This ill-conceived application, which is replete with misinformation and inaccuracies should never have reached this stage. Just one example: the Design and Access Statement states: “Corsham town centre is thriving whereas others, such as Melksham, are struggling”. This is nonsense which clearly demonstrates the speculative, uninformed nature of this application. Melksham has four superstores and three supermarkets; Corsham has just one small supermarket – the Co-op. If, as Redcliffe’s documents would have us believe, this is a benchmark for development, **then build in Melksham not in Corsham.**

The mining situation illustrates the complete lack of logic and some artifice from developer and planners alike. In the first (February) version of the Mining Report, it was stated that "*it would be prudent to undertake a* ***Geophysical Survey***". This was changed in the later (April) version to "*prudent to undertake a* ***visual inspection***”. The Planning Officer states “*The plan illustrates that the mine shafts are outside of the red line for the planning application. The mines are therefore not underneath the area proposed for housing and no objection is raised to the development in this regard.*” With the greatest respect, the location of a shaft has no bearing on the extent of the associated mine. For example, the working face of Pickwick Quarry (which the Redcliffe reports bizarrely say **is inactive**) is currently under the western edge of Copenacre some half-kilometre away from its shaft.

Further lack of logic is found in the Planning Officer’s conclusion with “*the application will*

*protect the long term future of the remaining green gap between Rudloe and Corsham*”. Having just effectively closed the green gap, what remains will be a rectangle (of sorts) bounded by: the Redcliffe and Hannick developments, Rudloe Estate and Basil Hill **– it will not be a ‘green gap’ between Rudloe and Corsham**. This would be in direct contravention of the objectives of Corsham Town Council’s Corporate Plan approved in 2010 which was to ‘Ensure that a green open space between Corsham and surrounding villages is retained’.

The current green gap here consists of about 60 acres of agricultural land, 35 acres of which will be lost to this and the Hannick development if both are approved. If we want to talk of sustainability, then the rate of loss of English agricultural land is not sustainable. At present, we only produce about 60% of our food requirement – we cannot afford to keep building on farmland. Agricultural land, though not widely known, is an important carbon store - so destroying it for building gives a ‘triple whammy’ – loss of a carbon store, loss of potential food production and increased carbon production from the buildings thereon. This is not just a patch of land that doesn’t matter – it does matter, maybe in a small way, but it could help to secure this country’s food supply and provide valuable carbon storage.

With regard to the Community Facility, why does the Planning Officer’s report make no mention of the Rudloe Community Centre just **half-a-kilometre** away, built 14 years ago at huge cost and now lying largely unloved and under-used. This existing facility should be brought into effective, constructive use rather than build another which would represent a gratuitous waste of money.

Also, with regard to ‘green’, sustainable travel on foot or by bike, **every** journey from this development would have to start and end by crossing one or other of the two busy roads that circumscribe this site - the footpaths and cycleways being on the opposite sides of these roads. This is neither safe nor ‘sustainable’.