is great in principle but in 30+ years experience of working in housing I have yet to see a development that really does this! Will a development proposal be turned down if it does not achieve the 10% aim? Recent examples of development such as the multi storey car park by the Olympiad and the current proposals to build another concrete structure on the old Chippenham college site do nothing for diversity. Developers build and move on; will they fund continued maintenance of bio diversity many put things in their proposals which are 'green wash' such as pulling down existing habitats saying they will plant trees but these are very young saplings (whose growth has a carbon cost) it is better to leave older trees in situ and build around them.	With the enactment of 10% BNG nationally in late 2023, developers will have to achieve this by law. Management of habitat post-development is important, and it is anticipated that this would be secured through obligation or conservation covenant when 10% BNG is introduced nationally. Further details will emerge from the Government in due course on this aspect.
P/GI1/29	This policy seems to focus within a development area and should be ensuring continuity between new developments and net gain ( on site or off)	It is anticipated that most BNG will be on the development site and that offsetting will only be used where BNG cannot be provided on site. Policy GI1 is geared towards this scenario, but it remains to be seen how the implementation of BNG nationally will play out.

P/GI1/30	To enhance biodiversity the green corridors need to be bigger and wider, particularly when considering authorising need buildings. Besides in areas such as Birdsmarsh, not only the trees in there are important, but also the adjacent farms are relevant to maintain biodiversity, therefore this entire area north on BirdsMarsh new developments NEEDS to be protected! Also more green areas within the town need to be expanded, including planting robust trees in order to help with carbon capture	<p>The size of the green corridors and local green spaces proposed under Policies GI3 and GI2 of the Neighbourhood Plan are realistic and practical, formulated by the Neighbourhood Plan's Green Infrastructure Topic Group, and responding to the existing built form of Chippenham.</p> <p>The area referred to the north of the 'Birds Marsh' housing estate is outside the Neighbourhood Area and therefore cannot be guided by the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The Town Council is committed to increasing tree cover by tree planting on green spaces it owns and has developed a Tree Planting Policy (2021) to guide this.</p>
P/GI1/31	Too many houses will harm environment	The Neighbourhood Plan is not proposing any land allocations for housing. Strategic housing allocations will be dealt with by the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan.
P/GI1/32	We are in an ecological emergency and humans are part of nature. Without improved biodiversity we will have food shortages. This should not be limited to new development	Noted, but the Neighbourhood Plan can only be used to guide new development.
P/GI1/33	What about all the new build housing?	New build housing proposals will be required to achieve a BNG of at least 10% under Policy GI1.
P/GI1/34	Wholeheartedly support the idea however, policing and enforcing this policy is likely to be challenging.	Support noted. Management of habitat post-development is important, and it is anticipated that this would be secured through obligation or conservation covenant when 10% BNG is introduced nationally. Further details will emerge from the <u>Government in due course on this aspect</u> .
P/GI1/35	Would be fantastic if this increase in biodiversity could be achieved.	Support noted.
P/GI1/36	would like it to be a 'minimum of'	Noted. Policy GI1 amended to 'a Biodiversity Net Gain of at least 10%' now relocated to second paragraph of Policy.
P/GI1/37	We need to crest habitats for wildlife including hedgehogs which are endangered. I would like to see developers planting hedges not fences so hedgehogs can roam	New criterion vii added to ensure that new development provides 13cm x 13cm holes in fencing for hedgehogs and other small mammals to pass through

## Policy GI2 - Local Green Spaces

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/GI2/1	I hope that you are not planning to build on the green space opposite our house. we used to live in Wood Lane, I have been on anti depression pills and moved here last year as I was not happy there as there was no green space to look at. Now we have moved here it has done a lot for my mood to look out at trees and green space, not houses. I am at home most of the time as I work from home.	The Neighbourhood Plan is not allocating any housing sites. Policy GI2 is seeking to designate the green space opposite your house as Local Green Space B.
P/GI2/2	Please don't build around Long Close, Baydons meadow or Harden mead. It is such a beautiful place, my children and now grandchildren enjoy the the area so much, and it feels safe to let them to play and explore. It's educational, we frequently see the resident muntjacs and foxes and lots of different birds. So much better for them then staying in their bedrooms playing video games. In the summer families have picnics and play games. I really hope this little bit of chippenham stays like this for future generations.	Support noted for proposed designation of LGS B because of its recreational and wildlife value.
P/GI2/3	Correct me if I'm wrong, but John Coles is privately owned? Your space is Monkton? More could be made of Redland for certain. Nobody wants green spaces in estates if they can't park their car, and whilst we all know you want us to ride bicycles, people don't want to. So green has to be the bigger landscapes - protect those. Support those at Ivy Road by Avenue la Fleche etc. They do great stuff. And don't let people build on green spaces. Your caveat is not good enough (page 57)	Both John Coles Park and Monkton Park are owned by the Town Council.  LGS O (Redland) retained for amenity and recreation value, but concur that more could be made of this green space.  Policy GI2 is also protecting larger green spaces (e.g. LGS A, FF, WW, Y) within the parameters of Para. 102 (c) of the NPPF which states that LGS cannot be 'an extensive tract of land'.  LGS C (Charter Road Parkland) is being proposed by Avenue la Fleche.  The final sentence to Policy GI2 is not a 'caveat' it is reiterating national planning policy that requires applications on Local Green Spaces to be determined in accordance with national green belt policy.
P/GI2/4	Again in principle this is good but will it be upheld?	Support noted. The Town Council will monitor the effectiveness and implementation of its Neighbourhood Plan policies.
P/GI2/5	BETTER POLICING	It is not within the jurisdiction of the Neighbourhood Plan to provide better policing.
P/GI2/6	Build less houses	The Neighbourhood Plan is not allocating any housing sites. The emerging Wiltshire Local Plan will allocate strategic housing sites.
P/GI2/7	But it is missing the green space at Gascelyn Close with the tall trees and children's play area. This is larger and better-used than some of the green spaces included in the list.	Support for Gascelyn Close to be designated as a Local Green Space is noted. The Neighbourhood Plan's Green Infrastructure Topic Group audited this green space and considered that it met the three tests of Para. 102 of the NPPF. However, they decided not to shortlist it as a Local Green Space because they considered it's long and ribbon shaped area, and interconnectedness with other green spaces, would be better identified and protected as part of a Green Corridor under Policy GI3 - that effectively connects Derriads Lane to the railway line (see Appendix 8 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan for further details). It may be difficult to define boundaries for any Local Green Space because of its linear form. The Town Council intends to retain the play area it manages.
P/GI2/8	But with one exception - farmland adjoining Hardens Mead (WW) - is neither appropriate or necessary.	LGS WW retained. Please refer to Appendix S of the Consultation Statement for a detailed explanation as to why this has been retained.
P/GI2/9	Community involvement and discussion about how the spaces are used and could be developed will be needed. Then this would seem an exciting prospect!	Concur that community involvement and discussion about how the spaces are used and could be developed will be needed.
P/GI2/10	During the pandemic having access to green spaces was vital to our health and continues to be so.	Support noted.
P/GI2/11	Essential.	Support noted.
P/GI2/12	Excellent green route already enjoyed by so many will with future expansions be seen as a key asset for the town	Support noted for designation of LGS B and LGS WW.
P/GI2/13	Gascelyn Park is missing from this plan, despite being a green space maintained by the town council. Please can it be added?	Support for Gascelyn Close to be designated as a Local Green Space is noted. The Neighbourhood Plan's Green Infrastructure Topic Group audited this green space and considered that it met the three tests of Para. 102 of the NPPF. However, they decided not to shortlist it as a Local Green Space because they considered it's long and ribbon shaped area, and interconnectedness with other green spaces, would be better identified and protected as part of a Green Corridor under Policy GI3 - that effectively connects Derriads Lane to the railway line (see Appendix 8 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan for further details). It may be difficult to draw up boundaries for any Local Green Space because of its linear form. The Town Council intends to retain the play area it manages.
P/GI2/14	Green space is vital to protecting biodiversity and also access is vital to human health and wellbeing. Green spaces should be managed to benefit wildlife - reduce grass cutting, grow bee friendly wild flower meadows	Support noted.

P/GI2/15	Green spaces are very important for the community and wildlife. We should also be promoting the use of hedges instead of fence panels	Support noted.
P/GI2/16	Green spaces are vital to the community.	Support noted.
P/GI2/17	I am familiar with many of the Green Spaces designated on the plan. It is important in a stressful world, to have these open spaces when often people feel hemmed in.	Support noted.
P/GI2/18	I believe there should be more spaces designated	There are 49 Local Green Spaces that the Neighbourhood Plan's Green Infrastructure Topic Group considered passed the necessary tests of Para. 102 of the NPPF and which the Group considered would not be better identified as a green corridor under Policy GI3 instead. This number of Local Green Spaces seems proportionate to the size of Chippenham. This public consultation offered the opportunity for the public to specifically suggest any additional spaces.
P/GI2/19	I didn't think that Green belt land had any protection any more.	Green Belt policy is set out in the NPPF, but there is no designated green belt surrounding Chippenham. Local Green Space guidance in the NPPF explains that 'policies for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with those for Green Belts' (Para. 103 of the NPPF).
P/GI2/20	I enjoy the green land adjacent to me. The wood, Baydons Meadow and all the little packets of greenery thereabouts. It's nice to see other people enjoying them, too.	Support noted for LGS B.
P/GI2/21	I feel strongly that all these areas should be protected and the biodiversity enhanced.	Support noted.
P/GI2/22	I note that the green space in Cepen North is not listed, and should be protected as it is highly used by the local community. Barnes Road / Stainers Way.	Support for Barnes Road/Stainers Way to be designated as a Local Green Space is noted. The Neighbourhood Plan's Green Infrastructure Topic Group audited green spaces in this location and considered that they met the three tests of Para. 102 of the NPPF. However, they decided not to shortlist the green spaces in this location as Local Green Spaces because they considered the linear nature of the spaces, and their interconnectedness, would be better identified and protected as part of a Green Corridor under Policy GI3 - that effectively connects green spaces close to Morrisons supermarket through to Hardenhuish Brook (see Appendix 8 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan for further details). It may be difficult to draw up boundaries for any Local Green Space because of this linear form.
P/GI2/23	I would go further than just the designated areas. People use fields and green spaces which are not designated too, so let's limit what we are losing	It is not possible to go further with neighbourhood planning policies. Local Green Spaces have to pass the three tests set out in Para. 102 of the NPPF, criterion c) requiring that the green space is local in character and not an extensive tract of land.
P/GI2/24	John Cole's Park doesn't seem to explicitly marked, and there is a missed opportunity to improve pedestrian access to it and protect it from vehicle generated pollution.	John Coles Park is proposed as LGS R.
P/GI2/25	Larger percentage of protection needed	There are 49 Local Green Spaces that the Neighbourhood Plan's Green Infrastructure Topic Group considered passed the necessary tests of Para. 102 of the NPPF and which the Group considered would not be better identified as a green corridor under Policy GI3 instead. This number of Local Green Spaces seems proportionate to the size of Chippenham. This public consultation offered the opportunity for the public to specifically suggest any additional spaces
P/GI2/26	Many of the green spaces identified have an important role to play in flood prevention. Trees, plants and grassed/cropped fields help lock water in, preventing the river's banks from overflowing. They also help support the ageing water/sewer system which is unable to cope with the additional houses it's supporting already . Building on green spaces not only creates water run off into the river but any reduction of trees/plants/grass in an area where they are already lacking exacerbates this.	Support noted.
P/GI2/27	More green space is needed	There are 49 Local Green Spaces that the Neighbourhood Plan's Green Infrastructure Topic Group considered passed the necessary tests of Para. 102 of the NPPF and which the Group considered would not be better identified as a green corridor under Policy GI3 instead. This number of Local Green Spaces seems proportionate to the size of Chippenham. This public consultation offered the opportunity for the public to specifically suggest any additional spaces.
P/GI2/28	More green spaces need to be allocated and attended to ensure diversity of wildlife.	There are 49 Local Green Spaces that the Neighbourhood Plan's Green Infrastructure Topic Group considered passed the necessary tests of Para. 102 of the NPPF and which the Group considered would not be better identified as a green corridor under Policy GI3 instead. This number of Local Green Spaces seems proportionate to the size of Chippenham. This public consultation offered the opportunity for the public to specifically suggest any additional spaces.
P/GI2/29	Needs to be made more specific and stringent in order to prevent unsustainable development - e.g. Future Chippenham is riding rough-shod over farmland and countryside	Local Green Space guidance in the NPPF explains that 'policies for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with those for Green Belts' (Para. 103 of the NPPF). It is considered that national policy is specific and stringent enough in this respect.

P/GI2/30	Should be maintained by the tax payer vs. Estate rent charges for new green space. Either that or a council tax discount should be awarded to owners paying to maintain public green space via an estate management company (or equiv. scheme)	The majority of the Local Green Spaces proposed to be designated under Policy GI2 are council maintained. There is no mechanism at present to prevent developers from forming a management company to manage open space in new development. The Town Council would be interested in discussing with individual developers whether there are possibilities for it to manage open spaces in new development.
P/GI2/31	Should have a minimum size per site so developments can't have green spaces too small to be used as such.	It is understood that standards within the Draft Open Space SPD (2007) by North Wiltshire District Council are still being used by the LPA. Paragraph 3.2 notes that 'The minimum size of open space is a Local Park at 0.2 ha and this is the minimum that would be acceptable within a new development.' It is likely that this unadopted SPD will be updated in the near future, and it is not considered necessary for the Neighbourhood Plan to implement new standards in the interim.
P/GI2/32	Strongly agree	Support noted.
P/GI2/33	The Donkey Fields attract a wide variety of bird species. It is an area which should be protected as is Woodlands Wood adjacent to it.	Support noted for the designation of LGS N.
P/GI2/34	The green corridor adjacent to the river (A, FF, B is such an important feature of the town (as is the land below the weir.)	Support noted for the designation of LGS A, FF and B.
P/GI2/35	The lack of parking has resulted in more cars being parked on local greens. While they may only be there temporarily, the ruts they leave make the surfaces dangerous to play on and walk across. There doesn't appear to be any sanction to prevent this. Perhaps some passive protection such as bollards are necessary to protect the areas.	Issue noted. If the Local Green Space designations are adopted it will be possible to look closer at the specifics of each individual Local Green Space and look at how these can be enhanced in consultation with the surrounding community. Some Local Green Spaces may well require bollards to prevent parking as suggested.
P/GI2/36	These spaces need to properly and appropriately maintained.	Noted
P/GI2/37	This is a well-worded and balanced approach that goes a long way towards better protection of existing green spaces and wildlife habitats. We strongly support the proposed designation of Local Green Spaces. The true value of these spaces goes far beyond monetary value. We believe that there is no such thing as a 'low value' piece of land.	Support noted.
P/GI2/38	This misses the importance of the green spaces between the Pewsham estate and A4 - canal corridor - green corridors need improvement for walkers and cycling - poor connectivity around Pewsham Estate.	Support for green spaces between the Pewsham estate and A4 to be designated as Local Green Spaces is noted. The Neighbourhood Plan's Green Infrastructure Topic Group audited green spaces in this location. However, they did not consider that these green spaces, which are all linked together, would pass the test of criterion c) of Para. 102 of the NPPF, in that they were not local in character and formed an extensive tract of land (see Appendix 8 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan for further details). The Group decided that due to the linear nature of the spaces between the Pewsham estate and A4, and the interconnectedness of the green spaces, they would be better identified and protected as part of a Green Corridor under Policy GI3 - that effectively connects green spaces from Westmead Open Space to London Road Cemetery.
P/GI2/39	This obviates my commend to the previous section. I strongly support the designations of green spaces outlined in this section	Support noted.
P/GI2/40	We need all the green spaces, it is hard to just pick one. They provide a patchwork of valuable outdoor spaces vital for health and wellbeing, nature and wildlife.	Support noted.
P/GI2/41	Why has the Monkton Park Golf Club not been included? This is a local green space and needs to be protected also.	Support for Monkton Park Golf Club to be designated as Local Green Spaces is noted. The Neighbourhood Plan's Green Infrastructure Topic Group audited this green space. However, because the majority of this space is only accessible to paid members (not all of whom reside in close proximity), they did not consider that it would pass the test of criterion a) of Para. 102 of the NPPF, in that it was 'in reasonably close proximity to the community it served' (see Appendix 8 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan for further details). The Group decided that this green space could alternatively be protected by forming part of the River Avon Strategic Green Corridor under Policy GI3.
P/GI2/42	Will never allocate enough...	There are 49 Local Green Spaces that the Neighbourhood Plan's Green Infrastructure Topic Group considered passed the necessary tests of Para. 102 of the NPPF and which the Group considered would not be better identified as a green corridor under Policy GI3 instead. This number of Local Green Spaces seems proportionate to the size of Chippenham. This public consultation offered the opportunity for the public to specifically suggest any additional spaces.
P/GI2/43	I apologise for only filling out one key part but I have just had a leaflet through my door which told me about the green space near where I live and how important it is to share my view and experience of this particular beautiful place and the need to preserve it, before the deadline. I was advised if I didn't have time to complete the whole questionnaire to at least try and do that part .	It is not clear which particular Local Green Space is being referred to, but it is hoped that designation under Policy GI2 will preserve this beautiful space for the community to enjoy.

## Policy GI3 - Green Corridors

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/GI3/1	Again let's just be careful that in saying this we don't limit ourselves to green corridors and tacitly give up more	Noted
P/GI3/2	Again the canal should be more important in this consultation	New paragraph added after 6.40 to reference support for the restoration of the Wilts & Berks Canal
P/GI3/3	Agree in part, but want more detailed information.	Please refer to Appendix 10 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan for further information.
P/GI3/4	As an ecologist I know the value of linking green corridors to mitigate habitat fragmentation. I would like to see green corridors planned for the new industrial area immediately east of the Cepen Way bypass between the Sainsburys and Lackham roundabouts, none are indicated except for along the railway, there are now cross area links. These should be incorporated before the estate is fully built.	Support noted.  Unfortunately not all reserved matters applications have yet been approved at Hunters Moon or Showell Farm and therefore the dimensions or locations of green corridors are not all resolved and still subject to change as part of the planning process in agreement with the LPA. Any future review of the Neighbourhood Plan could identify green corridors in this locality.
P/GI3/5	Bath road development site should form part of the green corridor.	It is considered that the optimal use of the Bath Road Car Park/Bridge Centre site would be for mixed use development as set out in Policy TC1. Designating the site as part of a green corridor would mean very limited future development of the site which is vital for the regeneration of the town centre.
P/GI3/6	But with on the east they should be restricted to the River Avon floodplain (on Hardens and Newlease Farms) which is large enough afford the optimum benefit for the community. Also Newlease Farm is outside the boundary and not relevant to this plan.	The Steering Group discussed the pros and cons of removing two fields from the River Avon Strategic Green Corridor which lie just outside of Flood Zones 2 and 3. However, they considered that the boundaries of this Green Corridor should be retained as proposed on Figure 6.3 given: a) the Harden's Farm access road would deliver a more robust and legible boundary to the Corridor, b) there was anecdotal evidence of surface water flooding on these fields, c) there were strong community views that did not wish to see development on land to the east of Chippenham because of its landscape importance, d) the Inspector's Report on the Chippenham Site Allocations Plan stated development on land to the east of Chippenham would 'have a significant environmental impact, particularly on the open landscape to the north and east, for which the SA [Sustainability Appraisal] concludes that mitigation would be difficult or impossible', and e) The Chippenham Landscape Setting Assessment (2014) by TEP identified 'key views of Chippenham' across these two fields (Figures 8 and 13) and included these two fields as part of the 'Green spaces and green fingers' corridor running alongside the River Avon (Figure 6).  Green corridors identified outside of the Neighbourhood Area i.e. New Lease Farm (where the policy was not proposed to be applied, but which was intended to show these were cross-boundary features that did not suddenly end at the Neighbourhood Area boundary) removed from Figure 6.3 for clarity.
P/GI3/7	Cannot see the point of "green corridors"	The purpose of Policy GI3 is to meet Green Infrastructure Objective 2: 'Identify a linked set of green spaces that allow people and fauna to travel freely between the town and countryside' Please refer to Appendix 10 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan for further information on the background to developing the Policy.
P/GI3/8	Care must be taken for the corridors to maintain significant links to the true countryside. If road building and other development continues we are in danger of turning the corridors into cul de sacs or islands of green with no links.	Noted. The 'countryside connection points' will provide a focus for ensuring that green corridors do not 'end in cul-de-sacs'.
P/GI3/9	Corridors have to go where people want to go else they become redundant. Corridors need safe ways to cross roads which are barriers to movement, with the faster the road the more significant the barrier.	Many of the green corridors proposed under Policy GI3 align with existing public rights of way. Policy GI3/Figure 6.3 shows a number of 'link enhancements' and 'countryside connection points' across roads, to target funding for enhancements to make it easier for people or wildlife to cross roads at these locations.
P/GI3/10	Doubt it will happen.	Noted
P/GI3/11	Excellent idea bringing countryside into town . Should include routes north and south not just river corridor	Support noted. The Railway Line Strategic Green Corridor also runs north and south.
P/GI3/12	Green corridor from Bremhill/Tytherton is very important for our River habitat.	Policy GI3 identifies the River Avon as a Strategic Green Corridor with important habitats/species, extending way beyond the confines of the Neighbourhood Area.
P/GI3/13	Green corridors are very important to wildlife so the human impact on them has to be very limited.	The wording of Policy GI3 seeks to protect and enhance these green corridors and ensure that any development is sympathetic to their function.
P/GI3/14	I feel this needs very careful consideration on an individual basis, there is no piecemeal solution, it has to be considered with all other factors.	When a development proposal comes forward, Policy GI3 will be applied, and carefully considered along with all other development plan policies in reaching a decision.
P/GI3/15	I reluctantly agree with this... because I know that the Wiltshire Council's local plan takes precedent over our desire to protect not just corridors but open countryside surrounding our town.	It is hoped that the Strategic Green Corridors identified under Policy GI3 can also be incorporated within the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan.
P/GI3/16	It is important to allow animals and people to move throughout the town without having to cope with the danger of roads and traffic.	Policy GI3 identifies 'link enhancements' and 'countryside connection points' across roads to assist the movement of humans and fauna between town and countryside.
P/GI3/17	It may have green corridors but damaging the environment and beautiful area	It is not clear how green corridors would damage 'the environment and beautiful area.'
P/GI3/18	Make more onerous conditions. Wildlife does not always respect human-made corridors and in many cases just disappear/die out as a result of narrow strips of poorly maintained corridors.	It is considered that the wording of Policy GI3 carefully balances the different push and pull triggers on green corridors considering their multi-functional use.
P/GI3/19	More information needed	Please refer to Appendix 10 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan for further information.
P/GI3/20	Most important. Wildlife should be able to access and use the space freely.	Support noted.

P/GI3/21	No green areas should be built on Chippenham lacks the infrastructure to take on more houses it is a market town.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot protect all countryside/farmland in the Parish as this would not comply with national planning policy guidance. Policies GI2 and GI3 seek to target those green spaces which were considered most important by the community.
P/GI3/22	No, they have been badly laid out. Not the best use of town needs overall.	It is not clear how the proposed green corridors 'have been badly laid out'.
P/GI3/23	One of the most precious features of Chippenham is the way that the countryside is bought into the town centre through these green corridors. They must be protected at all cost in their current form without being eroded. Also, if further development work is undertaken extending the town, that development should also extend these corridors in a similarly generous manner so that the town centre continues to be connected to the countryside.	Agreed.
P/GI3/24	Out of box ideas to be accepted also such as over/under road nature bridges/tunnels	Agreed.
P/GI3/25	Please can light pollution and air quality be given importance.	New paragraph added to explain the benefits for wildlife of having low light levels in green corridors.  New criterion v) added to Policy GI3 to ensure no future light pollution: <i>'Avoiding the installation of new lighting where possible. Where it is deemed necessary to install new lighting it should comply with the Institute of Lighting Professionals minimum standards for Environmental Zone E2.'</i>  It would not be possible for the Neighbourhood Plan to control air pollution in Green Corridors.
P/GI3/26	Please ensure artificial light is kept to minimum to avoid disturbing bats etc.	New paragraph added to explain the benefits for wildlife of having low light levels in green corridors.  New criterion v) added to Policy GI3 to ensure no future light pollution: <i>'Avoiding the installation of new lighting where possible. Where it is deemed necessary to install new lighting it should comply with the Institute of Lighting Professionals minimum standards for Environmental Zone E2.'</i>
P/GI3/27	Prioritising investment for sports and recreation within green corridors could be intrusive and unsupportive of biodiversity. Some types of sports and leisure facilities are very urban. Could this policy be clear what kind of sports and recreation is envisaged? i.e. not land consuming/ concrete/ tarmac or types that reduce biodiversity and landscape value.	Agreed. Criterion iii) of Policy GI3 amended from: <i>'iii) Prioritising investment in enhancement of open space, sport and recreation within the Green Corridors'</i> to: <i>'iii) Prioritising investment in enhancement of open space, and informal recreation where appropriate'</i>
P/GI3/28	Green and urban corridors need to connect- new development should only proceed with good inter street connections.	Policy GI3 criterion ii) ensures that new development incorporates open space which connects into green corridors wherever possible
P/GI3/29	The green corridor seems excessive around Rowden and nothing significant fully around the Town.	The reason for the River Avon Strategic Green Corridor being large in Rowden is that it follows the extent of the Countryside Park that will be created under the outline planning permission for Rowden Park. It also includes Westmead Open Space, a large area of newly planted trees. Much of the land that surrounds the town is farmland, which in itself does not necessarily form biodiverse habitat or has right of access over it, making it unsuitable for inclusion within the Green Corridors Policy.
P/GI3/30	These corridors like sustainable transport links need to co ordinated with adjacent community plans.	Early engagement in respect of Policy GI3 was undertaken between neighbouring parishes who have either prepared neighbourhood plans/or were in the process of preparing neighbourhood plans in order to coordinate and inform the location and extent of green corridors proposed.
P/GI3/31	This is key when new development is built.	Support noted.
P/GI3/32	Very good, only thing I would say is that roads are a major barrier and the UK has a very dense road network, which can be fairly easily (if not cheaply) mitigated by wildlife tunnels and bridges. So this should be taken into account. Particularly for species such as reptiles, amphibians and hedgehogs.  I realise it may be a challenge to convince developers to adopt such measures if it eats into their bottom line but ultimately the biodiversity and climate goals are very strongly linked to connected habitats (as the green corridor is a good example). In Wiltshire we have fantastic examples of nationally rare species and habitat but they are somewhat isolated.	The 'countryside connection points' and 'link enhancements' referred to in Policy GI3 are intended to be the mechanism by which enhancements, such as those suggested, can be made where green corridors cross main roads.  Comment on isolated species in Wiltshire referred to Wiltshire Council to inform future work to be carried out on their GBI Strategy.
P/GI3/33	Vital - wildlife needs to be able to move, it cannot survive in small island habitats. The blue corridor - river and canal are vital landscape arteries for biodiversity	Support noted.
P/GI3/34	We recognise the importance of these corridors, especially the River Avon Corridor, which defines much of the character of Chippenham. We support the Neighbourhood Green Corridors. We would like to see, where possible, greater shared use of corridors for sustainable transport (both pedestrian and cycling). The Strategic Corridors are also important because they provide opportunities for multiple uses, including recreational cycling, green transport, heritage buildings and heritage landscapes.	Support noted. Figure 6.3 includes many green corridors that have dual purpose for both wildlife and cycling/walking.

P/G13/35	Yes green corridors should also have low Lighting and it should be in darkness between 1am and 5am	<p>New paragraph added to explain the benefits for wildlife of having low light levels in green corridors.</p> <p>New criterion v) added to Policy G13 to ensure no future light pollution:  <i>'Avoiding the installation of new lighting where possible. Where it is deemed necessary to install new lighting it should comply with the Institute of Lighting Professionals minimum standards for Environmental Zone E2.'</i></p> <p>It would be unenforceable and too detailed/restrictive for Policy G13 to refer to times when lighting was not on.</p>
----------	--	--



## Policy GI4 - Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/GI4/1	A 20m buffer between the edge of a development and woodland seems a lot. Surely this could be less for some sites (i.e. only represents a maximum separation)?	Recent guidance (2022) produced by Natural England and the Forestry Commission 'Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions' recommends a minimum buffer zone of 15m between development and woodland. For ancient or veteran trees (including those on the woodland boundary), it recommends that the buffer zone should be at least 15 times larger than the diameter of the tree. It also recommends that the buffer zone should be 5 metres from the edge of the tree's canopy if that area is larger than 15 times the tree's diameter. This wording is considered to be too complicated to include in a planning policy, and therefore the 20m buffer zone, also required by the Landscape, Biodiversity and Trees SPD (2018) (Box B6) produced by Basingstoke and Deane District Council, is preferred.  The wording of the second paragraph of Policy GI4 allows for the buffer zone to be decreased from 20m where it can be satisfactorily demonstrated through the detailed design process that this would have no negative consequences on the woodland, people or property.
P/GI4/2	Agree, but, pointless if not followed. How many large, mature trees in birds marsh were removed to fit a few extra houses in?	Support noted. The Town Council will monitor how the policy is being implemented to ensure its effectiveness.
P/GI4/3	Also to note that many of these natural features are on historical boundaries and rights of way. If we lose these we lose our <u>connection to nature and our past</u> .	Para. 6.52 amended to reference the existence of trees, woodlands and hedgerows on historical boundaries and rights of way, <u>which have the effect of connecting nature and the past</u> .
P/GI4/4	Appropriate trees should be planted wherever possible to enhance areas, increase wildlife & help with the climate. Also important to retain what is there wherever possible. I agree there must be a sufficient distance from any woodland & houses to avoid future problems.	Support noted for tree planting and buffer zone in Policy GI4
P/GI4/5	Be great to plant more trees around the new developments	Support noted for tree planting in Policy GI4
P/GI4/6	But to make optimum use of Island Park it may be necessary to remove some less valuable trees and replace with others.	Policy GI4 does not prevent the removal of less valuable trees and replacement with others.
P/GI4/7	Don't cut any tree	Noted
P/GI4/8	hedgerows and woods are vital habitat, woodland helps to mitigate against flood impacts and trees provide vital carbon sequestration services to mitigate for climate change on the path to net zero	Agreed
P/GI4/9	Historically, Station Hill was once lined with trees. Trees on rural roads provided important shade. Trees and shrubs in planters in the shopping areas also make the place look cared for.	Policy GI4 supports the delivery of new street trees at criterion b). Reference to Paragraph 131 of the NPPF added to Paragraph 6.57 of the Neighbourhood Plan to strengthen support for street tree planting.
P/GI4/10	How about an objective to increase tree and hedge cover and to encourage ways for developers and residents to put in native hedges rather than fences around their houses?	One of the objectives of Policy GI4 is to increase tree cover in Chippenham, and the tool for doing so is the tree canopy cover section of the Policy. The Chippenham Design Guide contains advice on boundary treatments for non-householder planning applications, with Paragraph 35 explaining walls and fences should be avoided in favour of boundary hedges and tree planting.
P/GI4/11	How will this be assessed? Am concerned about the element of 'replacement tree planting' it is always better to leave existing older trees but developers will always say it is not economical as they want high density quick builds as this is where they make the most profit.	Agree that ancient, veteran or mature trees are usually more valuable, which is why the first paragraph of Policy GI4 seeks to retain these features in any new development. Where tree loss is unavoidable Policy GI4 relies on a sophisticated replacement tree planting scheme - the Bristol Tree Replacement Scheme, which takes into account the size (and therefore age) of the tree to be replaced.
P/GI4/12	I believe in environmental equality and this means everyone should benefit from the fortunate green environment.	Noted
P/GI4/13	I would like to see a clear means of enforcing compliance with this policy to ensure that developments that do not meet with it are not approved and that developers deliver on their commitments.	Unfortunately there is no mechanism for post-development checks in the planning system. However, the Town Council will monitor how the policy is being implemented to ensure its effectiveness at the planning stages, and through Ward Councillors empower new residents to report newly planted trees/hedgerows that die, or are not planted in accordance with approved plans.
P/GI4/14	I'd like to see mandatory tree planting in new development streets.	The NPPF at Paragraph 131 states the planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined. Support for street tree planting is set out in criterion b) of Policy GI4, but this cannot be made mandatory because there may be site constraints which do not allow for this in some instances. Reference to Paragraph 131 of the NPPF added to Paragraph 6.57 of the Neighbourhood Plan to strengthen support for street tree planting.

P/GI4/15	Also some rules preventing the removal of hedgerows and replacing with fencing.	The removal of a hedgerow does not in itself usually require planning permission in a domestic setting, but if replacement fencing is proposed as part of a non-householder planning application, Paragraph 35 of the Chippenham Design Guide explains that walls and fences should be avoided in favour of boundary hedges and tree planting. Aside from the planning system, hedgerows are offered some protection under The Hedgerow Regulations 1997 (2). This complex mechanism offers some protection for hedgerows of more than 20 metres in length or which join other hedgerows provided they adjoin agricultural land, forestry, paddocks, common land, village greens, a site of special scientific interest or a local nature reserve.
P/GI4/16	In principle it is fine but in practice it is not sufficiently policed during the design stage and afterwards the result is too late to remedy. Take for example the unnecessary removal of hedgerows in many developments around Chippenham - nothing has been done to replace or provide appropriate retribution for the biodiversity	Unfortunately there is no mechanism for post-development checks in the planning system. However, the Town Council will monitor how the policy is being implemented to ensure its effectiveness at the planning stages, and through Ward Councillors empower new residents to report newly planted trees/hedgerows that die, or are not planted in accordance with approved plans.
P/GI4/17	It is simply shuffling the deckchairs around on the Titanic.	Noted.
P/GI4/18	Like the planting of trees etc. but not annihilating our green space	Noted
P/GI4/19	Limits the best(as well as the worst) use of limited facilities in an already tightly developed town	Not sure how Policy GI4 limits the use of facilities in the town.
P/GI4/20	Many developments include trees and plants which are "ornamental" and do not benefit biodiversity. This needs to be addressed.	Agreed, although this may improve with the introduction of biodiversity net gain. Policy GI4 and the Tree Planting Guide refers to the need to plant native, large-canopied and orchard species where tree planting is necessary.
P/GI4/21	You make no argument for WHY tree canopy should be increased, other than some academic somewhere thinks so. Perhaps look after those we have more, and select some areas to populate with more trees, but your blind commitment to anything 'green' seems completely arbitrary, particularly when you are actively building all over every available bit of green. Complete hypocrites. None of your actions are about safeguarding what was a once nice town.	Paragraphs 6.46-6.51 explain why a tree canopy cover policy is necessary for Chippenham and this is justified by a variety of different evidence collected by the Neighbourhood Plan's Green Infrastructure Topic Group (please refer to the Topic Group Proforma relating to Policy GI4 in Appendix 2 of the Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan). Neither the Neighbourhood Plan through its policies, nor the Town Council through its actions, is promoting or actively building 'over every available bit of green.'
P/GI4/22	Maybe what you should do is stop people hiding out in the bunkers around town doing heroin? Perhaps clean up the rubbish (by which I mean tents) by Westmead, or Monkton, by the hospital, or by Wilkinsons, or by the old police station. These places would be nicer if there weren't people smoking drugs or injected drugs.	This is not related to planning or an issue which can be covered under the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan. Comment referred to Wiltshire Council and Town Council to see if any action can be taken.
P/GI4/23	Not sure if all developers think like this. Very hard to "police "	Agree that it is hard to 'police' when there are no post-development check built into the planning system. However, the Town Council will monitor how the policy is being implemented to ensure its effectiveness at the planning stages, and through Ward Councillors empower new residents to report newly planted trees/hedgerows that die, or are not planted in accordance with approved plans.
P/GI4/24	Shame that it is not already in place. Will follow this one closely.	Noted
P/GI4/25	Should have kept original trees planted then would not be having this discussion	Noted
P/GI4/26	The neighbourhood plan seems to give too much weight to trees at the detriment to other habitats. We need all habitats not just trees. It has been quoted that Chippenham used to be .....% trees so plant loads but that doesn't allow for all the roads and housing that have removed a larger percentage of farmland, scrubland, meadows and urban which needs to be considered, not just trees.	Agreed that a variety of different habitats are required in the town going forward and the biodiversity net gain process should achieve this. However, the Neighbourhood Plan Green Infrastructure Topic Group considered that increasing tree planting in new development was very important over the Plan period, particularly given the low starting base in Chippenham and therefore Policy GI4 does need to be a prominent and robust policy for this to be achieved.
P/GI4/27	The plan should seek to increase the tree cover, particular in the Hardens and Pewsham areas that have the lowest values. The low value in Pewsham clearly demonstrates that the idea that garden trees can serve to deliver the required tree cover is in error and should not be included in cover calculations especially for new build areas	Figure 6.4 can be a useful tool for developers/planners to determine tree canopy cover in new development, targeting those areas/wards suggested. However, ward boundaries and names changed in 2021 and so the data could not be written into Policy GI4 to increase tree cover in the wards with the lowest values. It is not known whether gardens in Pewsham were originally planted with trees, or not, but this ward contains a lot of fields to the south of the housing estate which may be the reason for the low value. In any case the Steering Group consider that garden trees should be included in tree canopy cover calculations, accepting that some will be retained and some will be lost in the future. The Tree Planting Guide contains guidance on suitable species for rear gardens, and if this guidance is followed it is more likely that trees will be retained when planted in rear gardens of new development.
P/GI4/28	The policy does not appear to be being followed in the new housing development to the south of Chippenham	The Neighbourhood Plan is not yet 'made', so its policies cannot yet be applied.
P/GI4/29	This needs to be thoroughly checked regularly after the development is complete and heavy fines for those breaching the policy.	Unfortunately there is no mechanism for post-development checks in the planning system. However, the Town Council will monitor how the policy is being implemented to ensure its effectiveness at the planning stages, and through Ward Councillors empower new residents to report newly planted trees/hedgerows that die, or are not planted in accordance with approved plans. Enforcement action/fines by Wiltshire Council can be used as a last resort where development is not being implemented in accordance with approved plans.
P/GI4/30	To add into leaseholds/freeholds that green space/hedges cannot be removed without planning permission.	Unfortunately this cannot be covered under the planning regime or by the Neighbourhood Plan.

P/GI4/31	Tree canopy cover near housing would require more space and less housing density so may be difficult to fulfil this ambition	Canopy Cover Assessment & Recommendations for Wycombe District' ( <a href="https://www.wycombe.gov.uk/uploads/public/documents/Planning/New-local-plan/Tree-canopy-cover-assessment-report.pdf">https://www.wycombe.gov.uk/uploads/public/documents/Planning/New-local-plan/Tree-canopy-cover-assessment-report.pdf</a> ), produced as evidence to support Policy DM34 of the Wycombe District Local Plan 2019, demonstrates at 5.1.3, different residential development layouts to prove development would still be viable with a 25% tree canopy cover requirement. These layouts have a density of between 29-34 dwellings per hectares with tree canopy cover of between 25.6%-35.2%. The development density and the style of development is always dependent upon the site and its particular constraints. However the residential development layouts are not specific to Wycombe and could be applied to any town/city. They are typical of what could easily be achieved in a new build residential development on a site of 0.5ha or more within Chippenham. In addition, the majority of new development on larger sites in Chippenham is likely to occur on greenfield land, where there may either be existing trees, or less site constraints to planting new trees.
P/GI4/32	We need lots of woodland, fields and hedgerows to protect wildlife and especially birds.	Agreed
P/GI4/33	What's so special about hedgerows that they should stop development? We are in a housing crisis.	Hedgerows are important for preventing soil erosion and supporting agriculture, supporting a myriad of wildlife and storing carbon amongst other things. The need for housing vs loss of hedgerows would be issues weighed up by the Planning Officer when considering a planning application where there was this scenario, having regard to national and local planning policies.
P/GI4/34	Whole lifespan management needs to be considered.	Planning conditions or land management agreements will usually cover the management of trees over their lifespan, especially for major planning applications.
P/GI4/35	Why not just leave things as they are, new development does not protect existing woodland etc, it destroys it. No point in replacing ancient trees with new saplings, which take decades to mature.	New development can, and does, protect existing woodland. There are many examples of woodlands being protected in Chippenham e.g. Vincients Wood, Hardenhuish Woods etc. There are compelling reasons to replace ancient trees (as a last resort where this is required) with new saplings in order to ensure that there are ancient trees for future generations.
P/GI4/36	would like increased tree and hedgerow throughout existing as well as new	Policy GI4 seeks to ensure retention of existing trees and hedgerows and planting of new trees and hedgerows.
P/GI4/37	Yes I agree especially after my children's favourite place birds marsh was cut down and made a lot smaller. We unfortunately don't go here anymore.	Support noted
P/GI4/38	Yes it has concerned me that some old trees have been cut down to build the hill corner road estate and Lidl.	Policy G14 seeks to retain veteran, ancient and mature trees in new development.
P/GI4/39	While trees do protect green spaces to a certain extent, they do not prevent traffic noise and pollution from impacting the space. For example the river corridor alongside Avenue la Fleche.	<p>It is agreed that trees will not prevent some noise pollution and air pollution from impacting on green spaces, particularly where green spaces are located adjacent to main roads.</p> <p>However, Forest Research suggest that 'Planting "noise buffers" composed of trees and shrubs can reduce noise by five to ten decibels for every 30m width of woodland, especially sharp tones, and this reduces noise to the human ear by approximately 50%. To achieve this effect, the species and the planting design must be chosen carefully.'</p> <p>With regards to air pollution, the Woodland Trust state that 'Trees and other vegetation planted in the right places can help improve urban air quality on a local scale by forming a barrier between people and pollutants. They also remove some particulate pollution from the air by catching the tiny particles on their leaf surfaces. Research has found significantly lower asthma rates among children aged 4-5 in areas with more street trees. As well as reducing air pollution, trees take carbon dioxide from the air, helping in the fight to limit further climate change.'</p>

## Policy GI5 - Green Buffers

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/GI5/1	Against sadly this may be the best we can do in the face of Wiltshire Councils plans for us, given that what you write cannot go against what they have planned which is great swathes of housing...	Noted
P/GI5/2	Annihilation of our beautiful surrounding countryside when we already have so many new houses	Policy GI5 cannot prevent strategic housing sites being allocated in the emerging Local Plan but has been substantially amended to address the comments of stakeholder and now designates a green buffer at Rawlings Green, encourages other neighbourhood plans to set similar green buffer policies and a new paragraph has been added to Policy GI3 to explain that green and blue infrastructure shall be strategically located along contours and the edges of greenfield development sites to help screen and filter harmful urbanising effects from new development and to avoid the creation of harsh new urban settlement edges fronting countryside.
P/GI5/3	But not the statement that "Chippenham's new development boundary should align closely with the those in place in 2021" as this is an attempt to prevent the necessary growth of the town that will need to be shaped by the Local Plan Review.	<p>The Steering Group discussed at length the options for amending or deleting Policy GI5 to address this comment and other similar comments from stakeholders. They agreed to substantially reframe the policy to remove reference to any strategic requirements and the 'Green buffer principles for Chippenham', which includes the bullet point referred to in this comment.</p> <p>Policy GI5 as now amended is a more focused localised policy which relates to a single green buffer, two fields within the Neighbourhood Area, which have previously been allocated as part of the wider Rawlings Green Country Park in the Chippenham Site Allocations Plan (CSAP)</p>
P/GI5/4	But why is this not included in the plan draft?	Policy GI5 has been substantially reframed to take into account the comments from stakeholders. It is now proposing to establish a specific green buffer on land at Rawlings Green. New paragraph added after 6.62 concludes that no other sizeable areas of land exist for this purpose in the Neighbourhood Area and that in most cases it will be up to surrounding parishes and their own neighbourhood plans to establish how green buffers will be promoted in their areas.
P/GI5/5	Certain villages need to accept that they will become part of Chippenham with expansion that's needed	It is hoped that this will not be the case, which is why the Neighbourhood Plan is proposing to establish a green buffer at Rawlings Green and encourages the neighbourhood plans of surrounding parishes to also establish green buffers.
P/GI5/6	Green buffers good but they must be rigorously protected	Support noted.
P/GI5/7	Have lived in an area where there the buffers were built on and the area lost its identity	Noted
P/GI5/8	How will the urban fringe be screened by tree planting all year round - does this require some evergreen planting? How defined? Preferably not leylandii (for example!) (under point C)	Policy GI5 has been substantially amended and Criterion C, which referenced new tree planting on the urban fringe, deleted and relocated to Section A of the Chippenham Design Guide because it relates to screening of new development in views from the town and countryside. A mix of deciduous and evergreen native species has been suggested, with breaks in the tree line to take account of important long distance views of the countryside from the town and vice versa.
P/GI5/9	I hope this idea will be enforceable otherwise how big will our town become? I often think we are a victim of our own success as every wants to live in Chippenham!	Policy GI5 has been substantially reframed to take into account the comments of stakeholders. It is now proposing to establish a green buffer on land at Rawlings Green and encourages other neighbourhood plans to set similar green buffer policies
P/GI5/10	I strongly disagree with the continuing urbanisation and infilling of space in Chippenham. Less development ,not green buffers, is the solution.	Unfortunately, the Neighbourhood Plan cannot determine the location/extent of strategic housing allocations. This will be dealt with by the emerging Local Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan does recognise the importance of preserving open space in the town through Policies GI2 (Local Green Spaces) and GI3 (Green Corridors) in particular.
P/GI5/11	I think its important to protect the town with a green buffer for the sake of the towns residents & surrounding villages as we don't want to merge & it is important for the beauty of the area & wildlife.	Support noted.
P/GI5/12	I think more weight needs to be given to town landscape views rather than just villages. We need open views for health and wellbeing.	Agree that open landscape views from the town are also important in addition to tree screening to protect views of the countryside. Green Buffer Principles and Criterion c) of Policy GI5 deleted and new text added to Section A of the Chippenham Design Guide to reflect that it will be necessary to include breaks in the tree line where important long distance views of the countryside from the town, and the town from the countryside, have been identified through a Landscape Character Assessment.
P/GI5/13	if followed, it should restrict the new housing development to the south of Chippenham	Policy GI5 has been substantially reframed to take into account the comments of stakeholders. It is now proposing to establish a green buffer on land at Rawlings Green and encourages other neighbourhood plans to set similar green buffer policies. The Policy as amended would not be able to prevent any strategic housing allocations on land to the south of Chippenham and the area of land required for designation as a green buffer would be too large/remote from the town to designate as a means of preventing coalescence with Notton or Lacock.

P/GI5/14	Less housing	Unfortunately, the Neighbourhood Plan cannot determine the location/extent of strategic housing allocations. This will be dealt with by the emerging Local Plan.
P/GI5/15	Look at alternative for development	It is not clear what is meant by this statement.
P/GI5/16	More deckchairs!	Noted
P/GI5/17	No more houses and buildings needed	Unfortunately, the Neighbourhood Plan cannot determine the location/extent of strategic housing allocations. This will be dealt with by the emerging Local Plan.
P/GI5/18	Not specific enough. Dense tree planting is insufficient in many cases as the species will not obscure street lighting and the likes. They are often ineffective buffers where noise and ground topography are concerned	Trees can be part of an effective solution in helping to screen light and noise pollution, but agree that this is not a solution in itself. Criterion b) of Policy GI5 has been deleted but new wording, to a similar effect, has been added to a new paragraph in Policy GI3 (green corridors) which states that: 'Green and blue infrastructure shall be strategically located along contours and the edges of greenfield development sites to help <u>screen and filter harmful urbanising effects from new development...</u> ' (underlining for emphasis).
P/GI5/19	Planting more trees is always good.	Support noted.
P/GI5/20	The urban fringe is spreading outwards so am not clear how this will help?	Policy GI5 has been substantially reframed to take into account the comments of stakeholders. It is now proposing to establish a green buffer on land at Rawlings Green which would help prevent coalescence of Chippenham with villages to the north/east.
P/GI5/21	This is absolutely essential	Support noted.
P/GI5/22	This policy seems to support the need for separation between the urban parts of Chippenham and the surrounding farmland. I strongly support this because it is essential to prevent Chippenham from spreading into the green 'belt'.	Support noted.
P/GI5/23	Though the buffer should be sufficiently large to keep the sound and vision of the town completely hidden from the surrounding countryside.	Policy GI5 has been substantially reframed to take into account the comments of stakeholders. It is now proposing to establish a green buffer on land at Rawlings Green. Criterion b) of Policy GI5 has been deleted but new wording, to a similar effect, has been added to a new paragraph in Policy GI3 (green corridors) which states that: 'Green and blue infrastructure shall be strategically located along contours and the edges of greenfield development sites to <u>help screen and filter harmful urbanising effects from new development ..</u> ' (underlining for emphasis).
P/GI5/24	Very important to avoid coalescence with surrounding villages	Support noted.
P/GI5/25	We strongly agree with this approach. We believe that it is essential to maintain separation between existing villages and settlements in the form of arable land and pastures. The open expanse of agricultural uses is a perfect backdrop for the density of Chippenham and its increasingly urban character. The immense value of Chippenham's 'green lungs' became apparent during the 2020/21 lockdowns, when these spaces became so important for health and wellbeing.	Support noted.

## Policy H1 - Housing Mix and Types

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/H1/1	Why cannot the council make a stand for council-led procurement of social/affordable/special needs housing? Why build masses of volume housing - and suburban sprawl of indiscriminate design quality - in order to get at best 20% of that for housing that is actually needed for the local community? The total number of houses required is far in excess of any sustainable requirement and will create a ring of suburbia that will supplant the town centre without enriching the town as a whole. Also, more commuters who will not use the town centre	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot propose any less housing than is specified by the Wiltshire Local Plan. As housing in Chippenham will be a strategic issue, and the Neighbourhood Plan can only deal with non-strategic issues, the Emerging Local Plan currently being drafted by Wiltshire Council will be the appropriate vehicle for deciding on numbers/location of new housing in Chippenham in the future. Neighbourhood Plan Policy H1 echoes Core Policy 43 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy which requires 40% affordable housing.
P/H1/2	I filled in your questionnaire earlier but want to add another comment about the HNA - housing assessment. I cannot see how the housing number is calculated. In your 2020 report the figure is 4510 and in this latest plan it is 5100. However there is a large number of houses with current planning consent but have yet to be built out - where are these accounted? For example there is Rawlings Green, Showells Nursery and the majority of Rowden Park that is likely to be constructed in the new Plan period - should these and other consented developments be subtracted from the perceived future housing need? I would be grateful if this query is answered. Thank you.	The current Local Plan requires 4510 houses to be built in Chippenham up to 2026. This includes Rawlings Green and Rowden Park site allocations. These allocations now have planning permission and/or are starting to be built out. The Emerging Local Plan will look to provide housing beyond the current Plan period - i.e for the period 2016-2036. The Regulation 18 Draft of the Emerging Local Plan indicated that Chippenham would have a housing requirement of 9225 houses for the Emerging Local Plan period, which after accounting for existing allocations in the current Local Plan such as Rawlings Green and Rowden Park, completions and permissions, leaves a residual requirement of 5100 dwellings to plan for in the Emerging Local Plan to cover the period up to 2038.
P/H1/3	More social housing is desperately needed  Stop building so many houses, and build social housing on brown belt sites	Agree, but the Neighbourhood Plan can only reiterate that 40% of all new housing should be affordable housing as the Neighbourhood Plan needs to remain in conformity with the Wiltshire Local Plan on strategic matters.  The Neighbourhood Plan cannot restrict the amount of new housing development as housing is a strategic issue dealt with under the Wiltshire Local Plan. The Town Council have made their views clear that the amount of future housing development proposed to be delivered in Chippenham by the Emerging Local Plan is not sustainable.
P/H1/4	No more retirement development needed thanks the ones we have are not selling!	The Chippenham Housing Needs Assessment (Appendix 11 of the Neighbourhood Plan) provides evidence that there are a net additional 285 specialist housing for elderly units that need to be provided for in Chippenham over the Plan period to meet future demand.
P/H1/5	But keep to absolute minimum needed, no more retirement development, housing needed for local young people.	Policy H1 specifies a requirement for 40% of new housing to be 1-2 bedroom, which is usually more attractive to young people. In addition, Policy H1 re-iterates Core Policy 43 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy that 40% of new housing in Chippenham should be affordable housing.
P/H1/6	15% Five or more bedrooms seems too much. How about more 1/2 bedroom places to give our young people a chance of getting on the market	This figure derives from the Chippenham Housing Needs Assessment (Appendix 11 of the Neighbourhood Plan) which provides an indication of the likely need for different types and sizes of homes based on the existing local housing stock and demographic change.
P/H1/7	A lot of people straight up don't want any more houses built. This is ridiculous as more and more people will always need houses. My only fear is that infrastructure may not keep up with the growth.	Noted. Neighbourhood Plan Policies C1, T1, T2 and T3 and the Chippenham Design Guide attempt to ensure that community, transport and green infrastructure is delivered with new housing development.
P/H1/8	Affordable housing should not mean small houses with no gardens. At least one property per development should be a social house to accommodate a large family.	Core Policy 43 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy already requires that 'affordable housing units will be dispersed throughout the development a development and designed to a high quality, so as to be indistinguishable from other development' However, this is an important issue so text has been added to Policy H1 to reiterate this, and also to require a range of different sizes of affordable housing in new development, in order to be able to accommodate a large family as suggested.
P/H1/9	Affordable means what exactly? Country drowning in debt already.	A definition of Affordable Housing is provided in an explanatory box on p. 73 on the Neighbourhood Plan.
P/H1/10	With an aging population (although slightly less than the local average) the need for bungalow development, although inefficient in terms of ground use should be increased.	Support noted for specifying a requirement for bungalows in Policy H1.
P/H1/11	Availability of bungalows is very important. Also smaller properties (one and two bed) are essential for first time buyers, and also for older people looking to downsize in later life. At the moment older people can't downsize as most smaller properties are buy to let. Hence the burgeoning equity release business.	Support noted for specifying a requirement for bungalows in Policy H1. Policy H1 also specifies a requirement for 40% of new housing to be 1-2 bedroom, but cannot regulate for the type of occupier.
P/H1/12	But please consider garden size too	Text added to Policy H1 to specify that the quality and size of new affordable housing shall be indistinguishable from that of market housing.  Text added to Paragraph 62 of the Chippenham Design Guide to require that rear gardens be of a regular shape, and a size that is at least equal to the ground floor footprint of the dwelling.
P/H1/13	But subject to changing demand and circumstances as the plan progresses - cannot be too restrictive at a moment in time	The following text has been added to address the comments that Policy H1 is not flexible enough: <i>'Where individual site circumstances, updated evidence of local need or development viability dictates a variation from these figures robust evidence shall be submitted to justify this variation.'</i>

P/H1/14	Can't comment-it feels like too much focus on retirement building and not enough for younger families/first time buyers. Also not enough focus on quality community building, local halls e.g. the barn at derriards would have made a great community centre and has been allowed to deteriorate until impractical to make into anything and yet listed so cannot be removed to make room for a decent structure	The proposed housing mix derives from the Chippenham Housing Needs Assessment (Appendix 11 of the Neighbourhood Plan) which provides an indication of the likely need for different types and sizes of homes based on the existing local housing stock and demographic change.  Neighbourhood Plan Policy C1 focuses on provision of community infrastructure in new housing development, as does the Chippenham Design Guide. Derriads Barn is owned by Wiltshire Council and this comment has been forwarded on to them.
P/H1/15	Compliance and affordability are going to be key issues, as will ensuring that supporting infrastructure- roads, public transport, shops, schools and medical facilities are included. I would also like to see action on existing housing stock that is unsold/unoccupied. Housing does not always have to be new.	Neighbourhood Plan Policies C1, T1, T2 and T3 and the Chippenham Design Guide attempt to ensure that community, transport and green infrastructure is delivered with new housing development. Unfortunately the Neighbourhood Plan can only provide planning policies for new development and cannot deal with existing housing stock.
P/H1/16	Definitely need more housing for young singles and young families so they stay in the town. Flats for young people rather than over 55s particularly in town centre	The proposed housing mix derives from the Chippenham Housing Needs Assessment (Appendix 11 of the Neighbourhood Plan) which provides an indication of the likely need for different types and sizes of homes based on the existing local housing stock and demographic change. It is considered that the Policy balances provision for young singles and young families with provision for over 55's.
P/H1/17	<del>Developers will say anything to get approval but then do not do as promised.</del>	<del>Noted.</del>
P/H1/18	First time buyers and lower income families struggle to get on the market in this town. Also our social housing stock is fairly poor these days. We need more for all people	Policy H1 re-iterates Core Policy 43 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy that 40% of new housing in Chippenham should be affordable housing. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot set a higher amount of affordable housing than is already specified by the Local Plan.
P/H1/19	I believe that Chippenham people should be able to stay local to their town if they want to. Many are being priced out of the area and there is not enough affordable housing for younger residents. According* to figures Chippenham has a lower rate of people over 60 yet there is so much retirement housing, yet the younger generation have no chance of being able to afford to live in their own town. Chippenham has become a commuter town since lockdown as people now working from home are moving out of cities like Bristol in favour of cheaper towns like Chippenham.	Policy H1 re-iterates Core Policy 43 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy that 40% of new housing in Chippenham should be affordable housing. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot set a higher amount of affordable housing than is already specified by the Local Plan.  The Chippenham Housing Needs Assessment (Appendix 11 of the Neighbourhood Plan) provides evidence that there are a net additional 285 specialist housing for elderly units that need to be provided for in Chippenham over the Plan period to meet future demand.  The Neighbourhood Plan recognises that Chippenham is a commuter town and its policies have been drafted to try to make sure that the necessary community, economic and green infrastructure is built to support any new housing development. Provision of allocated housing and employment land is a strategic issue best dealt with in the Emerging Local Plan.
P/H1/20	I saw no provision or mention of self-build housing, which I feel is lacking in the overall commentary on housing	The following text has been added to the final paragraph of Policy H1 in line with this comment: <i>'Major development schemes will be expected to demonstrate that consideration has been given to Custom and Self Build plots as part of the housing mix.'</i>  New paragraph added after 7.12 as supporting text to explain background to self-build and custom housing.
P/H1/21	I would like to see a higher percentage of affordable housing	Policy H1 re-iterates Core Policy 43 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy that 40% of new housing in Chippenham should be affordable housing. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot set a higher amount of affordable housing than is already specified by the Local Plan.
P/H1/22	<del>If you have to build houses, then yes agree</del>	<del>Support noted.</del>
P/H1/23	Improvements could be made in terms of balancing housing density and garden sizes etc.. recent developments around the town are very poor in terms of outside space for each plot	Text added to Policy H1 to specify that the quality and size of new affordable housing shall be indistinguishable from that of market housing.  Text added to Paragraph 62 of the Chippenham Design Guide to require that rear gardens be of a regular shape, and a size that is at least equal to the ground floor footprint of the dwelling.
P/H1/24	Isn't the need for housing for the elderly already demonstrated by the rising ageing population in Wiltshire and Chippenham, and the fact that developers are applying to build such accommodation on brownfield sites in the town? Some recognition that such housing would release more housing for families/ younger people (in the existing housing stock) would be helpful in this section.	Developers can not always be relied upon to build what is required or needed over a particular time period. Therefore the reference to provision of specialist housing for the elderly in Policy H1 is important. Text added to Paragraph 7.12 to recognise that the provision of specialist housing for the elderly could help to free up more of the existing housing stock for families and younger people.
P/H1/25	Issue in Chippenham is affordable housing. Plenty of large houses. Far to many 2beds are owned by renters & taken off the market for 1st time buyers. This squeezes availability & pushes the prices up!	Policy H1 re-iterates Core Policy 43 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy that 40% of new housing in Chippenham should be affordable housing. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot set a higher amount of affordable housing than is already specified by the Local Plan. With regard to the limited choice/availability for first time buyers, Policy H1 has been adjusted so that 10% of all new housing will be required to be provided under the First Homes scheme.
P/H1/26	It feels like there are a LOT of new house being built and the town doesn't seem to be developing at the same rate	It is assumed that this comment relates to the development of infrastructure. Neighbourhood Plan Policies C1, T1, T2 and T3 and the Chippenham Design Guide attempt to ensure that community, transport and green infrastructure is delivered with new housing development.

P/H1/27	It would be great if there could be more high density accommodation in the centre of the town, like the blocks on the Westinghouse site. Small apartments are more affordable than houses and reduces the need for a car.	Paragraph 8.4 of the Neighbourhood Plan recognises that encouraging residential uses in the town centre e.g. flats above commercial premises, is key to the town centre remaining vibrant. The Steering Group had to abandon a specific policy that they had drafted to encourage residential uses above shops when new permitted development rights were introduced allowing this type of development without the need for planning permission.
P/H1/28	It's positive but doesn't go far enough. We need substantially more social housing, especially affordable ownership. Bungalows are in demand as they make a large part of sought after parts of the town (like Monkton Park). Bungalows are not great for energy efficiency. I think we need more one bed bungalows for the elderly and disabled, not to be built for families	Policy H1 re-iterates Core Policy 43 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy that 40% of new housing in Chippenham should be affordable housing. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot set a higher amount of affordable housing than is already specified by the Local Plan. Support for bungalows noted but it is not possible for the Neighbourhood Plan to specify the end-user of any housing development.
P/H1/29	Let the market decide what the needs of the local people are. In the history of Britain town planners have never achieved a more efficient allocation than the free market.	Developers cannot be relied upon to build what is required or needed over a particular time period as profit will always trump the needs of local people.
P/H1/30	Little mention of social housing - 'affordable' housing isn't very affordable!	Social housing is a sub-set of affordable housing, which is the term more frequently referred to throughout the Housing Mix section. Policy H1 requires that 28% of new housing is affordable for rent and this is usually secured through a registered social provider.
P/H1/31	More affordable rental housing for working people to support their gaining chance to save and buy property, not just extra affordable mortgage options.	Policy H1 requires that 28% of new housing is affordable for rent as per the local evidence set out in the Chippenham Housing Needs Assessment. This is already slightly above the 24% recommended by Wiltshire Council in their Interim Position Statement on First Homes (June 2022).
P/H1/32	More people than ever are living alone at some point in their life, but accommodation is unaffordable and undesirable. There also appears to be an increasing social segregation based on age in Chippenham where the housing available to elderly residents are care homes or expensive residential complexes. Housing with low running costs and no service fees are hard to find meaning elderly people remain in homes that no longer meet their needs.	Agree to a large extent. However, the Neighbourhood Plan cannot specify end users for new housing development. All it can do, through Policy H1, is seek to ensure that there is an appropriate housing mix for Chippenham based on local needs and demographics, thereby ensuring greater choice for users.
P/H1/33	My only concern is that housing is all well and good, but we need more amenities (Dr's, dentists, hospital services etc) to cope with the increase demand on these resources. These things seem to be promised but not delivered	Neighbourhood Plan Policies C1, T1, T2 and T3 and the Chippenham Design Guide attempt to ensure that community, transport and green infrastructure is delivered with new housing development.
P/H1/34	No houses should be built	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot restrict the amount of new housing development as housing is a strategic issue dealt with under the Wiltshire Local Plan. The Town Council have made their views clear that the amount of future housing development proposed to be delivered in Chippenham by the Emerging Local Plan is not sustainable.
P/H1/35	Should be enforceable rather than recommendation	Unfortunately it can only be a recommendation because national planning policy allows for development viability to be taken into account in the determination of any planning application.
P/H1/36	Social housing only	Policy H1 re-iterates Core Policy 43 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy that 40% of new housing in Chippenham should be affordable housing. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot set a higher amount of affordable housing than is already specified by the Local Plan.
P/H1/37	STOP BUILDING.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot restrict the amount of new housing development as housing is a strategic issue dealt with under the Wiltshire Local Plan. The Town Council have made their views clear that the amount of future housing development proposed to be delivered in Chippenham by the Emerging Local Plan is not sustainable.
P/H1/38	The allocation of four-bedroom houses seems very low, compared to 5+ bedrooms. Surely there is much more demand for four-bed homes than five-bed homes?	Please refer to the Chippenham Housing Needs Assessment (Appendix 11) for the rationale and calculations used to generate a figure for four-bedroom houses. The figure for the delivery of one-bedroom homes has come at the slight expense of larger homes of four or more bedrooms to enable smaller and more affordable homes to be built in the Neighbourhood Area.
P/H1/39	The housing mix of any new development needs to have a much higher element of affordable housing local people especially young people cannot afford housing in Chippenham; there needs to be clear restrictions on 2nd homes and buy to lets.	Policy H1 re-iterates Core Policy 43 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy that 40% of new housing in Chippenham should be affordable housing. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot set a higher amount of affordable housing than is already specified by the Local Plan. There is no evidence that buy to lets or 2nd homes are a major barrier to affordability in Chippenham in particular.
P/H1/40	The latest information for the Council Tax rebate showed Chippenham has only 76% of it's housing in the A-D bracket while Salisbury is 93% A-D. Over the last few years we have seen too many executive homes built.	By setting an evidenced-based housing mix for the town through Policy H1, it is considered a more equitable and appropriate mix of new houses will be delivered going forward.
P/H1/41	Last year I got the figures for empty homes in Chippenham, there were 370 empty homes, the poignant thing for me was 371 people were on the social housing list. There are things Wiltshire Council could be doing more like other council's who support the empty homes week in February, can Chippenham include these measures and higher council tax for long term empty homes, all within the Government guidelines. Can Chippenham take the initiative to work with Wiltshire Council on this?	This is not an issue that the Neighbourhood Plan can deal with. The responsibility lies with the Empty Homes team at Wiltshire Council. Chippenham Town Council do not have the knowledge or expertise to lead on this issue. Notwithstanding this comment has been referred to the Director of Community Services at the Town Council to see if there is anything that the Town Council could assist with.
P/H1/42	Wiltshire Council is building/supplying 1,000 council houses over the next 10 years, how do we ensure Chippenham gets eco social housing, not the developer energy rating B housing we have received so far?	Neighbourhood Plan Policies SCC1 (net zero carbon) and SCC2 (sustainable design and construction) will raise the bar on energy efficiency of new housing in the town.
P/H1/43	Rather than just sticking to the traditional housing can we look into mini homes as a stepping stone for getting people out of tents <a href="https://www.cam.ac.uk/stories/modhomes?fbclid=IwAR3cp1c3xFFQ0ik1xwHdAZqmbhmVn0JZqnp2T9guLhwzCyQiVdxfQxTul8">https://www.cam.ac.uk/stories/modhomes?fbclid=IwAR3cp1c3xFFQ0ik1xwHdAZqmbhmVn0JZqnp2T9guLhwzCyQiVdxfQxTul8</a> Crisis is doing a Homes First campaign	This is a promising, yet bespoke solution to a problem which is likely to be more relevant to large populations of homeless in cities as opposed to the small population of homeless people in Chippenham. It is not considered necessary to have a policy for this in the Neighbourhood Plan.



P/H1/44	To much emphasis is being put on retirement housing, we have about 50 flats/apartments that have been on the market for years, the latest Churchill apartments haven't even sold yet from new. We are now getting more at the old college because the plans say they are needed but it isn't relevant to today's society. With multiple care visits daily available people are staying in their own homes, want their own gardens and independence, look after grandchildren and need/want the space.	The evidence from the Chippenham Housing Needs Assessment (Appendix 11 of the Neighbourhood Plan) suggests to the contrary, that there are a net additional 285 specialist housing for elderly units that need to be provided for in Chippenham over the Plan period to meet future demand.
P/H1/45	20% of the housing for Wiltshire in Chippenham is not sustainable, I understand the Neighbourhood plan cannot dictate to the local plan but please can any steps be made which can address, before it is too late when the Local Plan is issued.	You are correct that unfortunately the Neighbourhood Plan cannot restrict the amount of new housing development as housing is a strategic issue dealt with under the Wiltshire Local Plan. The Town Council have made their views clear that the amount of future housing development proposed to be delivered in Chippenham by the Emerging Local Plan is not sustainable.
P/H1/46	The market should self regulate. If there's a demand eg housing suitable for elderly then it will be built. If you impose numbers based on a survey these figures will be out of date before you can adjust them.	Developers can not always be relied upon to build what is required or needed over a particular time period as profit will always trump the needs of local people.  Policy H1 has been adjusted to allow flexibility with the figures, for example where 'updated evidence of local need' dictates a variation from these figures.
P/H1/47	The should be more affordable and social housing. This is becoming more of a problem with people moving out of London to commute back in and also with people using previously rented properties for AirBnB	Policy H1 re-iterates Core Policy 43 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy that 40% of new housing in Chippenham should be affordable housing. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot set a higher amount of affordable housing than is already specified by the Local Plan.
P/H1/48	There has to be a better way to assist first time buyers into the market, and that is lower cost housing.	Policy H1 has been adjusted so that 10% of all new housing will be required to be provided under the First Homes scheme.
P/H1/49	Unambitious in terms of affordable and extra care housing. Should include more provision for disadvantaged groups.	Policy H1 re-iterates Core Policy 43 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy that 40% of new housing in Chippenham should be affordable housing. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot set a higher amount of affordable housing than is already specified by the Local Plan.  The evidence from the Chippenham Housing Needs Assessment (Appendix 11 of the Neighbourhood Plan) suggests that there are a net additional 285 specialist housing for elderly units that need to be provided for in Chippenham over the Plan period to meet future demand and therefore Policy H1 supports this type of housing.
P/H1/50	We need a higher level of affordable rental properties 2,3 and 4 bed houses, not more flats. These need to be integrated into the development, not pushed into corners or in blocks.	Policy H1 requires that 28% of new housing is affordable for rent as per the local evidence set out in the Chippenham Housing Needs Assessment. This is already slightly above the 24% recommended by Wiltshire Council in their Interim Position Statement on First Homes (June 2022). Whilst it is not possible to specify the specific dwelling sizes for affordable rent text has been added to Policy H1 to require that a range of sizes will need to be provided as part of the affordable housing offer.  Planning applications for new flats will be judged on their integration with the rest of the development and their siting on a case by case basis.
P/H1/51	When housing affordability is outpacing local people I would suggest 60% market housing is to high and higher numbers of affordable scheme homes are needed. New build 2 bedroom homes are sold at a premium over existing homes.	Policy H1 re-iterates Core Policy 43 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy that 40% of new housing in Chippenham should be affordable housing. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot set a higher amount of affordable housing than is already specified by the Local Plan.

## Policy H2 - Housing Design

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/H2/1	Can we ask for more than 9/12?	Nine out of twelve green lights are required to achieve Building for a Healthy Life Commendation - indicating a residential scheme that has been well designed. The Steering Group do not consider there is justification to go beyond this. As explained in Building for a Healthy Life some site characteristics may be a limiting factor from the start. For instance, third-party land ownership may prevent optimal connectivity from being achieved, or local highway authorities have not adopted (or have not fully adopted) the principles set out in Manual for Streets which can make it very difficult for developers to secure a green light against Healthy Streets.
P/H2/2	Community centres and schools are key to new development	Agree. Policy C1 and the Chippenham Design Guide aim to ensure this infrastructure is incorporated in new largescale major new development.
P/H2/3	The access roads for new housing estates are too narrow.	Noted. However, the Neighbourhood Plan cannot dictate road widths. This is the responsibility of the Local Highways Authority who have their own design guidance on roads.
P/H2/4	I would like to see hedges planted not fencing all the time	Paragraph 35 of the Chippenham Design Guide has been amended following design advice from Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning that hedges would not provide suitably secure boundaries between plots and lead to unsightly add- hoc provision of fences by owners. However, the amended paragraph does require hedge or shrub planting in front of masonry walls to soften their appearance/reduce their impact on the streetscene and increase biodiversity. Fences on to the public realm are not supported.
P/H2/5	Design, sustainability and quality construction should go together.	Agree that all three are intrinsically related but the Steering Group consider that a single policy to cover all these aspects would be long and unwieldy. Hence splitting into Design & Construction (SCC2) and Housing Design (H2).
P/H2/6	I could not see this Annexe in the Neighbourhood Plan, is it in a separate document?	The Chippenham Design Guide (Annexe 1) is a separate document that could be found on the Neighbourhood Plan website, or hard copies viewed, throughout the Regulation 14 public consultation.
P/H2/7	I have concerns about how all the design elements will be provided without conflict. i.e. providing local centre, open space, bungalows, etc, whilst still having low enough density to ensure street scene is not dominated by car parking in front of dwellings.	It is possible for good design to achieve all these elements within a new residential development. Density does not strictly dictate car parking arrangements. Paragraph 50 of the Chippenham Design Guide as amended advises on-plot parking spaces for the majority of dwellings. Paragraph 51 goes on to explain that where it is not possible to achieve maximum parking standards through on-plot parking in development of higher density/urban character, allocated on-street parking spaces or suitable shared parking courts shall be provided.
P/H2/8	I reject all green ideology as it pertains to housing.  And certainly reject your pod ideas of 1x bed housing. Stop devaluing our town. The 'new' developments such as up by the college are awful. They look great when built and within a few years look dreadful. Try building beautiful. Nobody would object to a new 'Bath'.  We most certainly do not have a vibrant town centre. Lower rates. Encourage small businesses.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan is not proposing any policies for '1 x bed pods'. It is disagreed that the development referred to near Wiltshire College/Great Mead is poor in design terms. There are many design aspects of this high density development which are commendable such as landscaping, active frontages, large windows, and varied material palette and roof forms. Policy H2 and the Chippenham Design Guide seek to support well designed and beautiful buildings.
P/H2/9	Important to stress access for buses in new developments to make car ownership less essential, and make the town centre, rail station, and employment areas such as Bumpers Farm easily accessible by bus from all areas of the town.	Paragraphs 45 and 46 of the Chippenham Design Guide, as amended, stress access for buses in new developments to make car ownership less essential.
P/H2/10	It would be good if as part of build beautiful the original character of old buildings is used in the design, eg the old college to take that design not the 1960's BT building type where possible.	Agree. Table of 12 characteristics of Building for a Healthy Life added to explanatory box on p. 77. One of these 12 characteristics is 'make the most of what's there'. In addition, Figure 5.2 has been added for interpretation of Policy SCC2. One of the criteria listed in this table is 'Re-use and refurbishment of buildings on the site to prevent unnecessary demolition'.
P/H2/11	Just build more houses. No more red tape	Left to their own devices developers cannot be relied upon to deliver high quality housing.
P/H2/12	Needs to be more specific and stress proper sustainability that can be accounted, not just fine words	It is hard to measure good design. Notwithstanding the Steering Group consider that the Building for a Healthy Life tool, referred to in Policy H2, can be quantifiably used to account for good design.
P/H2/13	Someone more interested in a 'Gong' than doing the right thing I suspect.	This comment is not properly understood.
P/H2/14	Sustainable yes but a design guide limits design progress. Most housing has followed the Essex design guidelines for decades leading to a national uniform monotony	Noted but it is not considered that the Chippenham Design Guide would have the effect of limiting design progress. It stresses the importance of varied design and is not overly prescriptive on design details. It encourages contemporary, sustainable architecture.
P/H2/15	The build it quick sell it expensively habit of the major developers do not allow for these sorts of considerations but they are necessary. Good luck with this one!	Support noted.
P/H2/16	This must be dictated by national policy and government guidelines.	Housing design is already dictated by national policy in the NPPF and the National Design Guide. However, local design codes/guidance are also encouraged, which is the role of the Chippenham Design Guide.
P/H2/17	Unique homes, should be judged on individual merit for design and impact.	The Chippenham Design Guide stresses the importance of varied design and is not overly prescriptive on design details, allowing for unique homes to be built.
P/H2/18	We should no longer be building developments that are not sustainably designed and carbon zero, that will then have to be retrofitted in the near future.	Agree. Policies SCC1 (net zero carbon development) and SCC2 (sustainable design and construction) seek to achieve this.
P/H2/19	A lot more could be done to be innovative in this area. 1) ensure that estates must have lots of different designs, to give character. 2) Estates and housing must have local amenities, transportation, and parking for 2 cars/house.	The Chippenham Design Guide covers all the aspects referred to in this comment.

P/H2/20	ALL new build development whether housing or commercial should be required to have solar collectors in place and rainwater capture systems.	Paragraph 61 of the Chippenham Design Guide requires that all new homes shall have capacity to generate electricity from solar panels on roofs. Paragraph 62 requires rainwater harvesting in new housing development. Paragraph 69 requires ' <i>energy generation which shall meet all or most of the demand created</i> ' for commercial development associated with new housing development. This is most likely to come from solar panels. It also goes on to require rainwater harvesting. It is considered that these paragraphs adequately cover all future residential and the majority of future commercial development.
P/H2/21	Chippenham used to be a vibrant Georgian town, its been slowly destroyed by councillors who think they know how to build a town, your idea of a decent home (Cattle market) is poor, they are probably the most dilapidated properties in the town and they are some of the newest	Chippenham Town Council do not determine planning applications, this is the remit of Wiltshire Council as the Local Planning Authority. It is disagreed that the development referred to at the former Cattle Market is poor in design terms. There are many design aspects of this high density development which are commendable such as landscaping, active frontages, large windows, <del>and varied material palette and roof forms</del> .
P/H2/22	Think more thought needs to go into flats with good access to the countryside for leisure and well planned so to have an enhanced landscaped area around them and community garden/ allotments	Whilst Policies H1 and H2 require a mix of new housing types rather than just flats, it is agreed that new dwellings require good access to the countryside, are well planned, well landscaped and in close proximity to community gardens/allotments, and advice in the Chippenham Design Guide seeks to achieve such.
P/H2/23	We need high quality housing not just estate housing if we are to have a truly diverse population	Agree. It is considered that Policy H2 helps to achieve this.

**Policy TC1 - Bath Rd Car Park/Bridge Centre Site**

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/TC1/1	A balanced of social housing, retail, business and leisure will create a more attractive and welcoming environment.	Support noted
P/TC1/2	A large 4 storey building in Zone 1 would not be in keeping with the market town aspect of Chippenham and such height is completely unnecessary.	<p>The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) on the Neighbourhood Plan found that 4 storey building(s) in Zone 1 could be justified because it may not necessarily be higher than surrounding buildings. This is because if a modern building were to be developed at 4 storeys in height in Zone 1 it would have a similar overall height to any 3 storey historic buildings in the surrounding area which have greater floor to ceiling height differences (for example the ground floor of Avonbridge House is 4m in height compared to a typical modern building which has a floor to ceiling height of 2.4m). In any case, any new building here would be of a detached/standalone nature not immediately seen in the context of nearby buildings. The overall height of any new building in this location would appear further reduced in context to neighbouring existing buildings on the western frontage of Bath Road/Ivy Lane which are already sited on raised ground approximately one storey higher than the ground level of Zone 1.</p> <p>The first bullet point under Zone 1 in Policy TC1 has been modified to reflect the outcome of the SEA's preferred approach, from:  <i>'Built development up to 4 storeys in height'</i>  to:  <i>'Built development of 2-4 storeys in height and not to exceed the height of the tallest neighbouring building'</i></p> <p>This revised wording would also ensure that single storey development could not be built in Zone 1 which the SEA advised would harm the character and appearance of Chippenham Conservation Area, harm the setting of listed buildings, have an adverse impact on the streetscene given existing building heights are generally two storeys in the vicinity of the site, and would be an inefficient/low density use of a key brownfield site in the town centre.</p> <p>The revised addition of <i>'and not to exceed the height of the tallest neighbouring building'</i> would ensure that any new building in this location is not taller than its neighbours so it does not dominate the area.</p> <p>Please refer to the SEA for the full assessment of reasonable alternatives and commentary on the preferred approach.</p>
P/TC1/3	Ambitious plans but wishes for an ideal that is not financially viable has left this area undeveloped for decades. Perhaps run a competition to see if something interesting is out there	The scheme proposed for the site is based on the mix of viable uses suggested by the 'Market Assessment: Bridge Centre' Report by Cushman & Wakefield (2019) commissioned for Wiltshire Council. It is considered that, together with government funding e.g. the Brownfield Land Release Fund, a scheme would be viable on this site. A design competition could be used to draw up a detailed masterplan for the site based on the parameters plan in Policy TC1.
P/TC1/4	Any changes to the Bridge Centre roundabout must be designed such that there are sufficient breaks in the traffic flow up Rowden Hill, heading towards the hospital/est along the A4 towards Bath, so that traffic trying to join is able to - eg. coming from hospital or residential dwellings - the current traffic light arrangement caters for this need (I live on Rowden Hill - if the traffic lights are not working at the Bridge Centre, I cannot get off my drive safely due to the speed of traffic heading down the hill past the hospital (WC traffic survey a decade ago recorded AVERAGE speeds of 36 mph)	Noted. Any scheme would need to model traffic flows to ensure that motorists are able to safely enter/exit on to Bath Road.
P/TC1/5	But truly mixed, cafes, social areas not more cheap shops	Noted
P/TC1/6	Can housing be eco social housing giving good connections to public transport for those that don't want to be car reliant.	Policy TC1 is not specifying the type of residential at this stage, because the parameters plan needs to be flexible, viable and broad enough to allow for a detailed site masterplan to be drawn up. However, given the sustainable town centre location of the site it is anticipated that any car parking standards could be significantly reduced for residential development at this location.
P/TC1/7	Can't comment-not sure what the plans involved -it would be good to have better facilities for community -great to have the Arc. cinema but Olympiad needs generation.	Noted. The parameters plan was set out in Figure 8.2.
P/TC1/8	Car parking is already at a premium in the town centre especially during holidays. I would be concerned about the loss of spaces at Bath Road car park.	Policy TC1 explains that one of the potential uses in Zone 1 could be for a multi-storey car park. However, any future planning application for the scheme would need to demonstrate that sufficient public car parking opportunities remain in the town centre to meet demand if no public car parking is to be provided on the site.
P/TC1/9	Chippenham needs shops first. Maybe a multi-story on the market site and a nice footbridge. Not confident after effort by the Station!	The role of the town centre is changing, and the need/demand for shops decreasing because of online shopping at the same time as the need/demand for community uses, leisure uses, restaurants/cafes/bars, workshops and incubator units are increasing. A smaller, more compact town centre retail area for Chippenham is likely in the future. Zone 3, and the ground floor of Zone 2, could accommodate additional shops if there is demand/need.

P/TC1/10	Chippenham residents have been failed as this site should have accommodated the retail on the western edge of the town. Without understanding the road changes involved - is this a pipedream now?	The Neighbourhood Plan agrees that for far too long this site has been a longstanding blight on the town centre and represents a key regeneration opportunity which now needs to be realised. A wholly retail-led scheme is not considered to be viable in the current market, as set out in the 'Market Assessment: Bridge Centre' Report by Cushman & Wakefield (2019) <u>commissioned for Wiltshire Council</u> .
P/TC1/11	Doesn't identify where existing traffic will go. No time frame identified for this either, this results in significant blighting of a large area of the town.	Policy TC1 is for a parameters plan only and is intended to set the scene for a future masterplan for the site to be developed by the landowner, Wiltshire Council. Traffic modelling would need to inform any site masterplan. Timescales would be dependent on the landowner, and the Neighbourhood Plan is not at liberty to set any timescales.
P/TC1/12	Ever since the old bridge centre building was knocked down, it feels heels have been dragged on the re development of this site. Seems unfair that it has been allowed to be used as free parking for council staff and the ridiculous idea of a planted flower meadow , for us to sit and enjoy. It seems over the years that some big companies have not been allowed to develop the site, which would have encouraged other big companies in to the town.	The Neighbourhood Plan agrees that for far too long this site has been a longstanding blight on the town centre and represents a key regeneration opportunity which now needs to be realised.
P/TC1/13	We also need to make sure we provide enough parking in town. I work in the town centre and am very aware of the fact we have the highest parking prices in Wiltshire, discouraging people from shopping in town.	Policy TC1 explains that one of the potential uses in Zone 1 could be for a multi-storey car park. However, any future planning application for the scheme would need to demonstrate that sufficient public car parking opportunities remain in the town centre to meet demand if no public car parking is to be provided on the site.  It is outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan to set car parking prices.
P/TC1/14	First - the town's future parking requirement must be assessed. If there is any possibility that more parking is required the Bath Road site is the only place for it. The Bridge Centre site is too far away from the Bridge.	Agreed that the town's parking requirement will need to be assessed to progress redevelopment of the site. It is not accepted that the only site which could accommodate parking for the town centre is the Bath Road Car Park/Bridge Centre Site. Notwithstanding, Policy TC1 explains that one of the potential uses in Zone 1 could be for a multi-storey car park.
P/TC1/15	Second - we should be supporting the existing retail and improving the existing public realm rather than building more in to create direct competition.	The mix of uses proposed for the site i.e. residential, community uses, E Class units, offices, hotel, restaurants, cafes, bars etc. would not be in direct competition with any of the existing traditional town centre retail uses. They could actually create <u>greater footfall and linked trips to existing retail uses</u> .
P/TC1/16	I agree with redevelopment of the area. However I see the redevelopment being reliant on the 'bypass' between the A350 and A4, which won't be in place for many years, if at all. Without such a 'bypass' traffic flows will not be significantly reduced to downscale existing highway. How will shared space be implemented (reliant on low vehicle flows and design speeds of 10mph), given the high volume of cars using this route from Station/Monkton Park? - i.e. only traffic that could use this would be possibly buses and delivery vehicles. No through traffic, vehicle parking etc. I see the benefit of shared space here, but don't think it has been thought through. See Frosham Street in Chester for a good example.	It is not considered that redevelopment of the site is necessarily reliant on the proposed bypass between the A350 and A4. Other strategic highway options have not been explored and published with regard to removal or redesign of the gyratory at the site. The link road to the Rawlings Green site could also reduce traffic flow through the centre to Station Hill/Monkton Park. Notwithstanding all the possible future highway options/scenarios outside the site, Criterion A) of the boxed Site Proposals on p. 88 explains that redevelopment of the site in accordance with the parameters plan could be phased, with the Bath Road Car Park site being redeveloped, whilst still retaining the gyratory.
P/TC1/17	I do wonder where people who work in Chippenham who cannot get to work any other way will park if this is redeveloped. .	Policy TC1 explains that one of the potential uses in Zone 1 could be for a multi-storey car park. However, any future planning application for the scheme would need to demonstrate that sufficient public car parking opportunities remain in the town <u>centre to meet demand if no public car parking is to be provided on the site</u> .
P/TC1/18	It also seems a shame that a purpose built undercover market is not being used as intended	The poor design and location of the undercover market facility, and decreased size/role of the market, means it would not be <u>viable for the market to trade from here in the future</u> .
P/TC1/19	I prefer this to the original supermarket, then TK maxx plans. It would be great to have a row of bars, cafes and <u>restaurants alongside a green space</u>	Support noted.
P/TC1/20	I really like the proposals for Bath Road/Bridge Centre, but please NO multi story car park!	Support noted, but a multi storey car park needs to remain on the list of potential uses in case future town centre car park occupation surveys reveal there is a need for additional car parking in the town. A multi-storey car park could be well <u>designed or sunken to improve its visual appearance</u> .
P/TC1/21	I would have preferred to tick a not sure box! It would really depend on what the proposal is, I think it would be better to plant trees on it! We are in danger of it becoming only a car park if so make it one for recharging electric vehicles as there are so few recharging points in Chippenham.	The proposals are set out in Figure 8.2 and Policy TC1. It is not considered that use of the whole site for public open space would be a viable or efficient use of this land, which is brownfield land and which presents a prime opportunity to regenerate the town centre and improve the urban fabric. Only Zone 1 would have potential use as a car park.
P/TC1/22	I would love to see fewer and slower cars in that area and have the area redeveloped to shops and cafes and art <u>galleries etc. Bringing the river and Hardenhuish Brook in as central features is also excellent</u> .	Support noted.
P/TC1/23	I would prefer Bridge Centre site to be converted to something other than the car park it is at present. There should <u>have been definitive plans in place, before the building was demolished</u> .	The parameters plan identifies a new building in this location (Zone 1), which may include multi-storey car parking facilities as <u>part of a mixed-use scheme for the whole site</u> .
P/TC1/24	It doesn't go far enough. So much more could be done here, lets be inventive, how about building a Lido as a focal <u>point, just something more than lots of cafes and restaurants</u>	Although a nice idea, in practical terms it is unlikely a Lido would be a viable use for the site, meaning the site ultimately <u>remains vacant for the foreseeable future</u> .
P/TC1/25	It should be left as a green space/mini park. It is part of Chippenham that any transiting vehicle to the town will pass and should be a showcase of the environment.	It is not considered that use of the whole site for public open space would be a viable or efficient use of this land, which is brownfield land and which presents a prime opportunity to regenerate the town centre and improve the urban fabric
P/TC1/26	It will be like Swindon.....ruined	It is not clear why this would be the case from the comment received.

P/TC1/27	It would be good if the policy included better connection to Bath road and maybe include redevelopment of Ivy road industrial estate (old laundry)	It is envisaged that by downgrading the highway around the gyratory there would be improved connections for active travel between Bath Road and the town centre. The Ivy Road Industrial Estate lies outside of the town centre, is in private ownership, and accommodates existing businesses. Therefore it is not considered in need of regeneration.
P/TC1/28	It's essential that redevelopment of this area includes physically segregated cycleways that link to surrounding cycleways and quiet streets. The policy currently doesn't mention cycleways as part of the development.	Text added to reference ' <i>inclusion of segregated cycleways which link in to surrounding cycleways and quiet streets</i> ' in (E) of General Design Principles and in Feature 8 of Policy TC1.
P/TC1/29	Key is to have a mix of uses that attracts/ retains people in the town centre in a sustainable way. And keeps traffic congestion/ pollution away/ separated from the centre, making it pleasant and desirable to spend time in.	It is considered that the scheme for the site in Policy TC1 achieves these aims.
P/TC1/30	Lovely plan, but how is it going to happen?	Ultimately it is at the landowners (Wiltshire Council) discretion as to whether to develop or not, but the Town Council will keep applying pressure on them to get this site redeveloped.
P/TC1/31	More car parking	Zone 1 includes potential for multi-storey car parking. However, informal evidence suggests there is no need for additional car parking, the new public car park at Sadlers Mead remaining largely empty
P/TC1/32	More info needed	Policy TC1 provides a parameters plan, which it is considered contains the right level of information that can then be used by an architect to draw up a detailed masterplan at the next stage.
P/TC1/33	Most of the site should be high quality, high density residential accommodation, with maybe some retail/leisure. (Small retail units to encourage independent food retailers. Chippenham doesn't have a butchers!!!!) Also, the loss of the Bridge Centre was devastating for Chippenham's youth and has not been replaced. This should be a priority, either here or somewhere else central.	Comments noted. Zone 3 includes potential for community uses, which could include a youth centre or similar.
P/TC1/34	Mostly agree. I don't believe 4 stories is appropriate. We do not need more large buildings ruining the landscape like the car park at Monkton Park. Building should stay lower than the old Nestles Factory.	<p>The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) on the Neighbourhood Plan found that 4 storey building(s) in Zone 1 could be justified because it may not necessarily be higher than surrounding buildings. This is because if a modern building were to be developed at 4 storeys in height in Zone 1 it would have a similar overall height to any 3 storey historic buildings in the surrounding area which have greater floor to ceiling height differences (for example the ground floor of Avonbridge House is 4m in height compared to a typical modern building which has a floor to ceiling height of 2.4m). In any case, any new building here would be of a detached/standalone nature not immediately seen in the context of nearby buildings. The overall height of any new building in this location would appear further reduced in context to neighbouring existing buildings on the western frontage of Bath Road/Ivy Lane which are already sited on raised ground approximately one storey higher than the ground level of Zone 1.</p> <p>The first bullet point under Zone 1 in Policy TC1 has been modified to reflect the outcome of the SEA's preferred approach, from: 'Built development up to 4 storeys in height' to: 'Built development of 2-4 storeys in height and not to exceed the height of the tallest neighbouring building'</p> <p>This revised wording would also ensure that single storey development could not be built in Zone 1 which the SEA advised would harm the character and appearance of Chippenham Conservation Area, harm the setting of listed buildings, have an adverse impact on the streetscene given existing building heights are generally two storeys in the vicinity of the site, and would be an inefficient/low density use of a key brownfield site in the town centre.</p> <p>The revised addition of '<i>and not to exceed the height of the tallest neighbouring building</i>' would ensure that any new building in this location is not taller than its neighbours so it does not dominate the area.</p> <p>Please refer to the SEA for the full assessment of reasonable alternatives and commentary on the preferred approach.</p>
P/TC1/35	This could also be an opportunity to uncover Arthur's Well, which was a historically important feature of our town obliterated by the road changes in the 1960s. It was one of the main water sources for the town's inhabitants and was said to have healing properties.	<p>Agree that opportunity to uncover and restore Arthur's Well should be referred to in Policy TC1. New feature 12 added: '<i>12: Opportunity to restore Arthur's Well</i>'</p> <p>Figure 8.2 amended to show feature '12'.</p> <p>New paragraph added after 8.14 to explain Arthur's Well.</p>
P/TC1/36	Must be sustainability built and maintained	Agreed
P/TC1/37	Need to ensure that this development doesn't detract from the existing town centre	It is considered that the uses proposed for the site would complement, rather than compete with, traditional town centre retail uses. In this way, it could attract greater footfall into the town centre which would help retailers.

P/TC1/38	Not sure about more shops and coffee bars when we already have empty shop spaces in the town...do we need to think more laterally? ...would have to give this some thought.....maybe not think so commercially?	Unfortunately in order to redevelop the site there need to be some viable commercial uses e.g. cafes, bars and restaurants. Policy TC1 is forward thinking in that incubator units are being proposed within Zone 3 which could accommodate a whole host of different uses, including community/not for profit uses.
P/TC1/39	Only up to a point. I am concerned about reduction in car parking spaces and access to them.	The number of car parking spaces would be informed by traffic/parking surveys. Depending on the outcome it may or may not be necessary to include a multi-storey car park in Zone 1. The current surface car parking at Bath Road Car Park is an inefficient use of prime brownfield land.
P/TC1/40	Really interested to see what this site could be turned into, be it something practical like a new bus station or something recreational like a park or garden.	Noted
P/TC1/41	Really is a bit of an eyesore at present and this plan looks a great improvement. This car park was one of my first impressions of Chippenham.	Agreed, the current site presents a poor impression of Chippenham town centre to visitors.
P/TC1/42	Relocate/redesign the A4 gyratory and build on top of it	The cost of building on top/tunnelling the A4 underneath the site is likely to be prohibitive to the viability, and therefore deliverability, of any scheme.
P/TC1/43	Sadly WC pulled down the Bridge Centre, so they could use as a car park to supplement bad design details at Monkton Hill. A travesty's! Too late, do your best.	Noted
P/TC1/44	Should be developed after other town centre improvements made. May not be demand - economic situation likely to take its toll. If it proceeds, consider promoting night time economy there.	There may well be other town centre improvements required that would benefit the town centre/retailers in the short term (whilst the economic situation is poor) but these will largely be outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. It is considered, in planning terms, that regenerating this site is key to the longer term vitality and viability of the town centre. Suggestion for promoting night time economy on the site is noted.
P/TC1/45	Some great ideas for the bath road area, Maybe steer clear of too many retirement homes	Support noted. Policy TC1 does not specifically identify retirement homes for the site.
P/TC1/46	Something needs to be done on this site because at the moment it's an eyesore and does not give a good impression of our town.	Agreed, the current site presents a poor impression of Chippenham town centre to visitors.
P/TC1/47	Something needs to happen here and any change in the right direction would be a good thing	Support noted.
P/TC1/48	Supported but with reservations. I would like to ensure that mixed use developments meet with the requirements of all age groups. Facilities for young people are important but this should be as well as facilities for older residents, not instead of them	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot control the end users or businesses that would be accommodated on the site, but it is considered with the wide range/mix of uses that is being promoted by Policy TC1, it would likely cater for a diverse age range.
P/TC1/49	The bridge centre site is currently an eye sore!	Agreed, the current site presents a poor impression of Chippenham town centre to visitors.
P/TC1/50	The plan for Bath Road car park doesn't offer best use of area, instead it should be used to relocate the Town Bus station and accommodate National Coach Buses	Whilst the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group would not necessarily be against relocation of the bus station to this site, there are no signs that Wiltshire Council are actively looking for sites to relocate the bus station, or that the pros of doing so would necessarily outweigh the cons.
P/TC1/51	The town's heritage and architecture needs to be respected here	The proposals for the site have been developed to improve the character and appearance of this part of Chippenham Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings. Please refer to Appendix 14 of the Pre-Submission Draft Plan for further details.
P/TC1/52	This has been mentioned for decades and nothing ever gets done !!	Hence, why the Neighbourhood Plan is producing Policy TC1 and raising awareness of the need/putting pressure on Wiltshire Council for the site to be developed.
P/TC1/53	This is a traffic bottleneck that requires special attention	The downgrading of the highway as proposed under Policy TC1 is considered to be instrumental in better integrating the town centre with adjoining western suburbs, both from an urban design and active travel perspective. It is appreciated that this may rely on a multi-pronged approach beyond the site itself and may include factors such as other roads being built e.g. Rawlings Green link road, southern bypass, A4 link to Avenue La Fleche etc., making it less desirable for through-traffic to use roads around the town centre and more attractive to use the A350, and encouraging greater use of active travel amongst other things. Highway engineers would be involved in ensuring that any scheme minimises traffic congestion.
P/TC1/54	This is an exciting and innovative plan. The downgrading and reduction of the gyratory system would unfortunately present considerable traffic flow problems at peak times when the entire area is solid for much of the 'rush' already. If pedestrian crossing were possible without interrupting traffic flow, ie over or under passes? this would help. If the once-proposed link from Avenue Le Fleche just west of the river bridge to the roadway between Rowden surgery and the hospital was put in place this would allow the traffic that currently uses the gyratory to access the A4 west from the east side of the town to avoid the town centre entirely and traffic going from the A4 towards Calne as well of course. Without this link I suspect traffic flows will be non-optimal, to say the least. But the rest of the development looks interesting/	Support noted. The downgrading of the highway as proposed under Policy TC1 is considered to be instrumental in better integrating the town centre with adjoining western suburbs, both from an urban design and active travel perspective. It is appreciated that this may rely on a multi-pronged approach beyond the site itself and may include factors such as other roads being built e.g. Rawlings Green link road, southern bypass, A4 link to Avenue La Fleche etc., making it less desirable for through-traffic to use roads around the town centre and more attractive to use the A350, and encouraging greater use of active travel amongst other things. Highway engineers would be involved in ensuring that any scheme minimises traffic congestion. It is not considered that over or under passes would present a pleasant route for pedestrians/cyclists to negotiate the road system.
P/TC1/55	Convincing WCC to allow free parking in the town centre car parks for the first half hour or hour would do wonders for 'top up' shopping footfall.	It is not within the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan to set car parking charges.
P/TC1/56	This should be considered as urgent	Agreed.

P/TC1/57	Three and four storey buildings are not in keeping with the surrounding architecture.	<p>The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) on the Neighbourhood Plan found that 4 storey building(s) in Zone 1 could be justified because it may not necessarily be higher than surrounding buildings. This is because if a modern building were to be developed at 4 storeys in height in Zone 1 it would have a similar overall height to any 3 storey historic buildings in the surrounding area which have greater floor to ceiling height differences (for example the ground floor of Avonbridge House is 4m in height compared to a typical modern building which has a floor to ceiling height of 2.4m). In any case, any new building here would be of a detached/standalone nature not immediately seen in the context of nearby buildings. The overall height of any new building in this location would appear further reduced in context to neighbouring existing buildings on the western frontage of Bath Road/Ivy Lane which are already sited on raised ground approximately one storey higher than the ground level of Zone 1.</p> <p>The first bullet point under Zone 1 in Policy TC1 has been modified to reflect the outcome of the SEA's preferred approach, from: <i>'Built development up to 4 storeys in height'</i> to: <i>'Built development of 2-4 storeys in height and not to exceed the height of the tallest neighbouring building'</i></p> <p>This revised wording would also ensure that single storey development could not be built in Zone 1 which the SEA advised would harm the character and appearance of Chippenham Conservation Area, harm the setting of listed buildings, have an adverse impact on the streetscene given existing building heights are generally two storeys in the vicinity of the site, and would be an inefficient/low density use of a key brownfield site in the town centre.</p> <p>The revised addition of <i>'and not to exceed the height of the tallest neighbouring building'</i> would ensure that any new building in this location is not taller than its neighbours so it does not dominate the area.</p> <p>With regard to three storey building heights, principally relating to Zone 2, the SEA's preferred approach for Policy TC1 was to require 'at least' two storey development to be built along the frontage to Bath Road complementing existing building heights in the vicinity of the site, which are generally two storeys. As discussed earlier, given that any new buildings on the site would have lower floor to ceiling heights than most of the historic buildings in the vicinity of the site, a modern 3 storey building within Zone 2 would have a similar overall height to surrounding 2 storey buildings and would therefore appear in keeping with the surrounding area. The SEA notes that alternatively, a third storey could be incorporated in roof space to further</p>
P/TC1/58	We don't need any more large retail unit, office headquarters, hotel, or multi-storey public car parks in Chippenham! This area should be regenerated, but not with those sorts of buildings - we have lots of empty spaces already. Add affordable residential housing here - that (apparently according to WC) is what we're short of.	The scheme proposed for the site is based on the mix of viable uses suggested by the 'Market Assessment: Bridge Centre' Report by Cushman & Wakefield (2019) commissioned for Wiltshire Council. Affordable housing would be a suitable use to be accommodated as part of the scheme.
P/TC1/59	We recently had a storey car park built by the train station which is near enough town and not getting enough use, being vandalised and used by drug addicts. We don't need another one!	Noted. The opportunity exists to accommodate a multi-storey car park in Zone 1 should it be required, as informed by car park/traffic surveys.
P/TC1/60	Well for a start it shouldn't be a 'perk' for council staff.	Noted. The Town Council do not have free parking at this site.
P/TC1/61	Do something special, communal etc with it. Preferably not green wildlife based or we'll have dead animals on the roundabout which would be too awful to contemplate.	The proposals presented in Policy TC1 are for a mixed use scheme, which should provide benefits for a diversity of users. Public open space which improves biodiversity was considered to be an important element to incorporate in the scheme.
P/TC1/62	Bank House needs to be protected.	Bank House is a Grade II Listed Building. Policy TC1 requires that any new buildings in Zone 2 provide a significant gap to Bank House in order to respect the setting of this listed building.
P/TC1/63	And no ,we don't need to waste money on redesigning the roads. As per your catastrophic redesign of New Road!	The downgrading of the highway as proposed under Policy TC1 is considered to be instrumental in better integrating the town centre with adjoining western suburbs, both from an urban design and active travel perspective. The Town Council have not been, and will not be, involved in highway design.
P/TC1/64	You most certainly should not be discounting habits pre 2019, nor taking into account covid habits! You've wasted too much on trying to engineer people's behaviour - combining green and covid fantasies has to stop.	The COVID-19 pandemic has had significant long term effects on the way people use the town centre, along with other factors such as online shopping. It would be negligible to ignore these trends looking forward.
P/TC1/65	Who wouldn't agree with it but have been talking about this for years and still nothing has happened...except extra car parking for council employees.	Hence, why the Neighbourhood Plan is producing Policy TC1 and raising awareness of the need/putting pressure on Wiltshire Council for the site to be developed. The Town Council do not have free parking at this site.
P/TC1/66	Yes - very impressive, imaginative plan for what is currently an eyesore. Hope it doesn't get compromised too much as it progresses. It would work well with the developments at that end of town.	Support noted.
P/TC1/67	The demolition of building 13 The Bridge , Feature 9, page 90 is misleading as on figure 8.2 it only refers in the key as 'building to be demolished '	Figure 8.2 amended to include label '9'.



## Policy TC2 - River-Green Corridor Masterplan

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/TC2/1	All sounds brilliant. It's quite sad how little the river is used. Also many previous schemes were approved because of plans to have more use of the river, only for this to fall by the wayside after building work started. Borough Parade development plans is a good example of this. We mustn't make this mistake again. Also, what happened to the disabled access fishing station behind the Wiltshire Council office?	Support noted. It is understood that the fishing platform is now overgrown. The Town Council will investigate further, although the platform may not be DDA compliant now.
P/TC2/2	And need to minimise risk of flooding	Criterion E. of Policy TC2 amended to add reference to 'improving flood risk'.
P/TC2/3	Any deconstruction is energy intensive and thus rather counter productive, so this needs to be done with caution!	Noted. Policy SCC2 will require submission of details of embodied carbon from new development through its Sustainability Statement.
P/TC2/4	Best part of this is owned by a charity. Council need to step up & match them	It is not clear what the comment is requesting the Town Council to do through the Neighbourhood Plan.
P/TC2/5	Do something about foot path under the bridge. Too often deep in mud and hence breaking the otherwise almost continuous riverside route	Agreed. Criterion B of Policy TC2 requires exploring the possibility of re-routing or improving the Avon Path to limit the risk from flooding and provide year round access in the vicinity of Gladstone Road Bridge
P/TC2/6	Enhancing the wildlife and biodiversity on Monkton Park would be useful, it is an essential green space but the vast area of grass is of low value from wildlife, ecological and amenity viewpoints and large areas if mixed shrub and tree planting would be of value. <u>it would also save a fortune on mowing!</u>	The Town Council have produced the Monkton Park Management Plan, written in conjunction with Wiltshire Wildlife Trust. Biodiversity enhancements are set out in the Management Plan, and will be introduced over a five year period.
P/TC2/7	Especially getting rid of the Superdrug building! (And the block containing Revo while you are at it.)	Support noted for demolition of Superdrug building. The building which contains Rivo Lounge is considered to be less poor in terms of its architecture and context, and support for the demolition of this block is not proposed by the Neighbourhood Plan.
P/TC2/8	Especially retaining/ enhancing the Olympiad.	Support noted.
P/TC2/9	I am concerned about the threat posed by development close to the riverbank. It is an important area for birds nesting and the increased noise and disturbance could put this at risk , as well as disturbing other wildlife. Development near the riverbank will have a negative impact on green corridor biodiversity.	The areas closest to the riverbank are protected from inappropriate development by virtue of being located within the River Avon Strategic Green Corridor, Policy G13 of the Neighbourhood Plan. Text added to Paragraph 8.44 to clarify the retention of green open space on either side of the River (which falls within the River Avon Strategic Green Corridor identified under Neighbourhood Plan Policy G13) for its wildlife and biodiversity function. There is no reason to believe that wildlife would be adversely affected by development nearby. On the contrary, Policy TC2, seeks to enhance biodiversity along the River Avon Corridor.
P/TC2/10	I have grave misgivings about removing the weir -- I live in the flood plain and remember the floods which prompted its construction.	Noted. The Environment Agency will consult on any proposals to retain, remove or replace the weir in due course. The Steering Group believe that there may be benefits to biodiversity and visual amenity as a result of any future proposals <u>to remove or replace the weir.</u>
P/TC2/11	Also redeveloping thriving shopping areas will severely disadvantage those who rely on them.	The Steering Group do not believe Emery Gate Shopping Centre is a thriving shopping area because it turns its back on <u>the River and its architecture does not provide a quality experience for shoppers.</u>
P/TC2/12	I have lived in Chippenham for nearly 40 years, this has been talked about all that time! Cannot see it happening in my life time - <u>nice idea.</u>	The Town Council will implement those parts of Policy TC2 on land under its ownership and will positively encourage <u>other landowners to do the same on their land.</u>
P/TC2/13	I strongly support these suggestions, particularly all the green initiatives to increase biodiversity, but also the regeneration of the Olympiad for leisure and community uses.	Support noted.
P/TC2/14	I do not agree that Emery Gate Shopping centre should be regenerated unless you can make it a 'Retuna' style recycling mall: <a href="https://www.retuna.se/english/">https://www.retuna.se/english/</a>	The recycling mall suggested would be strongly supported by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. However, the end operator of any retail units/mall would be a commercial decision not falling within the remit of the planning regime. The Steering Group also consider that any improvements to Emery Gate Shopping Centre will improve the shopper and visitor experience to Chippenham and should be supported.
P/TC2/15	I think that the proposals about future development close to the river will really improve the centre of Chippenham	Support noted.
P/TC2/16	I would also like to see a bridge built over the river, linking the road next to Rowden surgery to avenue la flèche, as was originally proposed years ago. This would take traffic coming from Bath road to Pewsham and London road area, away from the town centre.	This would be a strategic highway project, led by Wiltshire Council as the Highways Authority, and outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.
P/TC2/17	If Gladstone Road river is such an important river location why did you build those dreadful buildings there? Which, I may add, you sneakily allowed them to go up a level they weren't initially going to. I know, I have to stare at them and can no longer see the sunset.	The Town Council were not involved in the development of buildings along Westmead Lane. This would have been the Local Planning Authority, Wiltshire Council. Notwithstanding, the Chippenham Conservation Area Character Appraisal (Annexe 3 of the Neighbourhood Plan) identifies these buildings as buildings of good townscape merit, and Bowles Court as a positive local landmark.
P/TC2/18	Emery Gate should be knocked down. It's awful, soulless, depressing place. Knock it down. Start again.	Agreed. Neighbourhood Plan Policy TC2 would support proposals for its redevelopment.
P/TC2/19	Improved access to the river can be made without too much redevelopment? Whoever designed the Emery Gate and should be recalled to rectify its back-turning deficiencies!	Improved access under Policy TC2 refers to improved walking or cycle routes and/or level access to the River at certain points, rather than development being built immediately adjacent to the River. Agreed that Emery Gate Shopping Centre <u>turning its back on the River represents poor urban design.</u>
P/TC2/20	Leave our environment alone protect green sites near town centres for enjoyment	Policy TC2 does not propose developing on any existing green space along the River Corridor. Text added to Paragraph 8.44 to clarify the retention of green open space on either side of the River (which falls within the River Avon Strategic Green Corridor identified under Neighbourhood Plan Policy G13) for its wildlife and biodiversity function.
P/TC2/21	More accessibility and use of the river will enhance the town centre	Support noted.

P/TC2/22	More info needed	The level of information in the Neighbourhood Plan for Policy TC2 is considered to be appropriate. It would be for future planning applications to provide a greater level of detail on any schemes which come forward.
P/TC2/23	No houses should be built within a mile of the river	It would not be reasonable to add such stringent criteria to Policy TC2. As long as new housing development is not built within Flood Zones 2 and 3, as required by national planning guidance, then there should be no demonstrable increase in flood risk.
P/TC2/24	No. The wilding of land behind the golf course is ludicrous within a Borough. A site for crime, fly tipping and bed mattresses. A recreation field similar to Westmead would be more appropriate.	Many people also enjoy this area because of its wilder nature, biodiversity, function as a green corridor and transition to the countryside. This is floodplain land and therefore flooding/waterlogging/drainage would likely be an issue that would prevent this from ever becoming a formal recreation ground.
P/TC2/25	Not sure-River should be protected and businesses which can make use of riverside regenerated (restaurants cafes)	This is what Policy TC2 seeks to secure.
P/TC2/26	One of Chippenham's greatest assets	Agreed.
P/TC2/27	Really agree that the river front has been wasted. The way Emery Gate backs on to Island Park or the way that houses were chosen to line the river front on the opposite side of the High Street many years ago.	Agreed.
P/TC2/28	I also think that some efforts should be made to restore or protect parts of the old bridge as it gave the heart of Chippenham a lot of character.	It is believed that the current Town Bridge is a modern structure that does not contain any remnants of the old Town Bridge. Whilst it is unlikely for such a major highway infrastructure project as replacement of the Town Bridge to occur within the Plan period, it cannot be completely ruled out particularly if either structural faults with the existing Bridge occur or Environment Agency proposals to replace the radial gate weir necessitate a new bridge in this location. Text added to Criterion H of Policy TC2 which supports the replacement of the current Town Bridge with a new bridge that would enhance the significance of Chippenham Conservation Area.
P/TC2/29	Redevelopment of the riverside area is key to putting Chippenham on the map. The site is close to the station and if this area was developed with quality bars and restaurants fronting the river people would flock to the town and the whole town centre would benefit.	Agreed.
P/TC2/30	The area between Wilkos/Emery Gate and the river provides the greatest opportunity to revitalize the town centre by opening up new retail and leisure frontages onto the river making very desirable area where people will want to be	Agreed, but within the confines of the existing built footprint, ie. not encroaching on to Monkton Park.
P/TC2/31	The policy relies on developer contributions to upgrade cycle access along the river and I disagree with further development. The new estates already in train are more than adequate to provide additional housing, along with any brown field sites available.	Noted, but developer contributions could also come for commercial development, such as the redevelopment of Emery Gate Shopping Centre.
P/TC2/32	I also disagree with the plan to remove access to Emery Gate from the High Street. The pinch point is an issue but this solution will just transfer the bottleneck to the roundabout at the war memorial or elsewhere.	The existing access into Emery Lane Shopping Centre via the Town Bridge was only ever meant to be a temporary solution. It currently creates a barrier between the High Street and Monkton Park/River Avon, and the public realm would be substantially improved without this. Any future redevelopment of Emery Gate Shopping Centre may result in uses which would decrease demand for vehicles to access the site, in which case one access into the site from Emery Lane could be suitable.
P/TC2/33	The river really is the gem in the crown. A careful balance of environmental protection and development of a few riverside cafes to bring people into the town	Agreed.
P/TC2/34	The river should be more regularly dredged and banks cleared of rubbish to encourage more wildlife	Comment referred to the Environment Agency.
P/TC2/35	There should not be any development on the river green corridor	Agreed. Policy TC2 and G13 prevent inappropriate development on the River Avon Strategic Green Corridor. Text added to Paragraph 8.44 to clarify the retention of green open space on either side of the River (which falls within the River Avon Strategic Green Corridor identified under Neighbourhood Plan Policy G13) for its wildlife and biodiversity function.
P/TC2/36	This doesn't really address the expected demise of the Tesco anchor store and potential for redevelopment at first floor level for alternative uses.	Emery Gate Shopping Centre has new owners. They are still in the process of determining their plans for the Centre and therefore the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group have not been privy to any future plans/ideas that the new owners might have.
P/TC2/37	This might work but not holding my breath over it!	Noted.
P/TC2/38	This needs to be amended to include the vacant office buildings on the north bank of the river opposite the Emery gate development. This is a further waste of river frontage that could be developed to a cafes, bars and individual retail development.	The Steering Group discussed this comment at some length and concluded that it was not necessary to add specific proposals for the north bank of the River in this location, because the design principles I-M listed in Policy TC2 would ensure that any new buildings/development or re-use of office space would be required to be of the highest quality design where frontages face on to the River.
P/TC2/39	Further to this, the social housing behind Superdrug is poorly placed	Policy TC2 is not proposing to relocate this social housing, which allows choice for occupants to live in the town centre and ensures that a mix of uses in the town centre prevails., which is key to its long term success.
P/TC2/40	We should make far greater use of the natural amenity that the extensive river frontage brings to the town.	Agreed.
P/TC2/41	We support most of this policy. We have some concern that large green open spaces such as Monkton Park may have a much greater 'recreational' function forced on them. Any increase in that and in bringing the green corridor into the town centre should be very carefully balanced so that the special character of these spaces is not lost.	Support noted. Policy G13 protects Monkton Park from inappropriate development because it is located within the River Avon Strategic Green Corridor. Text added to Paragraph 8.44 to clarify the retention of green open space on either side of the River (which falls within the River Avon Strategic Green Corridor identified under Neighbourhood Plan Policy G13) for its wildlife and biodiversity function.
P/TC2/42	Yes the river needs to be used as a feature for walks and leisure activities. It's a beautiful feature	Support noted.

### Policy TC3 - Public Realm Improvements to Upper Market Place

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/TC3/1	Changes at the war memorial area is not best and waste of monies.	Disagree. It is considered a cost effective scheme to implement because of the many and varied opportunities it would bring about, such as increased footfall for businesses, new public square, enhancement of setting of heritage assets, pedestrian friendly environment etc.
P/TC3/2	Again, stop with your walking and cycling. People don't want to cycle with their shopping. Stop it.	Disagree. Active travel is important for healthy lifestyles and to help combat climate change and should be encouraged.
P/TC3/3	But do not be too prescriptive at this stage	It is not considered that Policy TC3 is too prescriptive and allows for flexibility.
P/TC3/4	But less of a priority to other town centre improvements	Noted.
P/TC3/5	Can't see any major development in that area that would finance it. This should be done by the local authority	Agreed. It is intended that works would be publicly funded e.g. by Wiltshire Council, the Town Council, government grants/funding, or a combination.
P/TC3/6	Crossing the road can be difficult round here and this plan looks a great improvement.	Support noted.
P/TC3/7	Do it	Support noted.
P/TC3/8	Do not agree with Area 4 in current form as this will make the church inaccessible to many of the elderly people who use it.	Reference to removal of vehicular access deleted under Area 4 of Policy TC3 to allow for access to the parking area immediately located in front of St. Andrews Church, but reference retained to the removal of inefficient parking spaces on the public highway and replacement of tarmacadam with stone pavements which would benefit the setting of the Church and enhance the significance of Chippenham Conservation Area.
P/TC3/9	Would like to see a plain English version of Area 1.	It is not considered possible to simplify the language regarding Area 1 further, without there being a detrimental change in its meaning/purpose.
P/TC3/10	What exactly is a shared space. Would also like to see a reduced speed limit as part of the shared space especially if this involves removing pavements.	Explanatory box added to explain what is meant by shared space. It is likely that a reduced speed limit would form part of any shared spaces proposals.
P/TC3/11	Especially keeping pedestrian focused and well connected by bike and foot. And trees for landscape and shading.	Support noted.
P/TC3/12	Fully support the segregated cycle path in this proposal	Support noted for segregated cycle path.
P/TC3/13	I am concerned with respect to access to St Andrew's church. As far as I could see section 4 was to be restricted access for vehicles. It is already difficult for those who cannot walk to get to worship, and would become impossible for Messers Jones to carry out funeral activities.	Reference to removal of vehicular access deleted under Area 4 of Policy TC3 to allow for access to parking area immediately located in front of St. Andrews Church, but reference retained to the removal of inefficient parking spaces on the public highway and replacement of tarmacadam with stone pavements which would benefit the setting of the Church and enhance the significance of Chippenham Conservation Area.  The proposals under TC3 would unlikely affect F W Jones & Son at No. 30 Market Place as no car parking spaces are proposed to be removed in front of this building/on the eastern side of the Market Place.
P/TC3/14	I really like the proposals, as long as they don't interfere with bus access to the bus station.	Support noted. There are no plans for development around the bus station.

P/TC3/15	I understand the idea of this policy, but think it has been poorly thought through. As with Bridge Centre I don't believe that 'Shared Space' is fully understood, or poor advice has been provided. It is not some poor quality 'enhanced street' which is still vehicle dominated, and also will not work with two sperate short sections. How will it cope with significant through traffic to Tesco car park? The scheme needs to be connected, and extended to connect with High Street which would need to be permanently closed to through traffic, and allow cycle access. Why do you need a segregated cycle path when there is 'Shared Space' it defeats the object, as it not 'shared'. See CIHT document Creating better streets: Inclusive and accessible places for useful advice.	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group reviewed 'Creating Better Streets: Inclusive and Accessible Places - Reviewing shared space, Chartered Institute of Highways &amp; Transportation (CIHT), 2018' in formulating Policy TC3, and it is cited In Paragraph 8.50 which refers to the different types of shared space. It is not possible for the Neighbourhood Plan to prescribe which type of shared space may work best in the Upper Market Place without a detailed feasibility study being carried out by transport consultants taking into account current traffic flows (as referred to in Paragraph 8.50). However, the Steering Group discussed this comment at some length and agree that shared space is unlikely to work best in the two short separate sections shown on Figure 8.4 and have therefore amended Figure 8.4 to increase the extent of Area 1 so that this covers the whole of the Upper Market Place and roundabout junction. It is considered that this would work better from both a highway safety point of view and from a visual/public realm perspective. Text for Area 1 of Policy TC3 also amended to refer to '<i>downgrading of highway</i>'.</p> <p>An explanatory box has been added to the supporting text to define what is meant by shared space and clarify that there are different types of space.</p> <p>The significant traffic flow through to Tesco, referred to in this comment, is not a future given, and may change in any future redevelopment of Emery Gate Shopping Centre.</p> <p>The Steering Group support the closure of the High Street to through traffic, but this is not something which requires planning permission and therefore does not fall under the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. The issue needs to be considered by the Local Highway Authority because it would have much wider implications on the local traffic network. For these reasons it is not considered feasible or viable to extend public realm improvements beyond the Upper Market Place to connect to the High Street. If the public realm improvements at the Upper Market Place are successful it may be possible to extend them to connect to the High Street at a later date.</p> <p>The Steering Group discussed at some length the suitability of a segregated cycle path running through shared space and agreed that this would unlikely work. Reference to introduction of a segregated cycle path under Feature 7 of Policy TC3 removed and text amended to: '<i>Improved cycle route as part of a wider cycle loop connecting the Market Place with The Causeway, Burlands Road, Wood Lane and Timber Street. Improvements will depend on the type of shared space proposed and options for implementing segregated cycle paths outside of the shared space and linking these to existing or future cycle paths will be explored</i>'.</p>
P/TC3/16	I wonder how this would work practically but really interested to see what could happen in that area. Whilst it's useful to drive through that area sometimes, it's not completely necessary most of the time especially with (hopefully) more relief roads improving traffic in the town centre.	It is envisaged that this scheme would be developed through public funding e.g. Wiltshire Council, Chippenham Town Council., government funding/grants or a combination of all. Noted that there needs to be a holistic approach taken by the Local Highways Authority with regard to traffic flows in and around the town centre, dependent, or not, on relief road schemes and encouragement of active travel.
P/TC3/17	lovely idea to create a space around the war memorial	Support noted.
P/TC3/18	Market Place is beautiful and these proposals will improve it. St Andrews Church grounds are lovely, WITH THE EXEPTION OF THE BACK OF ONE STOP. HOW WAS THAT ALLOWED IN SUCH A BEAUTIFUL SPACE!!!!	Support noted. The Chippenham Conservation Area Character Appraisal (Annexe 3 of the Neighbourhood Plan) records that No. 28-29 Market Place forms a negative landmark in the Conservation Area and that there are negative views of the rear of this building from the grounds of the Church. Should opportunities arise in the future to redevelop this area/building the Appraisal will be important as an evidence base.
P/TC3/19	More out of town shopping centres where parking is free	It would be very harmful to the vitality and viability of the town centre if more out-of -town shopping centres are granted in the future. The Steering Group recognise that town centre car parking charges can affect footfall in the centre, but it is not within the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan to set parking charges.
P/TC3/20	Need to ensure disabled parking spaces are not reduced in this part of town	Agreed. The existing number of car parking spaces in front of St. Andrew's Church is one disabled parking space, whilst located off the access road adjacent to the Market Place are 12 spaces, with two of these being disabled car parking spaces. There would be a net loss of five car parking spaces overall as a result of the relocation of eight car parking spaces to Area 3. However, the number of disabled car parking spaces needs to remain the same as existing, and text added to the description of Area 3 in Policy TC3 to explain this.
P/TC3/21	Need to ensure that car access is retained for St Marys and Ladds Lane. Also look at the state of the road surfaces in this area, it's eye sore.	Car access would be retained for St. Mary St. and Ladds Lane. Comment about road surfaces referred to the Local Highways Authority.
P/TC3/22	Never read this bit as losing will to live!	Noted.
P/TC3/23	Not sure but again would welcome regeneration of the area-making it a vibrant, welcoming space for the future	It is envisaged that the proposals under Policy TC3 would make for a vibrant, welcoming space for the future.
P/TC3/24	Possibly the highlight of the plan!	Support noted.
P/TC3/25	The area needs to be cobbled or set completely with natural stone. More trees to be planted, attractive lighting introduced and more public benches. Again a ranger or warden(s) should be regularly patrolling this area day and night and provided with housing close by to overlook it.	Policy TC3 proposes to re-surface the area with natural stone paviours or similar and to plant new trees in the space. It is the intention for the new public square to incorporate new sensitive and efficient lighting, landscaping and public realm features such as benches, litter bins etc. and the details of this would be worked up for a future planning submission or masterplan. If the public realm is well designed it should not require a ranger or warden to patrol it. The Neighbourhood Plan is not proposing to provide new housing to overlook the square.
P/TC3/26	The many historic buildings need restoration and repair. Adding a green space is a good idea	Support noted.

P/TC3/27	There are a number of empty derelict buildings, including the Bear Hotel, which make the area feel very run-down. I am not sure the policy addresses this.	Agreed that this area of the town centre has been neglected for many years and requires investment to halt its decline. The Neighbourhood Plan does not have the necessary tools to fill empty/derelict buildings. The Plan can only provide planning policies for any future development which requires a planning application. However, it is hoped that the public realm improvements proposed under Policy TC3 would improve the area's attractiveness to businesses and other town centre uses, and positively address the issues of derelict/run-down buildings in this way.
P/TC3/28	This development can't come too soon, in my opinion!	Support noted.
P/TC3/29	This historic quarter of our town should be cherished. If we want to attract visitors we need to have something to show them. This should be the high end of the town, at present it is a down at heel, car park for betting shop users.	Agreed. It is considered that the proposals under Policy TC3 would help to restore this historic quarter.
P/TC3/30	This seems I'll conceived and does not address access at this side of town for those who have to drive to access services like the Post Office. Footfall has dropped in the area and could see a reduction in commercial viability for a number of businesses.	The proposals would not prevent vehicular access to the Post Office area side of the town centre, but they would make active travel to this area easier from the south. One of the reasons why footfall has dropped in the Upper Market Place is that the public realm is poor. Investment in the public realm, as proposed under Policy TC3, would help to ensure businesses remain viable and that this part of the town centre better connects into the High Street through a series of high quality public spaces.
P/TC3/31	How has the term inefficient been established for area 2?	The existing car park spaces in Area 2 are deemed to be inefficient because of their angled nature which takes up more space than standard right angled spaces. Informal evidence over the years points to the reduction in traffic using the Market Place road, and the overly engineered Post-War highway changes in the Upper Market Place, (which comprises of an unnecessary vehicular access road to access 12 car parking spaces and places the needs of traffic over the needs of pedestrians and cyclists) is an inefficient use of land and not of a suitable design to meet the future needs of motorists, pedestrians and cyclists.
P/TC3/32	Shared space - does this not put pedestrians into conflict with traffic especially 55 and 33 buses?	Shared space does not have to put pedestrians into conflict with vehicles or buses if it is well designed and appropriate to the local context and traffic demand/needs. Paragraph 8.50 recommends carrying out a feasibility study to inform the type of shared space that might be suitable in this locality. An explanatory box has been added to better explain the concept of shared space. It is envisaged that buses and other public transport would still be able to use shared space roads running through the area.
P/TC3/33	You are cutting off one of the few remaining free parking areas in the town, this will kill the town more than anything as popping in to grab something will become impossible. Stop with the parking greed	It is not considered that the overall loss of five short-stay car parking spaces in this area would have a detrimental impact on the viability and vitality of the town centre. It is hoped that the public realm improvements and active travel improvements proposed under Policy TC3 would actually encourage and support shoppers to use this area more.

## Policy TC4 - Development in Chippenham Conservation Area

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/TC4/1	Development needs to plan for future uses.	New paragraph added after 8.60 containing new bullet point to refer to development needing to be designed to be <i>'suitable for the use it contains and can be easily adapted to accommodate future uses'</i>
P/TC4/2	Commercial bin storage in Chapel Lane is an issue.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot control an existing issue. Its remit is to guide future development which requires planning permission. Design advice on bin storage is provided in the Chippenham Design Guide (Paragraph 67).
P/TC4/3	Do not understand it.	Text has been simplified where possible, but unfortunately it is not possible to simplify some of the technical language whilst still ensuring that the policy remains 'fit for purpose' in its application by planners and developers.
P/TC4/4	Ensure road access to St Marys Road and Ladds lane, but look at the road surface. Maybe cobbles, and 10 mph speed limit with pedestrians having right of way.	Policy TC4 is not proposing any changes to the road access to St. Mary Street and Ladd's Lane. Whilst the Steering Group agree with the suggested enhancement proposal for this area, it may not require planning permission. It would also be too detailed for Policy TC4 and would unnecessarily replicate the enhancement proposals for this area already set out in the Chippenham Conservation Area Management Plan SPG (2010).
P/TC4/5	High Quality Design' is too vague a term. What exactly is it, who determines compliance with it, who redresses failures, and how are those failure effected and in what time-scale?	New paragraph added after 8.60 including bullets to define the different elements of high quality design which make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. Unfortunately, the planning system does not post-monitor/determine compliance of approved plans versus what is actually built on site.
P/TC4/6	How to make this so it has actual effect, when we have seen a multi-storey carpark erected in the Monkton Park/ Railway Station conservation area in recent years - taking no notice of it whatsoever.	It is hoped that by making the Conservation Area Appraisal part of the Development Plan this will help to ensure that much more weight is attached to this document in reaching future planning decisions.
P/TC4/7	It needs to be followed	Noted.
P/TC4/8	Let's start by pulling everything down with a flat roof and building in-line with existing heritage....	This approach would be too simplistic as some flat roofed buildings now have architectural or historic significance and make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area. Diversity and interest in the historic environment is important.
P/TC4/9	New buildings should be either amazing contemporary in design or reflect the design and style of existing properties.	Agreed. New paragraph added after 8.60 including bullets to define the different elements of high quality design which make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness, one of which is architecture to be achieved through either traditional or contemporary architecture, but referencing that where contemporary architecture is chosen, the form and/or materials and/or architectural features of the local vernacular should be embedded into the design.
P/TC4/10	No development of conservation areas, only maintenance and increasing biodiversity	Planning legislation does not allow for no development to occur within a conservation area, and some developments can actually enhance the character and appearance of a conservation area. New criterion a) of Policy TC4 requires new <u>development to preserve or enhance Chippenham Conservation Area.</u>
P/TC4/11	Past mistakes by the council means a lot of historic buildings have been lost, more should not be lost ever!!	Agreed. Criterion b) of Policy TC4 refers to the retention of heritage assets which make a positive contribution to the <u>character and appearance of Chippenham Conservation Area.</u>
P/TC4/12	Very important policy as Chippenham has many heritage assets which have been undervalued in the past.	Agreed. Criterion b) of Policy TC4 refers to the retention of heritage assets which make a positive contribution to the <u>character and appearance of Chippenham Conservation Area.</u>
P/TC4/13	Very important to me. There are some lovely buildings in Chippenham but it doesn't feel as cherished as other local towns.	It is hoped that by having Policy TC4 and producing an updated Conservation Area Appraisal, which will form part of the Development Plan, this will help to ensure that much more weight is attached to preserving or enhancing the <u>Conservation Area and heritage assets in reaching future planning decisions.</u>
P/TC4/14	Why is the old Chippenham College building being pulled down when this is one of the most distinctive attractive buildings? It could be converted to flats within the existing shell again we have these aims but when it comes to proposals the aims are shelved :(	This building is considered to be worthy by the Steering Group of being listed as a Building of Local Merit in Policy TC5 and is noted in the Conservation Area Appraisal as being one of the finest buildings in this particular character area. The Town Council supported the retention of this building and objected to planning application PL/2022/03760 which proposed to demolish the building. The application was subsequently refused by Wiltshire Council.
P/TC4/15	Yes Chippenham needs to draw on heritage much more and restore some of the key architectural elements	It is hoped that by having Policy TC4 and producing an updated Conservation Area Appraisal, which will form part of the Development Plan, this will help to ensure that much more weight is attached to preserving or enhancing the <u>Conservation Area and heritage assets in reaching future planning decisions.</u>

## Policy TC5 - Buildings of Local Merit

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/TC5/1	But re (d) Wilkos - only the historic High St frontage should be preserved - not the building behind it.	<p>The building is experienced as a single entity from the inside, and for some it may not be obvious from the outside either that there is an original front section and larger, later rear section. It would be too complicated for the purposes of TC5 to dissect the building into 'locally listed' and 'non locally listed' sections. For this reason the whole of the building is proposed as a Building of Local Merit.</p> <p>However, as set out in the Buildings of Local Merit Topic Paper (Appendix 16) it is entirely accepted that only the original front section of the building is of merit and worthy of retention, with its distinctive and unusual upper façade. The Steering Group would have no 'in principle' objection to the removal of the rear section of the building - a modern steel framed shed which has a very poor relationship with Island Park.</p>
P/TC5/2	Extremely important.	Support noted.
P/TC5/3	I feel most of the suggested buildings are of poor quality and the designation may prevent the overall improvements sought.	It is disagreed that the suggested buildings are of poor quality. For a full justification as to why the Steering Group considered each building has heritage significance please refer to Appendix 16 - Buildings of Local Merit Topic Paper. It is not understood how designation might prevent overall improvements being sought.
P/TC5/4	I think you might be a bit late to save the old college. What powers will the town council have to implement all these fine policies? If developers sense profit, a policy will not help without legal backing. Especially if Wiltshire Council has a conflicting policy of imposing a huge housing allocation.	<p>Planning Application PL/2022/03760 for demolition of this building and redevelopment of the site was refused by Wiltshire Council in Feb 2023, one of the reasons for refusal citing the harm that would be caused as a result of the demolition of the heritage asset.</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority will be legally obliged to consider policies in the Neighbourhood Plan when determining planning applications, once it becomes adopted as part of the Development Plan for Chippenham. The Town Council will ensure that it monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of its policies, but it does not have the power to implement the policies per se. This lies with the Local Planning Authority.</p>
P/TC5/5	Look after our heritage. Properly.	Policy TC5 will play a part in the conservation of the historic environment.
P/TC5/6	Our towns appearance isn't a good one. It needs all the help it can get!	Support noted.
P/TC5/7	Please save the old Chippenham College building as it is a historic building and the proposal for flats is another concrete monolith	Support noted for the designation of the Former Technical & Secondary School as a Building of Local Merit. An application for its demolition and redevelopment of the site was refused by Wiltshire Council in February 2023, one of the reasons for refusal citing the harm that would be caused as a result of the demolition of the heritage asset.
P/TC5/8	There will be many other buildings of merit. If development is constrained pressure is made infilling and backland developments.	The Steering Group is satisfied that the buildings it is proposing are the main Buildings of Local Merit in the town. Following consultation with the Civic Society and wider public no additional suggestions have been made. The designation of a dozen buildings, as proposed, would have a negligible effect on development pressures in the town.
P/TC5/9	They should be reclassified as important heritage assets.	Policy TC5 has to work within the legal planning definitions which govern the historic environment, where these buildings must be defined as 'non-designated heritage assets'. The Steering Group considers that 'Buildings of Local Merit' most accurately defines their status and local interest.
P/TC5/10	Yes please protect the old buildings that gave Chippenham its character. Please restore old buildings and make use of ones going into disrepair. Please encourage new building planners not to build square boxes with no character (see Westinghouse site) just because they are cheap.	Support noted.
P/TC5/11	But such a shame about the old college building. It would have made a great community centre.	Support noted for the designation of the Former Technical & Secondary School as a Building of Local Merit. An application for its demolition and redevelopment of the site was refused by Wiltshire Council in February 2023, one of the reasons for refusal citing the harm that would be caused as a result of the demolition of the heritage asset.
P/TC5/12	Yes but again buildings are recognised but will they be protected. The Technical College building on Cocklebury Road is still at high risk yet it has again been recognised as important historically and aesthetically. We must protect this building. After all, it was built with public money and charitable donations. An art centre would be ideal as there is a growing arts scene in the town and as a mid point between the Heritage Centre and town, it's perfect for still having an educational purpose as was intended	Support noted for the designation of the Former Technical & Secondary School as a Building of Local Merit. An application for its demolition and redevelopment of the site was refused by Wiltshire Council in February 2023, one of the reasons for refusal citing the harm that would be caused as a result of the demolition of the heritage asset.
P/TC5/13	Some items written in the plan have irreversibly changed since 2019, ie the planned redevelopment of the former Chippenham College site, is now going to be retirement homes, with research dedicating pages to the idea of retirement homes, with a lower than average demographic of those over 44. The building was referred to as a Non-designated historical asset on page 107	An application for the demolition of this building and redevelopment of the site was refused by Wiltshire Council in February 2023, one of the reasons for refusal citing the harm that would be caused as a result of the demolition of the heritage asset.

## Policy TC6 - Design of Shopfronts and Advertisements

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/TC6/1	A splendid example of a much-needed document. Trowbridge has much to learn from this!	Support noted.
P/TC6/2	Good idea	Support noted.
P/TC6/3	I have been impressed by Frome shop fronts, where even empty shops have been well maintained.	Noted. Comment referred to the Town Council's Head of Community Development to explore how Frome are maintaining empty shops in order to see if the Town Council can assist in the process in any way.
P/TC6/4	It would be good if you could also retrospectively ask shops to amend their shopfronts to a more appropriate design, in keeping with the historical nature of the town. Unsightly shopfronts change the feel of the town centre to it's detriment. Difficult to do, I know, but it could have a big impact on making Chippenham a nicer place to shop in.	As the comment correctly recognises, the Neighbourhood Plan policy can only be applied to new development requiring planning permission. However, it is envisaged that once the Neighbourhood Plan has been 'made' the Town Council can do some promotional work with shop owners around the Shopfront Design Guide to raise awareness of it, and the requirements for planning/advertisement consent.
P/TC6/5	Limits innovation and progressive development.	It is not clear how Policy TC6 would limit innovation/progressive development. Policy TC6 can help to improve the visual amenity of the town centre and the appearance of Chippenham Conservation Area/listed buildings.
P/TC6/6	Lower rent then we won't have empty shops	It is not within the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan/Town Council to be able to lower rent.
P/TC6/7	Shop front design should definitely be controlled. I would even go as far as to say current occupiers should be made to restore back to original (pre 1960's at least) designs, allowing for accessibility of course.	Support noted. Policy TC6 can only be applied to new development requiring planning permission and therefore current occupiers can only be encouraged, rather than required, to restore back to original shopfront designs. However, it is envisaged that once the Neighbourhood Plan has been 'made' the Town Council can do some promotional work with shop owners around the Shopfront Design Guide to raise awareness of it, and the requirements for planning/advertisement consent.
P/TC6/8	Shopfront design needs to be more prescriptive	The Shopfront Design Guide, to which Policy TC6 relates, gives detailed guidance on the design of new shopfronts and advertisements, at a level of prescriptiveness which is considered to be consistent with other shopfront design guides produced.
P/TC6/9	Shopfronts may need to adapt to all future uses. Maintenance and enforcement is also required, - empty units etc.	Agreed. However, it may be appropriate to retain historic shopfront features even if the use has changed e.g. residential uses in order to preserve the character or appearance of Chippenham Conservation Area/listed buildings. Policy TC6 can only be applied to new development requiring planning permission. The responsibility of maintenance and enforcement are with landlords and the LPA respectively.
P/TC6/10	Shopfronts which are not in keeping with the building in which they are situated should be removed and replaced.	It would only be possible to remove a shopfront if it was unlawful and did not have the appropriate planning consent. This could not be done through the Neighbourhood Plan, rather through the LPA's enforcement powers.
P/TC6/11	So many lovely buildings hidden by plastic facias. The town could look so much more attractive.	Agreed.
P/TC6/12	Think this would also be great! Just hope there will be support for the independents and that this wont be an additional hurdle for them	Support noted. The LPA would apply Policy TC6 to all new shopfronts/advertisements which require planning permission, irrespective of the business type/size.
P/TC6/13	Too late for the tat in the High Street; can anything be done to get shops to change what is there now?	Policy TC6 can only be applied to new development requiring planning permission and therefore it would not be possible to require current occupiers to change what is there now. However, it is envisaged that once the Neighbourhood Plan has been 'made' the Town Council can do some promotional work with shop owners around the Shopfront Design Guide to raise awareness of it, and the requirements for planning/advertisement consent.
P/TC6/14	We support the principle of this policy. However, Chippenham Town Council should seriously question its own track record in relation to advertisements. Notorious (past and present) examples include the crass banners and signs advertising the Town Hall and the Museum, and also the unlawful posters, banners and flyposting by people/organisations hiring the Neeld Hall and other Town Council facilities. Nobody wants to see plastic banners and tacky posters on lamp columns advertising events or activities. If the Town Council cleans up its own act it may impose similar standards on shopfront designs and advertisements in Chippenham.	Support noted. With regard to permanent signage on Town Council buildings, it is considered that this is both appropriate and sensitive to the architecture and scale of host buildings, given these public buildings do need to be identifiable to visitors. With regard to temporary advertisements under control of the Town Council this comment will be referred to the Director of Community Services at the Town Council for further review/consideration. The Town Council currently writes into its contracts, with organisations which hire its buildings, that they must not flypost about events. The Town Council's Environmental Services Team routinely remove items that are flyposted in the public realm as part of its street cleaning remit.
P/TC6/15	Yes but again do not be too prescriptive	The Shopfront Design Guide, to which Policy TC6 relates, gives detailed guidance on the design of new shopfronts and advertisements, at a level of prescriptiveness which is considered to be consistent with other shopfront design guides produced.
P/TC6/16	Yes, make shops do better. Stop allowing dreadful shops in to town. Lower rates. Get a better class of shop.	The LPA, as opposed to the Town Council, determines shopfronts requiring planning permission in Chippenham. Policy TC6 in the Neighbourhood Plan would assist decision makers them in achieving high quality design. It is beyond the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan/Town Council to lower business rates or seek to influence/restrict competition in the commercial sector.
P/TC6/17	Yes, make shop fronts have a responsibility to be sympathetic. Or rather, just classy. Look at places like Malmesbury, Marlborough, Devizes, Bath etc.	Support noted.
P/TC6/18	Yes some shop fronts distract from the beautiful buildings on high street	Support noted.



P/TCS/	Re instate traditional style shop windows and facia in keeping with the original style of the building. No stone rooves should be removed but restored. Funds to be found to support responsible landlords and fines for properties left empty, with rent caps for retail premises.	The Shopfront Design Guide advises that replacement shopfront features should be in keeping with the architecture of the host building. It is beyond the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan/Town Council to lower business rates or seek to influence/restrict competition in the commercial sector.
--------	---	---

## Policy T1 - Provision and Enhancement of Cycle Paths

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/T1/1	A greater emphasis on promoting active travel to schools would be good to see. All schools should be accessible by dedicated cycle lanes.	Promoting active travel to schools maybe something which the Town Council's Climate and Ecological Emergency Advisory Group (CEEAG) are interested in picking up. Comment referred. Ideally yes all schools should be accessible by dedicated cycle lanes, but this is unlikely to be technically feasible. The Chippenham Cycle Network Development Group may have some ideas/info on how the current cycle network could be better adapted to realise this aspect.
P/T1/2	Agree up to a point. But experience in London has shown that if not carefully researched these can be under-utilised and increase traffic congestion	Noted. It is hoped that technical input from the local highways authority would avoid a situation where this was the case.
P/T1/3	All I think of is how hated the cycle route was along Bristol Road, it was plain wrong. The traffic lights installed in town has seriously angered town drivers, you need to be very careful how future cycle routes are chosen. Motorists in this town are extremely bitter and very angry.	Noted. The cycle path scheme along Bristol Road was installed by the local highways authority as a temporary measure during the COVID-19 pandemic, but it failed due to a number of factors including design, lack of permanent funding and lack of local consultation.
P/T1/4	Also need more enhancement of cycle paths within the centre of Chippenham	Noted. Many of the high priority improvement schemes suggested in Policy T1 are town centre based.
P/T1/5	As a regular cyclist this is very welcome news! I don't currently feel safe on our roads.	Support noted.
P/T1/6	As long as they are put in the right place! Wiltshire Council should not be allowed to decide again.	Noted.
P/T1/7	But you also need excellent secure cycle parking facilities or people just won't bother.	Policy T1 is about the provision and enhancement of cycle paths so it is not considered applicable to refer to cycle parking standards under this policy. Instead, paragraphs 62 and 69 of the Chippenham Design Guide require safe cycle storage in new residential development and commercial development accordingly. The Local Transport Plan already sets out cycle parking standards for new development and this is likely to be reviewed in the emerging Local Transport Plan with accompanying evidence base.
P/T1/8	Chippenham is a dreadful place to cycle (with a few notable exceptions) and the recent ill thought out attempts have been a disaster. However, given the layout of the town centre is difficult to see how this could be improved much without banning cars!!!	Policy T1 attempts to improve the cycle network in Chippenham by setting out high priority improvements, some of which are located within the town centre.
P/T1/9	Climate emergency dictates the need for active travel - along with the public health and wellbeing benefits of cycling. Cycling needs to be safe and enjoyable for uptake to improve for all ages.	Agree. Improving the quality of the cycle network, as Policy T1 seeks to do, will ensure greater use of the network.
P/T1/10	Cycling has to be made an easy, quick and safe (and safe feeling) option. This needs direct cycling routes with good surfaces, no obstructions and few give ways.	Agree. Improving the quality of the cycle network, as Policy T1 seeks to do, will ensure greater use of the network.
P/T1/11	Will the Calne cycle path be surfaced? Some of it falls within the area of the scope of the plan.	Wiltshire Council own from the viewing bridge over the River Avon eastwards halfway along that section then it is multiple land owners to Calne. Under a service level agreement with Wiltshire Council the Town Council undertake the maintenance of grass and hedge cutting and minor pot hole repairs, but the Town Council are not responsible for wholesale resurfacing. Comment referred to Wiltshire Council.
P/T1/12	Cyclists don't use cycle paths available, and instead stay on the road, so don't waste time/ money as won't be used.	Whilst no specific examples are listed, there may be reasons why certain cycle paths are not being used in preference to the road due to broken/poor links etc. which may have been picked up the Chippenham Cycle Network Development Group in their high priority improvement schemes and which form a basis for Policy T1.
P/T1/13	Don't waste like the cycle lane put in and then removed	These were schemes installed by the local highways authority as a temporary measure during the COVID-19 pandemic, but largely failed due to a number of factors including design, lack of permanent funding and lack of local consultation.
P/T1/14	Existing estates need better cycle connections - around A4 Pewsham Way.	The Cycle Network Development Group have reviewed the list of improvements required to the cycle network in and around the A4 Pewsham Way and have moved the following to the 'high priority improvements list' - Table 9.2/Appendix 22: - Improvement Ref. Nos. 19 + 27 – London Road (part of LCWIP - one of the high-priority schemes) - Improvement Ref. Nos. 20 + 21a + 21b + 21c – Pewsham arterial roads (part of LCWIP) - Improvement Ref. Nos. 22 + 24 (Crossings on Pewsham Way).
P/T1/15	Considering all weather surfaces.	Policy T1 has been amended to require adherence to the design principles in LTN 1/20, one of which is 'Cycle routes should be surfaced in smooth bound materials that are unaffected by weather and are well-maintained at all times of year' (Table 4-1).
P/T1/16	E-Bike charging and repair stations.	Whilst a bonus to have, it is not considered high priority infrastructure by the Neighbourhood Plan at the current time given that most e-bikes are of a short-trip nature and can be easily charged/repared at home.
P/T1/17	Far too much focus has been put into this in recent years and a lot of money wasted. How about investing in an electric scooter scheme instead. Please be bold	Noted, although active travel actually increased as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Paragraph 9.3 does refer to e-scooters, but it is too early to tell whether this new form of transport will easily and successfully scale up (or down) from cities to towns and become popular.
P/T1/18	Generally cycle networks are poorly used and become a maintenance overhead. Recent changes to highway code, have reset the priority, and although some segregation on major routes may be beneficial, a myriad of small connectors through urban settings is unnecessary	Improving the quality of the cycle network, as Policy T1 seeks to do, will ensure greater use of the network.

P/T1/19	I agree with the proposals. I think cycling will become more popular in future, established especially e-bikes which given the lack of affordable electric city cars on the market (plenty of expensive SUVs), e-bikes offer an affordable alternative for short trips.	Support noted. Agree.
P/T1/20	I suggest removing 'where appropriate' to remove wriggle room for developers. All major developments need cycle schemes as standard.	It may be unreasonable and unviable for a major development scheme at the smaller scale end, say for example 10 dwellings, to be required to produce a cycling scheme that is LTN 1/20 compliant. Therefore the wording of the first sentence of Policy T1 has been amended to be clearer: <i>'Cycling schemes shall be prepared for all large scale major development proposals, and the majority of major development proposals.'</i>
P/T1/21	should link to the existing town cycle network' ought to say 'must link to' - again to remove wriggle room.	Wording in second paragraph strengthened from 'should' to 'need to' in line with suggestion.
P/T1/22	I used to cycle to school, but I think this is no longer the case. I think liaison with schools to promote cycling and walking should be an important part of the plan.	Promoting active travel to schools maybe something which the Town Council's Climate and Ecological Emergency Advisory Group (CEEAG) are interested in picking up. Comment referred.
P/T1/23	I would like to see all types of transport working together on the roads.	Agree.
P/T1/24	Largely agree but stop with the stupid routes like Easton lane. I've cycled for years and it doesn't need to be a cycle lane only	Making traffic-free cycle routes, like Easton Lane, will create a safer environment for people cycling and only help to encourage greater numbers of people to cycle.
P/T1/25	Leave our original cycle path	It is not known which cycle path this comment is referring to.
P/T1/26	Malmesbury Road around the north side of John Cole's park is a car and HGV traffic hazard for bikes and pedestrians, especially given the 3 schools around this area. Where possible, traffic should be directed via Langley Road	Policy T1 suggests high priority improvement schemes on Malmesbury Road in the vicinity of its junction with Hardenhuish Lane which could help to improve highway safety. Otherwise it is the remit of the local highways authority to ensure highway safety and this comment has been referred to them.
P/T1/27	Much more needs to be done in this area, cycle lanes would be a useful addition that would make cycling a much safer option than it is at present.	Support noted.
P/T1/28	My only comment it to ensure that Wiltshire Council (WC) take sustainable travel modes seriously, and that to achieve much of what is proposed will require road scape reallocation, which at the moment WC are reluctant to at best.	Comment referred to the local highways authority.
P/T1/29	No. Stop it. Nobody wants this. Stop wasting public money.	There have been more public comments received which support this policy than do not.
P/T1/30	Plans need to be prepared, agreed and constructed	Agree.
P/T1/31	Really important to try to ensure continuous cycle paths I would still not venture up station hill on my bike because the cycle path is not continuous and you turn the corner and get launched straight back into traffic which is also turning and may not be expecting you there!! I would go round the back of the station down the old road and it is this side of the station access which really needs looking at!	Noted. One of the high priority improvement schemes listed under Policy T1 is to create a link from Greenway Lane to the Railway Station via Old Road.
P/T1/32	Sod Cyclists... didn't work on Bristol Road... not learning!	The cycle path scheme along Bristol Road was installed by the local highways authority as a temporary measure during the COVID-19 pandemic, but it failed due to a number of factors including design, lack of permanent funding and lack of local consultation.
P/T1/33	Stop trying to get cars off the road, I will never give my car for any cunt	Policy T1 is about encouraging modal shift from the car to sustainable transport. This would benefit car users by reducing traffic congestion.
P/T1/34	The better we make the cycle and path ways the more likely they are to be used. They need to be co ordinated with other adjacent local plans.	Agree. Improving the quality of the cycle network, as Policy T1 seeks to do, will ensure greater use of the network.
P/T1/35	The problems are manifold here. It needs bold planning/ investment decisions to alter roads in the town centre to accommodate safer cycle routes and it needs new development areas to be properly linked to existing cycle routes and quiet streets so that the network works as a whole, making it easy for people further out to safely cycle to the station/ into town without being dumped into dangerous, busy roads.	Agree. A number of high priority improvement schemes in the town centre, as developed by the Chippenham Cycle Network Development Group, are proposed as part of Policy T1.
P/T1/36	The proposals are all relevant and necessary	Support noted.
P/T1/37	The town is crying out for solutions to reduce the cars off the streets and remove the blight of traffic congestion, reduce pollution and improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists.	Agree.
P/T1/38	This policy could go even further to achieve a complete network of safe cycling routes - prioritising roads for cycling rather than cars. A lot more cycle parking is also needed.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter the priority that cars have over cycles on existing highways per se, as this falls outside its remit, which is to guide new development proposals. However, some of the high priority improvement schemes suggested by Policy T1 would help to give greater priority to people cycling on sections of existing roads in the town.  Agree that more cycle parking is needed. Paragraphs 62 and 69 of the Chippenham Design Guide require safe cycle storage in new residential development and commercial development accordingly. The Local Transport Plan already sets out cycle parking standards for new development and this is likely to be reviewed in the emerging Local Transport Plan with accompanying evidence base.
P/T1/39	Very important to encourage commuting by bike	Agree.
P/T1/40	Waste of money	There have been more public comments received which support this policy than do not.
P/T1/41	We already have great cyclepaths, I personally cycle to Calne for work twice a week but improving the maintenance should attract more people to use them.	There are some good cycle paths in the town, but many more which are not safe to use or where broken links reduce their attractiveness to use. Maintenance is correctly identified as a key issue. Unfortunately it does not fall under the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan, rather the local highways authority.

P/T1/42	We strongly support a more strategic approach to better cycling infrastructure. Segregated cycle lanes/paths are a great way to improve health & wellbeing, but can also have great economic and environmental benefits. A progressive approach to promoting cycling as part of a sustainable travel strategy would be welcomed.	Support noted.
P/T1/43	YES! Much more of this please!	Support noted.
P/T1/44	You are whistling in the wind if you think people are just going to give up their cars to cycle, this is not Amsterdam	There is no good reason not to aim high and try to become more like Amsterdam. Improving the quality of the cycle network, as Policy T1 seeks to do, can only ensure greater use of the network.

## Policy T2 - Access to the Bus Network

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/T2/1	400m is too far for many disabled people.	Last sentence of final paragraph of Policy T2 amended to: <i>'For development proposals which seek to provide purpose built accommodation for vulnerable and/or elderly people or where regular usage by people with mobility impairments may be anticipated the maximum walking distance should be reduced to 150m'.</i>
P/T2/2	Agree with eco-buses (Hydrogen only) but developer contributes diddly squat... home owners do!	Paragraph 9.20 revised to reference support for hydrogen buses, as well as electric buses. Policy T2 aims to raise the profile of bus infrastructure in Chippenham and secure greater financial contributions to improve it.
P/T2/3	Bus networks are slow or non-existent on Sundays. Ticketing is also an issue with a lack of integration into the Bristol/Bath/Swindon area.	Noted. Unfortunately the Neighbourhood Plan cannot improve these aspects, it can only provide planning policies to guide new development.
P/T2/4	Bus signage is a major issue in Chippenham- as a frequent visitor I find it so unclear and have missed buses when they are on diversion. Not withstanding the Station Hill traffic issues, there must be more integration between buses and rail station.	Noted. Unfortunately the Neighbourhood Plan cannot directly improve these aspects, but Policy T2 does seek to obtain financial contributions for real-time passenger indicator information and new or improved signage to direct visitors to main bus interchanges which may help to resolve this issue.
P/T2/5	Bus system broken, extra funding won't provide improvements for resident benefit.	Agree that the bus system needs to be improved in order for it to become an attractive sustainable public transport option for people to use in the future. Policy T2 recognises that developer contributions to improve infrastructure can assist in achieving this, but is only one small aspect of the fundamental modal shift that is required.
P/T2/6	Cars cars cars, buses are useless	Policies in the Neighbourhood Plan seek to reduce reliance on the private car and increase active travel and sustainable public transport modes, such as buses, in order to reduce carbon emissions.
P/T2/7	Excellent idea	Support noted.
P/T2/8	Existing provision is lacking in many estates. 50% of Pewsham estate has no service.	The Transport Topic Group acknowledged a lack of access to bus infrastructure in Pewsham and Cepin Park South in Paragraph 9.17. Notwithstanding, new sentences have been added to the end of Paragraph 9.17 to given this issue greater prominence and state the Neighbourhood Plan's support for improved bus infrastructure here. It is not considered appropriate to include within the policy text itself because there are unlikely to be major developments in these areas in the future which could justify a financial contribution towards creating new bus routes/infrastructure. Comment forwarded on to local highways authority.
P/T2/9	Fits with being a more sustainable community. Bus travel needs to be made easier and more reliable, to get people out of cars and onto buses.	Agree
P/T2/10	I find it extremely difficult to find information about which buses go where within Chippenham. There need to be more information at the bus station and it needs to be kept up-to-date.	Noted. Policy T2 requires developer contributions towards real-time passenger information indicators. Comment forwarded on to local highway authority.
P/T2/11	Id also like to see green rooves on the network of bus stops to provide habitat for pollinator species	Fifth bullet point added to Policy T2: <i>'• incorporating 'living roofs' for pollinator species on new or upgraded bus shelters'</i>  Paragraph 9.20 amended to include reference to support for living roofs on bus shelters.
P/T2/12	More bus routes would be very helpful to avoid the need for taxis/cars, especially connecting the Frogwell side of town to the hospital and Pewsham.	New sentences have been added to the end of Paragraph 9.17 to given this issue greater prominence and state the Neighbourhood Plan's support for improved bus infrastructure. Comment also passed on to local highway authority.
P/T2/13	More specific action is needed in this area. Bus services need to be drastically improved and far more reliable. having bus stops is good but will only have the required effect if a reliable bus service stops at them.	The operation of the bus service itself is not something which the Neighbourhood Plan can control. However, Policy T2 can play a part in ensuring adequate new bus infrastructure is provided in new development.
P/T2/14	No- one needs to go into the town centre anymore as employment, schools, shopping etc are all on the Western fringes.	It is acknowledged that the role of the town centre is changing/has changed. However, it is still considered that the town centre will remain an important 'meeting place' and therefore transport hub in the future.
P/T2/15	No. More. Red. Tape.	It is not understood what is specifically meant by this comment in relation to Policy T2.
P/T2/16	Nobody uses buses now.	There are people with reduced mobility and who do not have a car which rely on buses as their main form of transport. There is an opportunity to improve the bus infrastructure to attract new users.
P/T2/17	Parking. People want parking, and cheap bus routes. Stop trying to take people's cars away from them. No cycle lanes other than those we have. Cyclists now own the road, they do not need extra provision. If you bothered to read highway code, you'd know.	It is not within the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan to be able to provide public car parking spaces or cheap bus routes. It is disagreed that cycle infrastructure should not be improved in the town. The new Highway Code actually gives greater priority to cyclists.

P/T2/18	<p>People really underestimate the potential of the bus. If new developments include bus service from the start people will use them. However the bus network needs to go where people want to go, so not just to and from the town centre during shopping hours.</p> <p>I suggest bus services should change emphasis to linking the rail station (via town centre) to, Bumpers Farm, hospital, all residential areas, Sainsburys/Methuen Park, Morrison's, Hathaway Medical Centre. This could be done with a grid network of routes running east-west and north-south, OR, a radial route structure connected by an orbital route. The objective being that a journey can be made from anywhere in the town to anywhere else with just one change of bus by using the orbital route to connect the radial routes. Interchange stops would be needed at each point where routes bisect. Bus frequency would need to be high to minimise connection times, or less frequent services be timed to arrive at interchanges at the same time.</p> <p>This isn't fantasy, it is how buses work in Switzerland and many towns in the USA.</p>	<p>Noted. Useful insight/suggestions. Whilst it does not fall within the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan to change existing bus routes these helpful comments will be forwarded on to the local highways authority for further consideration.</p>
P/T2/19	<p>Public Transport is very important and we need to think as Green as possible. As our town has grown so much (and still is) we need better links to the new estates.</p>	<p>Agree.</p>
P/T2/20	<p>Putting bus times digitally on bus stops increases uses of bus stops. There is research which can back this up I believe.</p>	<p>Policy T2 seeks to obtain financial contributions for real-time passenger indicator information at bus stops at strategic locations in the town centre.</p>
P/T2/21	<p>The reference to a standard 400m walking distance is dated, a 400m distance is pointless if the service is in poor quality and infrequent, like all of the existing town services. Also bus services need to be in from the inception of a new development, see North Chippenham has a perfect bad example, with no bus services, whilst close to half the development is constructed. See CIHT: Buses in Urban developments.</p>	<p>The Transport Topic Group explored walking distances to bus stops and the various evidence around this (including the Buses in Urban Developments Report by CIHT). This is set out in a new Appendix 23. It was considered that whilst the advice in Table 4 of Buses in Urban Developments by CIHT (2018) was more up to date and nuanced in providing different standards based on different locations, it would also be harder to reference this table in a planning policy and it is more technical, and therefore arguably more difficult, for the general public to understand.</p> <p>North Chippenham does now benefit from a bus service (44k).</p>
P/T2/22	<p>There should be reference here to the legacy of sustainability with reference to bus shelters - eg allocating funding for their upkeep</p>	<p>New sentence added to Paragraph 9.21: <i>'Sufficient funding should be allocated for the long term maintenance of bus infrastructure, such as bus stops.'</i></p>
P/T2/23	<p>This doesn't appear to cover level of service. It's great to have people within x metres of a bus stop, but if there's only a bus once a day, that's not going to get them using it. Can the NP set minimum levels of bus service to be provided to new developments?</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan cannot set levels of bus service frequencies to be provided to new development as this does not require planning permission and falls within the remit of the bus operator and local highways authority.</p>
P/T2/24	<p>I'd also question the 400m figure - this feels like a long way to walk, and will likely put many people off, particular those who have challenges walking longer distances.</p>	<p>Last sentence of final paragraph of Policy T2 amended to: <i>'For development proposals which seek to provide purpose built accommodation for vulnerable and/or elderly people or where regular usage by people with mobility impairments may be anticipated the maximum walking distance should be reduced to 150m'.</i></p> <p>The Transport Topic Group collected evidence, which is set out in Appendix 23, as to why the 400m was a good general rule, without unnecessary complicating things by providing different distance standards for different circumstances.</p>
P/T2/25	<p>This policy needs to go further. We need somebody to be responsible for Chippenham buses, at the moment a full size bus goes past my house 6 times a day (it only runs 6 times) and at most 2 or 3 people are on it, the normal is no passengers. If we aren't managing our current usage how can we manage future requirements? There are so many options available and funding to go for but we need somebody to head this up. Malmesbury and Melksham town council have done some great consultation surveys and work.</p>	<p>Noted, but the Neighbourhood Plan cannot set levels of bus service frequencies to be provided to new development as this does not require planning permission and falls within the remit of the bus operator and local highways authority.</p>
P/T2/26	<p>Town Main Station should be relocated to Bath Road Carpark</p>	<p>Paragraph 9.24 as amended recognises that <i>'Chippenham Bus Station will remain at its existing site unless an equivalent or improved facility can be provided on a new site that would also be located within the town centre'</i>. The Transport Topic Group considered that the current Bus Station site benefits from good access for the majority of bus users. This does not rule out relocation to the Bath Road/Bridge Centre Car Park, but the technical evidence has not been gathered to suggest that this would be the optimum location.</p>
P/T2/27	<p>Our address wouldn't be described as rural however, the journey to town takes approx. 25 minutes on foot and despite there being a bus stop outside our front gate, there is currently no service.</p>	<p>Comment referred to the local highways authority as responsible for provision of existing bus routes/service.</p>
P/T2/28	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan set forward the idea of retaining bus stops within the town area, but during 2020 the Station Hill bus stops, and Park Lane was lost.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan is not yet 'made' and therefore has no weight in past/present policy making, such as preventing loss of existing bus infrastructure (which may not require planning permission for removal in any case).</p>

## Policy T3 - Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/T3/1	Absolutely essential. The inclusion of solar assistance panels where possible might help increase sustainability during daylight hours in public areas.	Support noted. Reference added to Paragraph 9.27 to give support to solar panel electric vehicle charge points.
P/T3/2	As long as this does not take space away from pedestrians or create trip hazards.	New paragraph added to Policy T3 to give support to cable routes being laid in new development where off-street parking provision is not possible. This also refers to the need for this type of infrastructure not to be provided on public footways in line with the reasons given in the comment: <i>'Where it is not possible to provide off-street parking in new development the provision of cable routes, to allow for electric vehicle charging on-street, will be encouraged. Such charging infrastructure should be placed in the road/carriageway, and not on footways where it could create obstructions or trip hazards for people walking or cycling.'</i>
P/T3/3	Developers need to plan for the increased use of electric vehicles	Agree.
P/T3/4	Diesel and petrol cars will no longer be available to purchase new after 2030, so we need to get on with this!	Agree.
P/T3/5	Define passive provision - is this equivalent to providing ducting? Or more than this?	Reference to passive provision deleted in third paragraph of Policy T3.
P/T3/6	Shouldn't taxi rank provision specify rapid chargers, as dwell times are short?	<i>Rapid'</i> added to beginning of fifth paragraph of Policy T3.
P/T3/7	What about provision of ducting for on street parking in development that has housing without off street charging being possible (e.g. terrace style apartment or flats, as at Langley Park for example). Should have this specified in the policy also.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot require higher minimum standards than Building Regulations standards without evidence that this would still make a development viable. However, the following paragraph has been added to Policy T3 to give support to cable routes being laid in new development where off-street parking provision is not possible: <i>'Where it is not possible to provide off-street parking in new development the provision of cable routes, to allow for electric vehicle charging on-street, will be encouraged. Such charging infrastructure should be placed in the road/carriageway, and not on footways where it could create obstructions or trip hazards for people walking or cycling.'</i>
P/T3/8	Each house needs 2 electric charging points, as most houses have 2 cars like it or not. Also insist that street parking has electric charging on every lamp post.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot require higher minimum standards than Building Regulations standards. It would be overly onerous on the developer to require them to retrofit lamp posts with EV charging infrastructure, when it is not known whether this would be technically feasible in terms of power supply or deemed acceptable by the Local Highway Authority.
P/T3/9	Electric vehicles are the biggest Scam going... just wait and see... Hydrogen folks!	Noted, but electric vehicles are the best option for the period of the Neighbourhood Plan.
P/T3/10	Electric vehicles will not be the answer in the long run	Noted, but electric vehicles are the best option for the period of the Neighbourhood Plan.
P/T3/11	Good idea; any thoughts how to retro fit other areas of Chippenham?	Support noted. Retrofitting is not something the Neighbourhood Plan can require as the Plan can only provide policies for new development.
P/T3/12	Having porous standings would be a positive improvement.	Agree, but permitted development regulations already specify porosity for hardstanding in new dwellings.
P/T3/13	I would consider expanding this to cover provision of on-street spaces for existing housing, as such provision if implemented badly will negatively impact pedestrian provision. i.e. charging points provided in footways, adding to existing street clutter.	New paragraph added to Policy T3 to give support to cable routes being laid in new development where off-street parking provision is not possible. This also refers to the need for this type of infrastructure not to be provided on public footways in line with the reasons given in the comment: <i>'Where it is not possible to provide off-street parking in new development the provision of cable routes, to allow for electric vehicle charging on-street, will be encouraged. Such charging infrastructure should be placed in the road/carriageway, and not on footways where it could create obstructions or trip hazards for people walking or cycling.'</i>
P/T3/14	IF electric vehicles become cheap enough for most people, one or even ten charging points in one CP will be insufficient.	The market would likely deliver sufficient charging infrastructure should electric vehicles become cheap enough for most people.
P/T3/15	Important to add: It's essential that EV charging infrastructure is placed in the road/carriageway, and not on footways, given it creates obstructions there.	New paragraph added to Policy T3 to give support to cable routes being laid in new development where off-street parking provision is not possible. This also refers to the need for this type of infrastructure not to be provided on public footways in line with the reasons given in the comment: <i>'Where it is not possible to provide off-street parking in new development the provision of cable routes, to allow for electric vehicle charging on-street, will be encouraged. Such charging infrastructure should be placed in the road/carriageway, and not on footways where it could create obstructions or trip hazards for people walking or cycling.'</i>
P/T3/16	Many people won't be able to afford at the moment	Noted. However, we need to plan for the whole of the Neighbourhood Plan period.
P/T3/17	Need charge points in Bath Road car park.	The Neighbourhood Plan can only deal with new development and not retrofit. However, if this site were redeveloped in accordance with Policy TC1 of the Neighbourhood Plan, new electric vehicle charging could be provided in line with Neighbourhood Plan Policy T3. Comment referred to Wiltshire Council as owner of this car park.

P/T3/18	<p>No. Stop it.</p> <p>Have you any idea how not carbon neutral / net zero these cars are???? The cost of charging an electric car on the street has climbed to a record high, intensifying calls for Rishi Sunak to end the VAT loophole that leaves drivers paying 20% in VAT on the street compared with just 5% at home.</p> <p>You're just deluded if you think this is going to be a sustainable change for people.</p>	The evidence proves that carbon emissions are lower (including embodied carbon) from electric vehicles than petrol/diesel vehicles. A sustainable change in the car industry is already taking place, with one in five people now owning a plug-in electric vehicle.
P/T3/19	Not strong enough. Every residence is going to require a charging point and this should be enforced forcibly.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot require higher minimum standards than Building Regulations standards without evidence that this would still make a development viable.
P/T3/20	On street charging needs to be addressed	<p>New paragraph added to Policy T3 to give support to cable routes being laid in new development where off-street parking provision is not possible:</p> <p><i>'Where it is not possible to provide off-street parking in new development the provision of cable routes, to allow for electric vehicle charging on-street, will be encouraged. Such charging infrastructure should be placed in the road/carriageway, and not on footways where it could create obstructions or trip hazards for people walking or cycling.'</i></p>
P/T3/21	Should be optional at build, not auto installed as costs to be manufactured, transported and installed, so not carbon neutral.	Building Regulations now require electric vehicle charging infrastructure to be installed at new residential and non-residential buildings. Electric vehicles will become carbon neutral over a much longer period when compared to petrol/diesel vehicles.
P/T3/22	This is important. Wiltshire Council have taken a backward step since they installed chargers in (2016?) their car parks. Most of these are not fit for purpose. The Rapid charger you show in this plan at Gladstone Road, has been only partially working for over two years. I drive an electric car and cannot rely on Wilts Council chargers. Most of the new chargers in 'that car park' at Monkton, have never worked!	Noted. Comment referred to local highways authority.
P/T3/23	Too expensive	The cost of electric vehicles is/will likely come down in the future.
P/T3/24	Urgent	Noted
P/T3/25	We also need to look at options for current terraced houses, maybe a share point on the street with allocated bay to promote use of EV.	<p>New paragraph added to Policy T3 to give support to cable routes being laid in new development where off-street parking provision is not possible:</p> <p><i>'Where it is not possible to provide off-street parking in new development the provision of cable routes, to allow for electric vehicle charging on-street, will be encouraged. Such charging infrastructure should be placed in the road/carriageway, and not on footways where it could create obstructions or trip hazards for people walking or cycling.'</i></p>
P/T3/26	We are so far behind everywhere else	Noted
P/T3/27	We have a hybrid car but would welcome infrastructure to enable full electric to be a more viable option	Support noted
P/T3/28	What about existing high density areas. I live in the Butts and Baydons Lane area where there are rows of cottages with no street access, let alone off street parking, and there are several similar areas in Chippenham.	<p>New paragraph added to Policy T3 to give support to cable routes being laid in new development where off-street parking provision is not possible:</p> <p><i>'Where it is not possible to provide off-street parking in new development the provision of cable routes, to allow for electric vehicle charging on-street, will be encouraged. Such charging infrastructure should be placed in the road/carriageway, and not on footways where it could create obstructions or trip hazards for people walking or cycling.'</i></p>
P/T3/29	Whilst EVs are not going to solve the climate emergency (active travel is the priority, followed by public transport), they are part of the mix. The current charging infrastructure is pitiful, with existing points not maintained.	Agree
P/T3/30	Why hasn't this already been done?	A lack of Government legislation requiring this to be done.



#### Policy T4 - Access for Disabled People and those with Reduced Mobility

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/T4/1	As long as whole journey is considered and consistency between developments.	Policy T4 has been amended to refer to best practice design set out in Inclusive Mobility: A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure (2001) by the Department of Transport, which should result in a greater level of consistency between developments.
P/T4/2	Got to help the disabled and especially as the population grows or ages... didn't read!	Agree.
P/T4/3	Important that ALL public buildings can be accessed by vehicle if necessary	Agree. However, the Neighbourhood Plan is not proposing to set car parking standards for buildings. This is best left to the emerging Local Transport Plan to set. Control of vehicles/on-street parking on the highway does not require planning permission and is therefore something which the Neighbourhood Plan cannot control.
P/T4/4	in accordance with government guidelines	Policy T4 has been amended to refer to best practice design set out in Inclusive Mobility: A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure (2001) by the Department of Transport.
P/T4/5	More info needed	For more information please refer to Appendix 18 - Access for Disabled People and Those With Reduced Mobility & Waymarking Signage on the Footpath Network Topic Paper.
P/T4/6	Not ambitious enough given ageing population. Would like to see Chippenham position itself as a disability friendly town and seek accreditation as such. Why not work with national organisations to make signage accessible to all? I know Wilts Council has more responsibility for commissioning care but no space for provision factored in.	The Steering Group consider that Policy T4, as amended, is as ambitious as is practical to be so, given the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan can only be to guide new development where planning applications are submitted. The comment regarding seeking accreditation as a disability friendly town and improving signage forwarded to the Head of Community Development at the Town Council
P/T4/7	Should this not include something about flush access to all facilities, on the person's desire line? (ie dropped kerbs where people want to cross roads, so as not to force people into long detours to find a dropped kerb)	Policy T4 has been amended to refer to best practice design set out in Inclusive Mobility: A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure (2001) by the Department of Transport, which includes best practice standards on the design of dropped kerbs.  New sentences added to the beginning of Paragraph 9.34 to recognise the importance of level access via dropped kerbs at all road crossings and to all public facilities. Reference also made to the need to follow desire lines.
P/T4/8	Some disabled people such as myself who don't drive find crossing roads without a crossing very stressful. It would be good if there was a pedestrian crossing connecting Pewsham to the Westmead open space, on Avenue La Fleche, for example.	Agree that it would be helpful to have a pedestrian crossing on Avenue La Fleche, although it is considered that this is too prescriptive to incorporate into Policy T4. If new strategic housing development comes forward south of Pewsham, the Town Council would likely push for a new crossing to be installed, subject to a full highways assessment. Comment referred to the local highways authority.
P/T4/9	This is essential	Support noted.
P/T4/10	Too many cycleway and walkways are too narrow for mobility vehicles. Too many pavements do not have suitable dropped curbs and many paths surfaces are not adequately maintained.	Policy T4 has been amended to refer to best practice design set out in Inclusive Mobility: A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure (2001) by the Department of Transport. This guidance provides standards on footway widths, dropped kerbs and footway surfaces.  New first sentence added to Paragraph 9.34 to recognise the importance of level access via dropped kerbs at all road crossings.
P/T4/11	Unfortunately, with WC now charging for blue badge holders to park, we are likely to see more parking on double-yellow lines....	Noted.
P/T4/12	Where feasible, accommodations should be made. Not being told where to walk isn't exclusionary, fgs.	Noted.
P/T4/13	Yes access for disabled people is a must.	Support noted.

## Policy T5 -Waymarking Signage on the Footpath and Cycle Network

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/T5/1	A little bit of a waste of money, most people know where they are going, google maps sorts the rest	It is envisaged that signage would be paid for by developers. There are some members of the community who do not have access to, or do not wish to use, their mobile phones for route navigation and should not be excluded against as a result.
P/T5/2	As for previous answer, consider accessible signage	New Criterion 4 added to Policy T5 to reference accessible signage being provided in accordance with best practice guidance in Inclusive Mobility: A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure (2001) published by the Department for Transport.  New Paragraph added at the end of the supporting text to set the context for the addition of Criterion 4 of Policy T5.
P/T5/3	As well as signage we need mapping and new resident packs. Many people do not know you can get to the town centre off road from Birds Marsh via Rawlings Farm and the 403 cycle path so would drive as walking is unpleasant on the main road.	Agree. A condition of large scale major residential development is often to produce a travel plan for new residents. If new residents are not receiving this, the local planning authority should enforce to ensure that this is being carried through.
P/T5/4	But should be miles, not km.	The Steering Group considered that the local highways authority would be best placed to decide whether the distance on waymarking signage is in miles, metres or kilometres. Criterion 1 amended accordingly to not specify a measurement.
P/T5/5	Wayfinding signage also needs to be provided on the cycle network	Agree that wayfinding signage also needs to be provided on the cycle network. Policy T5 title amended to '...Footpath and Cycle Network'. Appropriate amendments made to text in Policy T5 and Paragraphs 9.39 and 9.40 accordingly.
P/T5/6	Ensure consistency across the town and avoid gaps / broken links. Where do people want to go?	This comment relates more to the network itself than the waymarking signage required by Policy T5. Policy T1 (Enhancement and Provision of Cycle Paths) aims to fill gaps/broken links in the cycle network, whilst the 'Sustainable Transport' section of the Chippenham Design Guide also addresses this aspect in relation to the footpath and cycle network.
P/T5/7	Ensure new developments have this from first occupation.	Although preferable, it would likely be overly onerous to add in a requirement to Policy T5 that the developer provide waymarking signage from first occupation.
P/T5/8	Footpath signage needs to be improved in parts of the town	Agree. It is hoped that Policy T5 will contribute towards improvement.
P/T5/9	If you have to. But it's money for nothing.	It is envisaged that signage would be paid for by developers.
P/T5/10	It might also be appropriate to ensure that there is lighting on such footpaths.	It would not be appropriate to include lighting within Policy T5, as this is solely about waymarking signage on the network. The local highways authority or developer should provide appropriate lighting on footpaths as part of any scheme.
P/T5/11	lots more needed.	Support noted.
P/T5/12	Should be a defacto policy!	Support noted. There is not currently a development plan policy which requires this. Hence the inclusion of Policy T5 in the Neighbourhood Plan.
P/T5/13	Signs should also be attractive and consistent design	Criterion 2 amended to provide signage to local highways authority specification for consistency.
P/T5/14	Waste of tax payers money	It is envisaged that signage would be paid for by developers.
P/T5/15	What about the existing areas? Depends Park south is short of signs. Cycle/footpaths round St Mary's School are neither signed nor on cycleway maps	It would only be appropriate to request new/upgraded waymarking where there would be increased use of the existing footpath and cycle network in the vicinity of new development sites. However, comment forwarded to the local highways authority for further consideration/information.
P/T5/16	Ensure signage and priorities are well marked especially in "short cuts" through estates	Policy T5 would aim to ensure improved waymarking signage on the cycle network. This is also reiterated in paragraph 44 of the Chippenham Design Guide when designing for largescale major residential development.

## Policy CI1 - Community Infrastructure

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/CI1/1	1% is just a sop.	Final paragraph of Policy CI1, which referred to 1% of development cost to fund new community infrastructure, deleted as no evidence to demonstrate that this figure is viable. Replaced with the following wording: <i>'...an appropriate financial contribution, based on individual site circumstances, will be provided towards off-site community infrastructure or public art provision.'</i>  Although this may result in a smaller than 1% contribution, it would also allow for a greater than 1% contribution in some circumstances. The Steering Group considered this flexibility to be preferential when compared to the previous wording, and in line with planning legislation and guidance.
P/CI1/2	1% is too low.	Final paragraph of Policy CI1, which referred to 1% of development cost to fund new community infrastructure, deleted as no evidence to demonstrate that this figure is viable. Replaced with the following wording: <i>'...an appropriate financial contribution, based on individual site circumstances, will be provided towards off-site community infrastructure or public art provision.'</i>  Although this may result in a smaller than 1% contribution, it would also allow for a greater than 1% contribution in some circumstances. The Steering Group considered this flexibility to be preferential when compared to the previous wording, and in line with planning legislation and guidance.
P/CI1/3	Also need to think about times of the town with no community infrastructure such as Cepen Park South	Agreed, but the Neighbourhood Plan can only guide new development. If sites/buildings became available in Cepen Park South these could be targeted for new community infrastructure.
P/CI1/4	Contribution of 1% is far too low.	Final paragraph of Policy CI1, which referred to 1% of development cost to fund new community infrastructure, deleted as no evidence to demonstrate that this figure is viable. Replaced with the following wording: <i>'...an appropriate financial contribution, based on individual site circumstances, will be provided towards off-site community infrastructure or public art provision.'</i>  Although this may result in a smaller than 1% contribution, it would also allow for a greater than 1% contribution in some circumstances. The Steering Group considered this flexibility to be preferential when compared to the previous wording, and in line with planning legislation and guidance.
P/CI1/5	Define culture - the term is too broad.	It is not considered necessary to define the term 'culture' for the purposes of this Policy. However, new final paragraph to supporting text added to define 'community infrastructure' for the purposes of applying Policy CI1.
P/CI1/6	I don't feel this goes far enough. We have as a prime example the former Chippenham College, this is ideally placed near the station to be a fantastic community space. What we don't need is more retirement apartments, we need a younger demographic.	Policy CI1 can only help to secure new community infrastructure where development is proposed. Landowners cannot be forced into developing their land for particular uses and without profit.
P/CI1/7	I'm not certain what this means I support art and crafts as an important part of society	Noted.
P/CI1/8	It says essentially, nothing. Just a series of mgmt words about 'diverse and inclusive'. Lower rates, make access easier, encourage small business, encourage local artists, make parking free, and bring exciting things, like the old bi annual concert in Monkton Park, or the re-enactment as you're doing this year. And you know what about even doing fireworks????	Disagree with the comment. Policy CI1 is trying to secure new community infrastructure and protect existing community infrastructure where planning is required. The other things referred to in the comment are outside the remit of a neighbourhood plan.
P/CI1/9	Make it higher than 1% if possible	Final paragraph of Policy CI1, which referred to 1% of development cost to fund new community infrastructure, deleted as no evidence to demonstrate that this figure is viable. Replaced with the following wording: <i>'...an appropriate financial contribution, based on individual site circumstances, will be provided towards off-site community infrastructure or public art provision.'</i>  Although this may result in a smaller than 1% contribution, it would also allow for a greater than 1% contribution in some circumstances. The Steering Group considered this flexibility to be preferential when compared to the previous wording, and in line with planning legislation and guidance.
P/CI1/10	More sports facilities are needed - Chippenham Sports Club I can't cope with demand at peak times E.g. more tennis courts and another cricket pitch needed. And more parking, bearing in mind about half members come from villages outside of Chippenham.	Noted. The Town Council will raise this with the LPA when consulted on planning applications which may require new community infrastructure.
P/CI1/11	Need to ensure that uses can change as needs change. Transport and walking / cycling infrastructure to be at heart of new uses. That developers/owners don't block alternative uses. That low quality residential conversion is avoided.	Permitted development rights currently allow for a wide variety of changes of use without the need for planning permission. Policy CI1 helps to better protect existing community infrastructure which is vulnerable to being lost to residential conversion.  Agree that new community infrastructure needs to be accessible by sustainable transport. The Chippenham Design Guide sets out that largescale major development will require a local centre with community infrastructure and that this should be within 15 minutes of walking/cycling from new residential properties.
P/CI1/12	No idea what this means, its so vague	Policy CI1 has been reworded and is hopefully more specific now.

P/CI1/13	Potentially too penal on property owners	<p>Final paragraph of Policy CI1, which referred to 1% of development cost to fund new community infrastructure, deleted as no evidence to demonstrate that this figure is viable. Replaced with the following wording: '...an appropriate financial contribution, based on individual site circumstances, will be provided towards off-site community infrastructure or public art provision.'</p> <p>The Steering Group considered this flexibility to be preferential when compared to the previous wording, and in line with planning legislation and guidance.</p> <p>First sentence of Policy CI1 deleted which referred to all development having to demonstrate need for community infrastructure. Replaced with new wording which clarifies that major residential developments only shall submit a Community Infrastructure Statement which demonstrates how the community infrastructure needs of new residents, generated as a result of the scheme, can be fully met on site or nearby.</p>
P/CI1/14	Property buyers paying again!	It is not understood how Policy CI1 would negatively affect property buyers.
P/CI1/15	Since the loss of the Bridge Centre and the farce with the Olympiad, the youth of Chippenham have not been provided for.	Noted. The Town Council will raise this with the LPA when consulted on planning applications which may require new community infrastructure.
P/CI1/16	The Neighbourhood Plan is good but it does not address one significant area, pubs. Pubs are part of the historic and social history of the UK. But over recent years, during and pre-covid, many have been snapped up by property developers and turned into residential developments. Pubs play a key role in combatting loneliness and social isolation. I would like to see a policy statement in the plan that the council will fight to preserve pubs in its area, especially where a community buy-out is an option to save a failing pub.	<p>New paragraph added after 10.5: 'Public houses are an important community facility in Chippenham and those remaining are particularly at threat of being lost to other uses. Retention and improvement of public houses is supported because they can be important community assets by helping to create a sense of place and a hub for developing social networks between the local community'</p> <p>In addition, specific reference made to resisting loss of public houses (along with other specifically referred to uses) in third paragraph of Policy CI1.</p>
P/CI1/17	The old college could have been an excellent arts centre.	Policy CI1 can only help to secure new community infrastructure where development is proposed. Landowners cannot be forced into developing their land for particular uses and without profit.
P/CI1/18	There is a shortage of affordable community venues/social spaces for hire	The data collected by the Community Infrastructure Topic Group also concluded this (Appendices 7, 20 and 21).
P/CI1/19	This fund needs to be flexible and utilised wisely	<p>Final paragraph of Policy CI1, which referred to 1% of development cost to fund new community infrastructure, deleted as no evidence to demonstrate that this figure is viable. Replaced with the following wording: '...an appropriate financial contribution, based on individual site circumstances, will be provided towards off-site community infrastructure or public art provision.'</p> <p>Although this may result in a smaller than 1% contribution, it would also allow for a greater than 1% contribution in some circumstances. The Steering Group considered this flexibility to be preferential when compared to the previous wording, and in line with planning legislation and guidance.</p>
P/CI1/20	We must have more arts and culture in the town at present it is almost a wasteland	Noted. It is hoped that Policy CI1 will help with this.
P/CI1/21	Why 1% of development cost towards community infrastructure? Has a % been specified for other types of infrastructure? Could this not vary depending on the location/ other requirements for a particular site? (cycle infrastructure provision, green space provision, etc.)	<p>Final paragraph of Policy CI1, which referred to 1% of development cost to fund new community infrastructure, deleted as no evidence to demonstrate that this figure is viable. Replaced with the following wording: '...an appropriate financial contribution, based on individual site circumstances, will be provided towards off-site community infrastructure or public art provision.'</p> <p>Although this may result in a smaller than 1% contribution, it would also allow for a greater than 1% contribution in some circumstances. The Steering Group considered this flexibility to be preferential when compared to the previous wording, and in line with planning legislation and guidance.</p>

## Policy E1 - Circular Economy

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/E1/1	Again, Retuna ( <a href="https://www.retuna.se/english/">https://www.retuna.se/english/</a> ) would be a good step forward for achieving a circular economy.	A recycling mall would be good, but too specific a use for the Neighbourhood Plan to single out support for, or allocate a site for. Policy E1 would support development proposals from ' <i>businesses that can demonstrate that they are designing-out waste and pollution and keeping products and materials in use and economic circulation</i> ', such as a recycling mall, where planning permission was required.
P/E1/2	But how will this be demonstrated?	Businesses with development proposals that seek to create circular economy benefits will need to explain their circular economy process in their planning submission in order to demonstrate compliance with Policy E1.
P/E1/3	Existing buildings should be repurposed, not demolished. However, without legislation, this is not likely to happen. A recent radio 4 programme argued strongly that repurposed buildings save an enormous amount of carbon.	Policy E1 supports the retention of existing buildings for this reason. Whilst the influence of this policy would be nowhere near as effective as legislation, it would still contribute to this aim by giving weight to the retention of existing buildings in any <u>planning determination</u> .
P/E1/4	Great to see this included. Can we start promoting it now for shopping local, supporting local, eco shops and facilities etc? Promoting Reduce, reuse, repair and recycle?	The Neighbourhood Plan is not a promotional tool. Its purpose is to guide decisions on planning applications in Chippenham. Notwithstanding, the Town Council could decide to do some promotional work on this aspect upon its adoption.
P/E1/5	I didn't understand the circular economy. But it is important to generate more high quality local employment and thus <u>reduce the level of outcommuting</u> .	An explanatory box of the circular economy has now been provided.
P/E1/6	I reject your green ideology. It's clearly apparent you will do whatever you like, and it will all be a waste of OUR public money, and that because you spend all your time talking to other civil servants you think this is how rest of public think. Most people are so disaffected they won't even bother filling this in to tell you that your cycle lanes are basically <u>onanism</u> .	Noted
P/E1/7	I'm not sure that the second clause makes sense!! Should it say ' encourages the avoidance of wastage of resources?...'	Agree. First sentence of third paragraph of Policy E1 amended to ' <i>...all new development is encouraged to avoid use of primary resources by...</i> '
P/E1/8	Love this idea	Support noted
P/E1/9	The statement is difficult to understand. Plain English would help.	Wording of Criterion c) of Policy E1 amended as agree that terminology is difficult to understand/interpret. Also, first <u>sentence of third paragraph of Policy E1 amended and Criterion b) simplified for these reasons.</u>
P/E1/10	What does this mean in real terms ( an example of hard to understand language)	Wording of Criterion c) of Policy E1 amended as agree that terminology is difficult to understand/interpret. Also, first <u>sentence of third paragraph of Policy E1 amended and Criterion b) simplified for these reasons.</u>
P/E1/11	Would love to see a recycling hub in the town centre - like the one in Corsham, alongside a repair cafe and library of things, with community training sessions and workshops	Agree, but would be too specific a use for the Neighbourhood Plan to single out support for, or allocate a site for. Policy E1 would support development proposals from ' <i>businesses that can demonstrate that they are designing-out waste and pollution and keeping products and materials in use and economic circulation</i> ', such as a recycling hub, repair cafe etc., where planning permission was required.

## Policy E2 - Business Incubator Units

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/E2/1	A great idea.	Support noted.
P/E2/2	A major missing link. As a business owner there is nothing for my business which is affordable and flexible in the town.	Support noted.
P/E2/3	But again don't be too prescriptive - will be site dependent	It is not considered that Policy E2 is too prescriptive. It does not specify a no. or % of units of less than 5000 sqft. in size that have to be provided on the site - this can be left to negotiation depending on the site, viability etc.
P/E2/4	Development proposals should not be given permission unless there is a contract for occupation. It is not acceptable to build huge units on spec and then advertise for occupants. What a waste.	This would require fundamental changes to the English planning system.
P/E2/5	I'd love to start a showroom, I can't with current prices	Noted.
P/E2/6	It is good to have a requirement that will help cater for small and medium businesses but this seems rather weak. What range of units sizes? 5000 square feet is large. What is an acceptable range of unit sizes? Seems like more specifics needed in this policy.	The Steering Group consider that Policy E2 strikes the right balance between being flexible enough not to restrict businesses and being specific enough to ensure that business incubator units are being provided on allocated employment land. It would be too prescriptive and restrictive on businesses to stipulate unit sizes/specify numbers of individual unit sizes on employment land.  The figure of 5000sqft. or 464sqm. came from evidence reviewed by the Economy Topic Group (see Appendix 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan), in particular a Briefing Note from Huw Thomas of Huw Thomas Commercial (property managing agent in Chippenham) which highlights the need for the next 'Bumpers Farm' (a well established, at capacity, employment area which accommodates a range of business types and unit sizes). It suggests that the strongest demand in Chippenham has historically been for premises of less than 5,000 sq.ft. in size.
P/E2/7	Market should self regulate. If there's a real need they will be provided. Needs will change during the life of this plan	The market does not always deliver what is needed; but does deliver what is profitable. If no employment land is allocated for delivery through the planning system the market will not be able to deliver.
P/E2/8	Partially. But yes, lower rents. FGS!	It is not within the remit of the Town Council/Neighbourhood Plan to lower rents.
P/E2/9	Rather than just keeping allocating land for business and no businesses come, can existing vacancies be taken into account? <a href="https://propertylink.estatesgazette.com/commercial-property-for-rent/chippenham">https://propertylink.estatesgazette.com/commercial-property-for-rent/chippenham</a> Showell, Methuen, Sadlers Mead, Birds Marsh and other sites have business land but not interest. SWLEP say it is only their job to allocate land, how do we get Wiltshire Council to engage with businesses?	Agree that more needs to be done by local government/SWLEP to encourage/incentivise businesses to take up vacant uses in Chippenham. It is not clear how Policy E2 could be amended to take into account existing vacancies though.
P/E2/10	Start up units should be supported but careful control to avoid use which would be better accommodated in vibrant town centre - gyms, health and beauty etc rather than industrial spaces.	Agree but the Neighbourhood Plan is not a tool which is able to restrict national permitted development rights which allow for changes of use between different uses classes.
P/E2/11	The town currently has a great number of empty shops and offices. These should be refurbished where necessary, and used before more units are built.	Business incubator units may not be compatible with town centre shop units due to their industrial nature and potential noise/extraction issues which may harm the amenity of surrounding residential/commercial occupiers.
P/E2/12	This needs to be thought out better with more people WFH.	Policy E2 is aimed at helping those businesses with industrial processes that cannot be carried out at home.
P/E2/13	Waste of money	The comment is not understood, as no public money is proposed to be used.
P/E2/14	We also need to more flexible and allow local businesses to expand, we have have lost so many local employers because they could not expand by staying in Chippenham. Refusing people like The Range denies more local employment and encourages more commuting.	This partly comes down to sufficient employment land being allocated by the Local Planning Authority to be available for business expansion/relocation together with proactive incentives/marketing of employment sites by the local authority/SWLEP etc.
P/E2/15	We need to foster local quality employment opportunities so that local residents can work where they live and get more involved with community life (and not just sleep in Chippenham!)	Agree

## Developer Contributions

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/DC/1	A robust community led spending plan needs to be agreed. This is once in a generation spend and should be used wisely.	The Neighbourhood Plan can set the spending priorities, which it does in Section 12. However, the Local Planning Authority will be in charge of spending developer contributions and their 75% of CIL monies.
P/DC/2	A structured plan for developments gives locals a say in how and what is built, and developers then are constrained to build what we want and not just what they can most money from.	The Neighbourhood Plan is a community-led plan, with policies being formulated by/with the community. The spending priorities are derived from the different policies in the Plan.
P/DC/3	Agree with the priorities especially bio diversity	Support noted
P/DC/4	All developers should plant a tree for 10m2 they develop either on or around their site. Native trees and hedgerows only.	Policy GI4 sets out an alternative approach which also ensures new tree planting on sites. It requires that proposals demonstrate a minimum future tree canopy cover of at least 20% of the site area on sites outside of the town centre and greater than 0.5 ha in size.
P/DC/5	Developer contributions should include ring fenced amounts for maintenance over time - the cost of this should not be reliant on household contributions into the future via the precept	Agree, but the mechanism for achieving this will need to be operated by the Local Planning Authority rather than the Town Council.
P/DC/6	Developers are almost always only interested in money, and will try any means to get around the best laid community plans.	Noted.
P/DC/7	Developers must not be allowed to wriggle out of their obligations. Measures to help mitigate for the climate and ecological emergencies should be prioritised.	Agree.
P/DC/8	Developers should have to contribute to improving green areas & facilities when building in a town or rural area & must meet planning obligations.	Agree.
P/DC/9	I don't think developers are charged enough under CIL or other methods. The reach for these payments should extend to the whole town not just their development also. If they want to build houses they need to build the community up also.	The CIL charging schedule has been developed by the Local Planning Authority and would have been tested for viability. Agree that the necessary community infrastructure needs to be put in place for housing development.
P/DC/10	I think the suggestions are good, but we need to keep an eye on the sort of thing that CIL is being spent on. I don't think dirty diesel vehicles for the council are of much benefit to the community. It should be used for litter bins, parks, benches, facilities, etc.	All capital expenditure including CIL expenditure is approved by the Town Council's Full Council as part of the annual budget setting process. Where CIL is used this is checked and reported to Wiltshire Council to ensure it fits within their criteria.
P/DC/11	More social housing is desperately needed	Developer contributions for affordable housing are already required under the Local Plan, and will continue to be in the future.
P/DC/12	No - but I'm pleased to see it there. I don't think that appropriate contribution has been made in the past.	Support noted
P/DC/13	Nothing other than just no, to net zero.	Noted.
P/DC/14	Only to ensure that appropriate contributions are secured and then used. Wiltshire Council do not have a great history of this. i.e. North Chippenham, no ped/cycle contribution/offsite connections, and no bus service as of yet. Recent Rawlings Green approval, derisory contribution for ped/cycle improvements.	Noted.
P/DC/15	Shouldn't EV charging infrastructure be included here as well? And sustainable urban drainage and other kinds of flood management/ prevention? And development of the river corridor? And allotments/ local food space provision? And investment in sports, leisure and recreation? Could be quite a lot more on this list.	A wishlist cannot be created. Developer contributions need to be specifically related and referenced to a policy in the Neighbourhood Plan. Such contributions also need to be site/development specific and pass the three tests of Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations.
P/DC/16	The really important items that need massive funding are the transport infrastructure - roads, cycling lanes, buses etc	Agree. That is why these are suggested for inclusion on Wiltshire Council's CIL Infrastructure List, because these large scale projects cannot be funded by the Town Council.
P/DC/17	We need to use Chippenham's heritage to promote it as well as develop its beautiful river location	This is captured in the Neighbourhood Plan's Vision for the Town Centre.

## Monitoring & Evidence

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/ME/1	Any breaches of the plan should be heavily fined.	The Local Planning Authority can only fine offenders in certain circumstances for breaches of their planning permission through the enforcement regime.
P/ME/2	Furthering Monitoring and Evidence could be provided through dedicated sites for biodiversity being used and promoted. Please can updating IRecords <a href="https://irecord.org.uk/enter-casual-record">https://irecord.org.uk/enter-casual-record</a> and the Woodland Trust <a href="https://ati.woodlandtrust.org.uk/what-we-record-and-why/what-we-record/notable-trees/">https://ati.woodlandtrust.org.uk/what-we-record-and-why/what-we-record/notable-trees/</a> be promoted by the Council so we have year round data in advance available for all desktop studies right at the start of site investigation. Also can Wiltshire Council's <a href="https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/planning-bio-community-toolkit">https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/planning-bio-community-toolkit</a> be promoted.  Yearly resident surveys to involve the community.	This suggestion can be taken forward to the body/group who will monitor the Neighbourhood Plan. Also forwarded to the Town Council's Climate & Biodiversity Officer.  New paragraph added after 6.15 in supporting text of Policy GI1 to refer to the important role the community and voluntary sector in Chippenham can play in supporting the biodiversity objectives of the Plan by maintaining habitats, gathering environmental data (suggested websites referred to in footnote) and producing community environmental plans (Wiltshire Council Community Environmental Toolkit referred to in text).
P/ME/3	I think it is important that impartial monitoring is carried out to see that things are progressing & also achieving things agreed in the plan.	Agree.
P/ME/4	Monitoring reports should be regularly published to enable public scrutiny.	Agree. This will be suggested to whichever body/group it is decided will monitor the Neighbourhood Plan
P/ME/5	This will need close monitoring and I encourage a diverse team to do this.	Agree.
P/ME/6	Too vague!	The Steering Group discussed whether more detail should be added to this section. However, they may not be the group/body that eventually monitors the Plan. The process for setting up this stage, post-Plan, will need to be determined by the Town Council after a thorough review of how other town and parish councils with neighbourhood plans have carried out monitoring and evidence.
P/ME/7	Unfortunately, somehow, you need to actually speak to people. Your monitoring only ever brings about bias results. That needs to change before you entirely ruin this town.	Specific examples would have been helpful to substantiate this claim.



## Final Comments

Ref. No.	Comment	Response
P/FC/1	A well thought out strategy plan for the town. Very excited for Chippenham to turn a corner and excited to see the future	Support noted
P/FC/2	Again, no to green, no to net zero, no to cycle lanes, no to gargantuan public expenditure without accountability.  Collect my bins. Give us an A&E. Clean the town centre. Invite small businesses in (lower rates) and encourage a better class of shop. Not estate agents/charity shops.	Noted. The issues listed in the comment do not require planning permission and are therefore outside of the control of the Neighbourhood Plan to facilitate. The majority of these issues relate to services carried out by Wiltshire Council, rather than the Town Council.
P/FC/3	An admirable document!	Support noted
P/FC/4	Bravo!	Support noted
P/FC/5	Chippenham needs an arts and culture venue.	Noted. It is hoped that Policy CI1 will help to deliver this kind of facility.
P/FC/6	Chippenham should not be forced to take any more houses we have not the resources to cater for them and the green spaces will be destroyed forever for future generations	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot restrict the amount of new housing development as housing is a strategic issue dealt with under the Wiltshire Local Plan. The Town Council have made their views clear that the amount of future housing development proposed to be delivered in Chippenham by the Emerging Local Plan is not sustainable.
P/FC/7	Delighted to see cycling being taken seriously	Support noted
P/FC/8	Enough with the urban sprawl, protect our town from out of town developers.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot restrict the amount of new housing development as housing is a strategic issue dealt with under the Wiltshire Local Plan. The Town Council have made their views clear that the amount of future housing development proposed to be delivered in Chippenham by the Emerging Local Plan is not sustainable.
P/FC/9	Far too many houses destroying what once was a beautiful market town that you could walk to the outskirts for countryside walks. Don't destroy these areas.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot restrict the amount of new housing development as housing is a strategic issue dealt with under the Wiltshire Local Plan. The Town Council have made their views clear that the amount of future housing development proposed to be delivered in Chippenham by the Emerging Local Plan is not sustainable.
P/FC/10	Good future looking plan. A shame Local Plan policies (e.g. for excessive housing numbers) will work against it.	Support noted. The Town Council hopes that housing numbers will be revised down.
P/FC/11	I am broadly supportive of most of these aspirations, but I am concerned that Wiltshire council will impose its own agenda, and Chippenham will become an urban sprawl. This draft neighbourhood plan states correctly that most residents value our rural surroundings, but these seem to be under threat of being built over.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot restrict the amount of new housing development as housing is a strategic issue dealt with under the Wiltshire Local Plan. The Town Council have made their views clear that the amount of future housing development proposed to be delivered in Chippenham by the Emerging Local Plan is not sustainable.
P/FC/12	I am concerned about Chippenham becoming a soulless large housing estate where everyone works and socialises elsewhere. We must make more of our lovely buildings, beautiful river and green spaces to make it more attractive to young families. The climbing wall is a great new addition.	It is hoped that policies in the Neighbourhood Plan will result in improved design, improved local economy and improved infrastructure alongside any new housing that is allocated. By setting out policies and a future Vision for the town it will make clearer to developers the existing qualities of the town and the aspirations of the community on what a future <u>Chippenham should look like</u> .
P/FC/13	I think if the Plan is implemented Chippenham will be an even nicer & attractive place to live than it is now. I may not be around by the end of the time but hope to see some of the improvements. <u>It has taken a lot longer than 15-20 mins to read the plan &amp; respond to the questions!</u>	Support noted. Thank you for taking the time to respond.
P/FC/14	I think there are towns nearby such as Stroud, Frome and Devizes that seem to be doing more. Networking and how Chippenham fits within a wider region seems to be missing.	It is not understood what is specifically meant by 'doing more'. It is considered that there is sufficient regional context in the Neighbourhood Plan. After all, the Neighbourhood Plan is only concerned with future planning applications in Chippenham Parish. Networking is not something which can be managed by the Neighbourhood Plan, as it is not a physical entity which <u>requires planning permission</u> .
P/FC/15	I welcome much of this plan. However, the proposed excessive housing development adjacent to Pewsham, which is being taken to judicial review (in part due to lack of consultation on the final plan) is my main current concern.	Support noted. The Housing Infrastructure Fund bid (subject of judicial review) has been withdrawn and this scheme will not now go ahead. It remains to be seen how this will affect future housing allocated in the Emerging Local Plan.
P/FC/16	I work in the library and am very aware of our role in improving the wellbeing of local people. Our visitors tell us their views on local facilities and services and I know locals feel strongly about their town. There is a feeling that Chippenham has been neglected for years (I only moved here relatively recently and so can't comment on the validity of this perception) and if the proposals in this plan are put into action I think they would go a long way towards countering this perception. It is a beautiful town I used to visit as a tourist but even then thought it was less well promoted and celebrated than other local towns. We really noticed how relatively difficult it was to get tourist information about the area. This still seems to be a neglected area, and there seems to be little promotion of the town as a tourist destination - very little online or to give out to visitors.	Agree, this is an area which could be improved, but falls outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. Comment forwarded the Town Council's Head of Community Development.
P/FC/17	I'd like to see a regeneration of the market itself, with many more stall holders attracted into the town, and the addition of a makers market.	It would be great to see the market regenerated. This does not require planning permission though and therefore falls outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. Comment forwarded to the Town Council's Head of Environmental Services.

P/FC/18	If it's possible to actually get this plan operational, Chippenham will be a fantastic place to live. Please be persistent <del>against any resistance and obstacles put in your way.</del>	Support noted.
P/FC/19	Inadequate as it stands.	Noted. It is not clear why the Plan is 'inadequate'.
P/FC/20	Incubator artists' studios and promotion of creative industries pushed out of Bath and Bristol by high prices could help revitalise the town. Please don't miss out on the boom in food courts / vans. A great opportunity for some local people <del>who can't commit to full-time work to operate part-time.</del>	Agree with these comments, but these aspects do not require planning permission and therefore fall outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan
P/FC/21	It is what this town needs. A well thought out proposal with so many positives. Good work!	Support noted.
P/FC/22	It's a great plan (if rather long!) and I really hope that all it sets out can be achieved as it would enhance Chippenham and improve the quality of life for residents. I am still concerned that there is still an over emphasis in the housing part on large scale developments that do not provide the scale of affordable green housing that is needed and it will be difficult for local people to have any real influence on proposals given the government core strategy.	Support noted. At the time of writing the Government are consulting on revisions to the NPPF which would see changes to national housing targets.
P/FC/23	It's a shame that Chippenham is so far behind the curve and lost so much CIL.	Noted.
P/FC/24	Will the CNP prevent future Chippenham expansion.	The Neighbourhood Plan can only deal with non-strategic issues and not the strategic issues relating to any future Chippenham expansion. What it can do though through its policies is to ensure that any development in the Parish relating to future expansion is well designed and has the necessary infrastructure in place to make for sustainable development.
P/FC/25	Who will you ensure whole community engagement and that referendum is well supported.	The Steering Group have involved the community to date and will devise a strategy to ensure that the referendum is well supported by the community.
P/FC/26	Love the vision, but needs sustained funding and willingness to deliver.	Support noted.
P/FC/27	Many people in this town feel angry about some major fails made here. The multi story parking by the Olympiad, the traffic lights are utterly hated and very wrong in operation, cycle lanes that were hated by most. Residents tend to love this town, we feel very let down by recent decisions.....  But still PROUD to live here.	Noted. Comment forwarded to the local highways authority as these decisions were all taken by them.
P/FC/28	More social housing is desperately needed	Agree, but the Neighbourhood Plan can only reiterate that 40% of all new housing should be affordable housing as the Neighbourhood Plan needs to remain in conformity with the Wiltshire Local Plan on strategic matters.
P/FC/29	More out of town shopping centres with free parking	It would be very harmful to the vitality and viability of the town centre if more out-of-town shopping centres are granted in the future. The Steering Group recognise that town centre car parking charges can affect footfall in the centre, but it is not within the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan to set parking charges.
P/FC/30	Abolish the role of PCC's and elected regional mayors, waste of tax payers money	This is not something which either the Neighbourhood Plan, Town Council or Wiltshire Council can enact.
P/FC/31	My overall feeling about Chippenham - where I have lived my entire life is that it needs to be conscious of its history and try to protect that as much as possible. However I know it will grow and the infrastructure must grow with it. Relief roads are absolutely key. There is currently a pretty bad bottle-neck occurring at the Bridge Centre roundabout. I see a lot of comments from people saying that there shouldn't be any more roads because they don't want houses to be built on them. However, take for example a potential new road between Lackham and Pewsham Way, this would need a bridge over the river and flood plain but would mean any traffic coming off the motorway along the A350, or coming from Corsham or north-west Chippenham could get to east Chippenham without having to go through the bottle-neck which is the Bridge Centre. This would ease air and noise pollution and traffic on Bath Road, and probably open up even more options for Bath Road Car Park.	Noted. Agree that the history of the town is important in place shaping and that infrastructure must accompany any growth. It is not within the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan to make strategic decisions about new roads.
P/FC/32	Nothing on the scale of development or where it would best be situated.	If you are referring to housing or employment land allocations the Neighbourhood Plan cannot restrict the amount of new housing or employment land as these are strategic issues dealt with under the Wiltshire Local Plan. The Town Council have made their views clear that the amount of future housing development proposed to be delivered in Chippenham by the Emerging Local Plan is not sustainable.
P/FC/33	On the while very positive and IF things are done as indicated should realise substantial improvements all round.	Support noted.
P/FC/34	Overall, this plan is very positive. I would advise it is broken down into small chunks and shared on social media to encourage more comments. As a local historian I would be very keen to help with any research or advice needed to <del>preserve our town's history.</del>	Support noted. The Steering Group have previously used social media in the way suggested by this comment and will likely use this approach in the run up to the public referendum on the Plan.
P/FC/35	Planning and building allocation is essential to ensure a proper and adequate development of the area occurs.	Agree
P/FC/36	Please reconsider traffic routing around John Cole's park and try to minimise this as much as possible by encouraging routing via Langley Road	This is not something which the Neighbourhood Plan cannot enact as it is a local highways issue. Comment referred to local highways authority.
P/FC/37	Please save our green spaces and allow wildlife the chance to thrive, and don't ruin the countryside by building on sites that should be left wild and uncultivated. The river side should be a wildlife haven for everyone to enjoy. Please save <del>our fauna and flora and keep it natural.</del>	Neighbourhood Plan Policies G1 and G12 seek to protect Local Green Spaces and Green Corridors respectively. Neighbourhood Plan Policy TC2 seeks to protect the River Avon Green Corridor in particular. The Neighbourhood Plan is not allocating any sites for development.

P/FC/38	Please stop soiling our amazing countryside. !!!! Think of our environment and wild animals and mental well being.	The Town Council, who are writing the Plan, are not the Local Planning Authority. This is Wiltshire Council. The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to protect the natural environment under its Green and Blue Infrastructure Policies G1-G5.
P/FC/39	Pleased to see some thought and planning going into the future of the town. Loads of room for better planning and deeper, more futuristic thinking. <del>Developers still have the upper hand. I am afraid.</del>	Support noted. It is hoped that the Neighbourhood Plan will play a part in helping to re-balance the planning system locally.
P/FC/40	Really interesting & balanced document, with clear objectives.	Support noted.
P/FC/41	Someone has done a lot of work on this. It must have cost a lot of money too and I hope this isn't destined for a dusty cupboard.	As a result of the Neighbourhood Plan being 'made' the Town Council will receive an uplift to 25% of total CIL monies generated, which are guaranteed to be spent in Chippenham. A group will be set up to monitor and report back to the Town Council on the effectiveness of the Neighbourhood Plan policies. The Neighbourhood Plan may also need to be reviewed to <del>ensure alignment with the Emerging Local Plan.</del>
P/FC/42	The Neighbourhood Plan appears to be silent on development outside of the allocated sites and I have found an absence of conflict with the policies within. "As such the site's location outside but adjoining the settlement boundary would not in itself conflict with the development plan." <a href="https://www.gazette-news.co.uk/-/19526672-homes-plan/">https://www.gazette-news.co.uk/-/19526672-homes-plan/</a>	The Neighbourhood Plan has no allocated sites. The Steering Group consider that the policies in the Plan allow for windfall development where this is appropriate whilst giving adequate protection to those areas where it is not appropriate to develop e.g. Local Green Spaces, Green Corridors, Green Buffer etc.
P/FC/43	GL1 re green space, I'd want to see more on protecting the trees, ponds, hedges etc that exist - developers should be made to build around them unless absolutely necessary to destroy.	In respect of Policy G11 new criterion i) added which references protection of ancient trees and hedgerows and/or trees and hedgerows of arboricultural value. New criterion ii) added which references protection and enhancement of blue infrastructure (such as ponds).
P/FC/44	Please find a few ideas below, if they can't be included are there other ways they can be taken into consideration:  Sewage discharge - 20% of the housing for the whole of Wiltshire when our current systems can't cope - Wessex Water have asked for sewer and surface water to be separated on new developments and retrofitted, Government aren't including this in policy, can we? This is a useful link to check Chippenham incidences <a href="https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/e834e261b53740eba2fe6736e37bbc7b/page/Map/?draft=true&amp;fbclid=IwAR1YHrU4TXbalkqJpfHtqbACHrQVJ5jgEKo04HTGW6d3eOX2bRdaugNE_Ok&amp;org=theriverstrust">https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/e834e261b53740eba2fe6736e37bbc7b/page/Map/?draft=true&amp;fbclid=IwAR1YHrU4TXbalkqJpfHtqbACHrQVJ5jgEKo04HTGW6d3eOX2bRdaugNE_Ok&amp;org=theriverstrust</a>	The sewer and surface water connections to new housing are governed by separate consents required from the statutory waste/water bodies. Government guidance is clear that neighbourhood plans should not try to duplicate what is already covered under separate regimes.
P/FC/45	Light Pollution - can anything be included so stores like Aldi don't have all their lights on at 3am wasting electricity?	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot regulate hours when lights are on/off in commercial properties. This could be done by imposing planning conditions on any consents where considered necessary and able to pass the tests set out in the NPPF for use of conditions.
P/FC/46	As a climate emergency has been declared can anything be done to limit paper flyer frequency for pizza companies etc? <del>Are there any other schemes that can be included like plastic free items in Chippenham.</del>	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot deal with this aspect. It can ensure adequate litter bins are provided in new green spaces though.
P/FC/47	We currently have issues for Doctor and Dentist, even child availability, can this be addressed?	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot address this immediate situation, but it can seek to ensure through Policy C11 and the Chippenham Design Guide that future development proposals include adequate social infrastructure (such as doctors, dentists etc.) to meet the needs of new communities.
P/FC/48	The neighbourhood plan is a great piece of work, well done!	Support noted.
P/FC/49	There was one question on community infrastructure and the rest seem to be about the environment and buildings. I don't feel this that this is a balanced reflection of the views of all of the groups who met to help with the Neighbourhood Plan and has been mainly driven by the opinions of the environmental group.	The Community Infrastructure Topic Group were given the freedom to investigate and research what might be possible for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan around community infrastructure and submit draft policies to the Steering Group. They did this and their policy was agreed by the Steering Group. The Steering Group do not agree with the comment that the Plan does not represent a balanced reflection of the views of all Topic Groups, as the process described above occurred with each Topic Group.
P/FC/50	This is a great plan overall. I hope the council manages to implement it, particularly the green (climate and biodiversity) initiatives and make our town more sustainable and pleasant.	Support noted. Wiltshire Council, as the Local Planning Authority, would implement the Neighbourhood Plan, rather than the Town Council.
P/FC/51	This is not intended to be a 'woke' comment, but it would be good to see the use of "older people" instead of "the elderly". The draft carefully does not use "the disabled" and you may wish to consider applying the same approach to older people.	Agree. Reference to 'elderly' replaced with 'older people' in Paragraph 7.12 and Policies H1 and T2.
P/FC/52	This is overly long and complex questionnaire based on a overly long and complex plan. It is dense and verbose and seems designed to garner as little response as possible due to the long-winded and rambling nature of the document. It appears specifically designed to actually put people off providing feedback!	The questionnaire was not intentionally designed to put people off, and it was made clear to respondents that they only needed to fill in those parts of the questionnaire where they were interested in responding on the topic/policy.
P/FC/53	It needs less technical and bureaucratic jargon and more plain English.	When reviewing the Plan's policies the Steering Group have tried where possible to ensure greater use of plan English, but recognising that the Plan's audience is varied. For example, technical language sometimes has to be used when having to deal with complex, technical issues, to ensure policy wording is not misinterpreted by developers.
P/FC/54	Very comprehensive - let's hope parking will not be a problem	Support noted.
P/FC/55	Very well considered and progressive Plan. <del>Well done everyone</del>	Support noted.
P/FC/56	We must have more arts and cultural development, there is some support for sports but very little for the arts.	Neighbourhood Plan Policy C1 seeks to provide new community infrastructure for major development schemes.

P/FC/57	We need more green space, wild flower meadows, nest boxes, swift nest boxes in new build units where possible. We need to protect the riverbank in town centre from intrusive development and disturbance to wildlife.	Neighbourhood Plan Policies GI1-GI5 seek to enhance existing green and blue infrastructure, and create new green and blue infrastructure, for wildlife to utilise. Policy GI1 requires building integrated bird and bat boxes and swift bricks and bee bricks in new buildings. Policy TC2 seeks to protect and enhance the River Avon Green Corridor.
P/FC/58	Well done, great effort	Support noted.
P/FC/59	Well this is a well written document and I applaud most of the objectives, however I can't help but think that it has been written with you 'hands tied behind your back' That the achievement of many of the objectives will be determined by what Wiltshire Council decides and the absence of any say on bigger development issues means that our neighbourhood plan will be tinkering at the edges.....what about our food security for example when all out farmland has been built in? What about real access to open countryside? What about levels of induced traffic in the town with all the additional housing. However, thank you all who are trying to improve our neighbourhood. I think this is a good plan.	Support noted. As correctly commented upon the Neighbourhood Plan can only deal with non-strategic planning issues in Chippenham. However, the Plan and additional CIL money which can be spent in Chippenham as a result, will still be of meaningful benefit to the Chippenham community. Some of the issues raised in the comment are either strategic issues or non-planning issues.
P/FC/60	Where is the section on new bypasses, and plans for infill housing, they might be WCC plans but they definitely impact the Chippenham plan and need to be stated and taken into consideration	The Neighbourhood Plan can only deal with non-strategic issues and not strategic issues relating to any proposed future bypasses, which are the domain of the Emerging Local Plan and/or Local Highways Authority. The Neighbourhood is not allocating any brownfield infill housing sites in its Plan, as this would be over and above the thousands of new houses proposed for Chippenham in the Regulation 18 version of the Emerging Local Plan.