

DevelopmentmanagementNorth

From: Paul Turner
Sent: 27 December 2013 15:12
To: Marsh, Chris; DevelopmentmanagementNorth
Subject: Planning Application 13/05724/OUT - Land South of Bradford Road, Rudloe
Attachments: Objection to Hannick Planning Application - part 1.docx; Objection to Hannick Planning Application - part 2.docx; Objection to Hannick Planning Application - part 3.docx; Objection to Hannick Planning Application - part 4.docx; Objection to Hannick Planning Application - part 5.docx; Objection to Hannick Planning Application - part 6.docx

Importance: High

Chris,

I have just discovered a few 'typos' in the documents attached to my objection email dated 24th December. I have corrected these and attach the original email and associated documents below. I see that with the intervening Christmas holiday, no representations from 24th, 25th or 26th December have yet been uploaded to the 13/05724/OUT webpages so I wonder if you could include this email and its revised attachments rather than the original.

Many thanks

Paul Turner

Original email dated 24th December follows:

Chris,

Ref: Planning Application 13/05724/OUT - Land south of Bradford Road, Rudloe

There are so many holes in this planning application that it's difficult to know where to start.

With regard to Hunter Page's 'Statement of Community Engagement' and its 'have you stopped beating your wife' loaded questions, at the present time, there are 62 representation letters from the community on Wilts CC's 13/05724/OUT webpage all opposing this speculative development. I know, from community contacts, that there are many more in the pipeline so by the time the consultation period ends, I would imagine that the account will show about 100 against with (probably) no letters of support. So whither the statement in the Planning Design and Access Statement, "As evidenced from the feedback received from the most recent public consultation event, there appears to be a good level of local support for this application"?

Contradictory and apparently hurried (statements within) documents illustrate the contempt with which the local community is held by the developers (for example, the Flood Risk Assessment shows Shill Brook as a fluvial flooding source - a miracle required here as Shill Brook is in Oxfordshire!). The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is marked 'DRAFT NOT FOR SUBMISSION'. The figures page and (four) appendices to the Transport Statement are empty. Searching questions receive no response (e.g. questions in an email to Hannick on 25th November). Whilst this development is held to be within the area designated as 'Corsham Town' by the Core Strategy and Wilts CC's Spatial Planning Department, no Rudloe community representation is allowed at Corsham Town Council Planning Committee meetings in spite of the fact that Rudloe developments (e.g. the subject application) are discussed and "supported" (on extremely shallow grounds).

Much is made of the Bath ASU/Pharmaxo commercial side of this development in Hunter Page's 'Planning Design and Access Statement' yet the commercial planning application is made by Masrich Executive Pension Scheme Trustees, not Bath ASU. This Bradford Road development, unlike Bath ASU's proposed Park Lane development, is purely speculative and the "additional employment land" (as described in Corsham Town Council's 'support'), with 150,000 sq ft of commercial property already vacant in the Corsham area, is not needed.

And talk about 'Something is rotten in the state of Denmark', the planning process, in this case, appears tainted. In June 2013, a Corsham Primary School governors meeting was informed that approval had been granted for this development some six months before the planning application was to be submitted! In July, discussions were under way with architects regarding the design of new school buildings! No response has been received from the governors to a request for explanation. This needs to be investigated, probably by an external authority - the Planning Inspectorate perhaps?

In order not to produce an inordinately long single tome, I have had to divide my objections into six volumes which are attached:

- the 'big picture' with regard to sustainability (apologies for using this buzzword)
- the greenfield/brownfield issue
- the commercial side of the proposal
- the expansion of Rudloe into a large conurbation with no services
- the transport and vehicular access issues
- response to Hunter Page's Planning Design and Access Statement

With best wishes for a happy Christmas and prosperous New Year

Sincerely

Paul Turner
29 Springfield Close
Rudloe

Part 1 of a 6-part response by Paul Turner, 29 Springfield Close, Rudloe SN13 0JR

1. The 'big picture' with regard to so-called sustainable development east of Bath

Much of what follows was also presented in the argument against the speculative Gladman development at Pickwick. The reason for this is that the subject development and the Gladman development are both speculative greenfield developments and, if approved, will add to an already over-large sprawl west of Corsham and increase traffic problems.

Sustainable developments and sustainable travel? **The big picture is far from sustainable.** Local people are extremely concerned about current traffic levels on the A4, B3109 (Bradford Road), Westwells Road and Park Lane and their associated roundabouts and junctions. Commuters face long lines at peak times at the Pickwick roundabouts, the Cross Keys lights and the west Chippenham A4 roundabouts. Easton Lane is being used as a 'rat run' between Corsham and Chippenham, particularly at peak times, bringing problems to walkers, cyclists and the inhabitants of Easton and Westrop. On 3rd December, I monitored the traffic using Easton Lane between 16:45 and 17:45. The total number of vehicles entering/leaving Easton Lane was 141. This is, of course, a winter figure – in summer, with lighter nights, usage is higher. Look at what has come to pass with the Basil Hill development in Hawthorn. Whilst the major roads (A4, A360, B3109) were envisaged as the access routes, the 'rat runs' through Potley, Moor Green and Westwells are being used by commuters to the south and Quarry Hill by those from the west. This situation militates against **any** further development in Corsham (or Chippenham for that matter).

Apart from local traffic issues, all developments east of Bath increase traffic problems in Bath, Bristol and the country lanes used as 'rat runs'.

Our region's road infrastructure, apart from the M4 and its access roads, remains the same as that used by previous generations – it is essentially a rural network. It was never designed to, nor should it, cope with the demands being placed on it by incessant and excessive urban growth. Typifying the problems that growth and the rural road structure bring is the example of our regional, international airport, Bristol. The airport has no railway or motorway links. All taxis travelling to the airport from east of Bath (and presumably from Bath itself) use the lanes through, for example, Chew Magna and Winford creating traffic chaos in these small communities. The reason for this is, of course, that the main routes are already beyond capacity. For every one of my taxi journeys to Bristol Airport in the last ten years (and this is a considerable number) the 'rat run' route has been taken. **Is that a sustainable situation for our regional airport, the communities along the 'rat runs' and the airport's users?**

Similarly, the Royal United Hospital (RUH) lies on the 'wrong' side of Bath for its catchment area of North West Wiltshire. Developments east of Bath will increase ambulance journeys to Bath RUH. Sired ambulance journeys are already a curse along the rural A4 where sirens can be heard, for example, as far away as Weavert Lane (perhaps 2 or 3km from the A4) or Pound Mead on numerous

occasions each day. Sirens travelling past Ashley, through Box and up Box Hill can be heard at considerable distances for minutes on end throughout the By Brook Valley and on its hillsides. In restaurants and elsewhere along the standard route for ambulances in Bath: The Paragon, George St, Gay St and Queen Square, I have calculated from experiences in restaurants along the route, siren frequency as 'two per meal'. The more development to the east of the city, the more traffic along the A4 into the city, the more ambulance journeys across the city and the more disquieting everyday life becomes. Clearly, this example of ambulance journeys is just the thin end of the wedge as all Wiltshire users of the RUH increase the traffic problems across the city.

In terms of the long-term **sustainable** (apologies) future access to the RUH and a peaceful life along the A4 and in the city, development should be targeted to the west of Bath (or the RUH moved!). An example of such development would be the former Cadbury's site at Keynsham.

The general point is, of course, that given the current traffic levels on major routes and the 'rat run' situation, Corsham and Chippenham **are not sustainable** for speculative growth.

I therefore urge Wilts CC planners to reject this planning application.

Sincerely

Paul Turner

2. The greenfield/brownfield issue

In spite of planning guidelines, little or no import appears to have been given by our local council representatives to this issue. They prefer instead to take the easy option by giving approval without, it appears, thinking of the long-term consequences.

The list below shows approved or potential brownfield development sites in the Rudloe/Hawthorn area:

- Ex HMS Royal Arthur site – 221 dwellings (with permission)
- Ex RNSD Copenacre site – 100+ dwellings (with permission)
- Ex RAF Rudloe No 1 site – permission lapsed/land sold on (18.5-acre part advertised for commercial development in November 2013)
- Ex RAF Rudloe No 2 site – (20 acres for sale by tender – January 2014)

The remaining requirement of just 239 dwellings (of the total of 475 for Corsham Town listed in the Core Strategy and identified by Hannick) for the Corsham area by 2026 can easily be satisfied by the Copenacre and RAF Rudloe No 2 sites. So why speculate on greenfield sites and worse why approve that speculation?

Regarding the RAF Rudloe Manor No. 2 Site, in 2009 and 2011, Sarah Morgan and Ellen O’Grady, senior town planners with Defence Estates (now Defence Infrastructure), commenting on Wilts County Council’s planning webpages with regard to development west of Corsham, said the following:

“RAF Rudloe No. 2 site is previously developed and accessible and therefore should receive priority for housing development. The site also benefits from existing established residential uses in the form of MoD living accommodation.”

“The Rudloe site provides a significant opportunity to deliver sustainable mixed use development in Corsham on previously developed surplus public sector land, and its redevelopment should take priority over the development of greenfield land.”

Other brownfield developments are going ahead or planned in this area – 39 homes at West Point on the site of the former Leafield Engineering factory at Westwells, 14 dwellings at the site of the former Flamingo Club at Westwells (both developments are included in the ‘475 reduced to 239’ figures given above). In addition, the GreenSquare housing organisation proposes to increase density at Rudloe Estate by building about 20 homes where garages now stand (this will further reduce the 239 requirement).

I doubt if there is another part of the country with so much brownfield land available within such a small area. Indeed, the Planning Design and Access Statement in para 6.17 quotes a recommendation of the NPPF in “remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.” Sooner or later (certainly by 2026), these brownfield sites will be developed, so why develop greenfield sites to the west of Corsham? If greenfield developments are allowed, Rudloe, Hawthorn and Westwells will become an enormous sprawling conurbation with no services (but that’s another issue – see part 4).

I therefore urge Wilts CC planners to reject this planning application.

Sincerely

Paul Turner

PLANNING
SERVICES
27 DEC 2013

Part 3 of a 6-part response by Paul Turner, 29 Springfield Close, Rudloe SN13 0JR

3. The commercial side of the proposal

Corsham Town Council Planning Committee in supporting this application with, “the additional employment land provided would benefit the immediate community” shows a conspicuous lack of knowledge of the Rudloe/Hawthorn area and (lack of) insight into the wider availability of commercial land/premises in the wider Corsham area.

Unfortunately, this proposed development, along with all others in the country follows a formulaic, second-decade-of-the-21st-century pattern of dwellings plus B1 development. Look just half-a-mile down the road to the speculative Gladman development – exactly the same formula. Hannick and Gladman appear not to believe in their own ‘hype’. If the formula ‘homes plus development’ is designed for local employment, why incorporate 170 parking spaces in the commercial areas?

No doubt, like the high-rise debacles of the 60s and 70s, this formula will be regarded with disdain in decades to come. Why would people want to buy a house or live next to commercial premises? Moreover, around 150,000 sq. ft. of commercial/industrial/office premises is currently being advertised (November 2013) through EG (Estates Gazette) at Leafield, Fiveways, Park Lane and Moon (Box Hill) industrial estates, Pickwick Park, Hartham Park, Spring Park, Martingate Centre, Overmoor Farm, The Old Malthouse and Rudloe Campus. Why build more speculative commercial premises with all this current spare capacity in the Corsham area alone?

The last-mentioned site above at RAF Rudloe No. 1 Site is another enormous brownfield site with permissions which also has potential for scores of homes and commercial property. Indeed, part of this site is currently, in Nov 2013, being advertised by DTZ as “Rudloe Campus, an 18.5 acre brownfield site for commercial/industrial development.”

In addition, the commercial side of this development is purely speculative. Bath ASU proposes a substantive development in Park Lane alongside its existing premises on Fiveways Industrial Estate. The speculative aspect of the Bradford Road development was confirmed by Chris Watt, a director of Bath Qualasept/Bath ASU/Pharmaxo in a conversation at the Hannick presentation in September. In addition, in order to separate the risks of this speculation from the main arms of the company, the planning application is made in the name of Masrich Executive Pension Scheme Trustees. The statements within the planning documents and by others that this proposal will provide scores of jobs (“60 additional jobs” in the Planning Design and Access Statement) is therefore baseless and irrational. One may as well say that the 150,000 sq ft of empty commercial premises currently being advertised in the Corsham area will provide scores of jobs.

I therefore urge Wilts CC planners to reject this planning application.

Sincerely
Paul Turner

RECEIVED
SERVICES
27 DEC 2013

4. The expansion of Rudloe into a large conurbation with no services

The Rudloe estates already consist of 600+ homes.

With future development of local brownfield sites at Copenacre, RAF Rudloe No 1 Site, RAF Rudloe No 2 Site, Royal Arthur, The Flamingo Club and Rudloe Estate (density increase) along with the current build at West Point in Westwells, the Rudloe/Hawthorn/Westwells area will become a 1,000+ dwelling conurbation with no services to speak of. These developments will, sooner or later, come to pass. The current speculative greenfield proposal will add another 90 homes to this agglomeration.

The Planning Design and Access Statement, in para 3.27 states that the accompanying Transport Statement clearly shows that the site is “well located in respect of distances to existing facilities enabling non-car trips to be undertaken for most journeys”. This is patent nonsense, clearly indicated by the inclusion of 200 car parking spaces on the residential development. The primary school across the road and the Post Office in Westwells Road are the only facilities, of the nine listed, that may be accessed on foot. The ‘food store’ on Rudloe Estate is also within walking distance but has an extremely limited range of items and would only be used on an odd occasion perhaps for an exhausted staple e.g. milk. The other services listed: doctor, dentist, secondary school, chemist and bank are all 1 to 1.5 miles distant as are Corsham shops, library, restaurants, butcher, bookshop, hardware store etc (all 1.5 miles distant).

The inclusion of the railway station at Melksham as a service within close proximity is also a nonsense. The Transport Statement table shows a distance of 4.6 miles for the station whereas AA Route Planner calculates the distance as 6.4 miles. Perhaps Badingham (the author) is using unsustainable ‘rat runs’.

In order to access a reasonable-sized supermarket with a range of goods and competitive prices, the Rudloe shopper must travel to Sainsbury’s in Chippenham or Morrisons in Bath. Assuming no car is available for locals in social housing, a mother with two fare-paying children (to help carry the shopping!) must pay more than £12 in bus fares for this privilege. This is a sizeable chunk of a weekly budget to lose before shopping even starts.

The Rudloe website at <http://www.rudloescene.co.uk/archive-1/boxfields/> shows archive material including maps of the Boxfields prefab estates, the forerunners of Rudloe Estate. The maps show that the estates of perhaps 300 prefabs had the following facilities: butcher, grocer, cobbler, coal merchant, fish & chip shop, doctor’s surgery, library, community centre and school. This was in the 1940s, 50s and 60s – now in the 21st-century, the school and community centre remain but little else.

Another facility lost at Rudloe was within the £750,000 Rudloe Community Centre, a centre built at the turn of the century and recently described by Wilts County Council as “not fit for purpose”. The bar facility here closed in September 2013 after 64 years of operation in three different locations. Now, the social activities associated with the bar have been lost and facilities further afield must be used.

A local ‘community leader’ (for want of a better word) has described Rudloe as “deprived” and “needy”. It certainly is deprived of services. The Rudloe family is disadvantaged compared with those living closer to town centres and by proposing more development here with social housing, more families will become deprived.

So what is the rationale behind the creation of an enormous conurbation without services? Perhaps there is no rationale and, as a neighbour here has speculated, Rudloe is a convenient dumping ground for developmental sprawl.

I therefore urge Wilts CC planners to reject this planning application.

Sincerely

Paul Turner

27 DEC 2013

Part 5 of a 6-part response by Paul Turner, 29 Springfield Close, Rudloe SN13 0JR

5. Transport and vehicular access issues

Wider transport issues are discussed in Part 1 of this objection - **The 'big picture' with regard to so-called sustainable development east of Bath.**

This part concentrates on the local transport and site access issues.

It is widely known that, over the years, Bradford Road and Park Lane have seen many accidents. However, the planning application concentrates solely on reported accidents involving serious injury over the last three years, from the police database, which totalled just one.

This development, if allowed, will last generations not just three years. So it is appropriate to disclose the accidents that have occurred here over generations.

The only (non-fatal) accident in the police database is or was where a car with an elderly couple from Frome aboard failed to negotiate the bend below Rudloe Estate and crashed into a tree. This was about 200 metres east of the new school entrance. There have been many other non-fatal accidents very close to the new school entrance (NSE): Lorraine Dancey suffered a fractured skull and other injuries and Maureen Ashley, who was pregnant, suffered life-changing injuries - these accidents occurred after the ladies concerned had alighted from the bus; a Rudloe resident was hit by a car about 150 metres west of the NSE and hospitalised with broken bones; my brother-in-law lost control of his car and crashed into the trees just below the NSE - he was uninjured but the car was a write-off. My other brother-in-law (!) was involved in a collision at the B3109/A365 junction when the occupants of the 'other' car (who were Rudloe residents) had to be cut from the car. Recently two accidents with vehicles colliding with trees have occurred within 100 and 200 yards respectively of the NSE.

In July 2009, Leanne Harris (the mother of a Corsham Primary pupil) was killed at the B3109/A4 junction. David Plummer, a Rudloe resident, was killed in August 2007 on the B3109 some 200 metres east of the NSE (if you look carefully, you may see a small 'shrine' at the spot). In a horrific accident, witnessed by a neighbour, a horse and rider were killed on the B3109 at Rudloe Fiveways some 300 metres west of the NSE. Another Rudloe resident, Janet Slocombe, was killed on the B3109 at Thorneypits about 800 metres west of the NSE. Some years ago Mrs Kelly, a Rudloe resident, was killed whilst cycling at the Skynet Drive/Park Lane junction some 200 metres south of the NSE. Again some years ago, two local lads, Timmy Gibbons and David Hunt, were killed on Park Lane close to what is now the entrance to Katherine Park. And some years before that, a schoolchild was killed in Park Lane close to St Patrick's Church. I relate Park Lane accidents here as the Bradford Road and Park Lane are similar Corsham-Rudloe/Hawthorn routes.

And on Friday 13th December 2013, a 17-year-old local motorcyclist, Kieron Kellett, collided with a parked car outside the NSE. The accident happened at 4:20pm and the road was closed while the emergency services attended. Kieron was treated at the scene by the ambulance crew but his injuries required further treatment at Frenchay. The on-scene treatment and accident investigation necessitated road closure until around 6:20 pm.

So that's the 'known' accident situation described in the application's Transport Statement as follows, "In summary, the accident record along the local highway network over the three year period does not indicate any particular highway safety issue within the area considered."

The 'new' Bradford Road entrance (described above as the NSE) to what is now Corsham Woodland School has been the subject of intense debate and criticism since its opening in 2010. Indeed, an article on the subject can be found at the foot of the 'News', 'Rudloe' page of the Rudloe website here: <http://www.rudloescene.co.uk/news-1/rudloe/>. The file 'link' shown below the article details the correspondence on the subject and runs to 60 pages!

The Bradford Road is used by service buses (four per hour) and Town Link buses (at present). It is the favoured route for MJ Church 32-tonne trucks ploughing a regular furrow between quarries at Whatley and other locations to the south and west, and any destination to the north and east. Scores of these trucks can make this journey every day. It is also the route for the 44-tonne trucks delivering wheat to the Nestle factory at Staverton. And it is the route for the many industrial-scale agricultural vehicles travelling between the Freeman Brothers base at Boxfields to destinations north and east. This is, of course, all in addition to the regular vehicular traffic.

I was invited to attend a meeting at County Hall on this subject in September 2013 with the deputy leader of Wiltshire County Council, John Thompson, and the Associate Director of Highways and Transport, Parvis Khansari. At this meeting it was determined that the process to implement parking restrictions in the form of double yellow (heritage primrose actually) lines would be inaugurated at the site of the NSE.

A local movie maker has produced a video illustrating the dangers of this road and the school parking. It can be found on Youtube here: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EzRHmxKIJFQ>. The video footage starts at about 1 minute 25 seconds.

The proposed entrance to the speculative development is opposite the NSE between two blind bends. **This is not a viable location for an estate entrance!**

The Transport Statement states that the site is located within walking distance of local services, comprising shops and local facilities (there are no "shops" or "local facilities") and then goes on to advise us that the residential development alone will contain about 200 parking spaces! Tarmac for cars on what was once a green field! It then offers a half-baked 'solution' to a problem that need not exist. This is the provision for at least 12 parking spaces, in lay-bys, for use by school parents. Twelve

parking spaces used for 30 minutes each weekday? There is an unused 30-space car park on Rudloe Estate opposite the main school entrance!

The Planning Design and Access statement, in para 3.29, says: "The residential scheme will be accessed via a new vehicular access, located on Bradford Road. This access will take the form of a ghost island right turn lane, with an incorporated pedestrian refuge. The design and location of this proposed access has been agreed with highway officers from Wiltshire Council." This 'right turn lane' along with the 'visibility splay' at Skynet Drive, will effectively make three lanes in Bradford Road between the two blind bends. This road widening will require the removal of all the trees to the south of the road - at least 41 semi-mature trees and many shrubs detailed, along with 11 photos, in the 6th October Rudloe News article at the Rudloe website here:

<http://www.rudloescene.co.uk/news-1/rudloe/>

However, the Ecological Appraisal contains the following statements: "The development minimises adverse impacts by avoiding the boundary trees and shrubs, **which will be protected during construction** using methodologies agreed with the local planning authority. Although common birds may be nesting in boundary habitat, most of this habitat is located outside the site boundaries. **As such it will be retained and remain unaffected by the proposed development**, and therefore nesting birds are not considered to be a constraint for the proposed development."

It is stated elsewhere in the documents that the trees along the Bradford Road are outside the site boundary so, presumably, these are the 'boundary trees' and 'habitat' of the Ecological Appraisal. However, the road widening scheme will require the removal of just about all of these trees so whither the statements highlighted in bold above?

Now, passing to the proposed cycle network between the development and Corsham. Certainly, there is now a good cycle path running the length of Park Lane from RAF Rudloe No 2 Site (a brownfield site!) to Pickwick. However, **there is no safe access from Skynet Drive to the cycle path.** Skynet Drive joins Park Lane at a blind bend and this is the very spot where Mrs Kelly, a cyclist and Rudloe resident, was killed some years ago.

I therefore urge Wilts CC planners to reject this planning application.

Sincerely

Paul Turner

Part 6 of a 6-part response by Paul Turner, 29 Springfield Close, Rudloe SN13 0JR

6. Response to Hunter Page's Planning Design and Access Statement

Para 3.3 of the subject statement states: "The boundary to Bradford Road has the greatest amount of screening by vegetation particularly along its northern section where the road is below the level of the site." And then later in para. 6.19 "Where existing vegetation is removed to accommodate the site access and visibility splays, replacement planting of native species will be provided further back in order to maintain the landscape buffer adjacent to Bradford Road. "What neither this chapter nor the document states is that **all this screening will be removed in order to enable the road-widening scheme**. Indeed, the Ecological Appraisal states: "The construction phase will protect nesting birds and all boundary vegetation." Disingenuous or just downright dishonest? Not only that but both foul and surface water drains run along the northern (Bradford Road) boundary of the field. Wessex Water has stated that no tree planting is to take place within 6 metres and no building within 3 metres of the foul sewer. It may be diverted at the developer's cost but I fail to see where it could be diverted to avoid buildings and trees. Perhaps the supposed replacement trees will fall foul of the sewer (joke!) and we will never see them.

Para 3.11 states: "The employment area will act as an extension to the established Fiveways Trading Estate and provide additional land for Bath ASU/Pharmaxo." If so, then why is the planning application not in the name of Bath ASU/Pharmaxo? The reason, as stated elsewhere, is that this is not a substantive Bath ASU/Pharmaxo development but a speculative development by Masrich (mas = more, rich = rich) – a scheme taking advantage of weakened local government and local communities in the face of powerful forces.

Para 3.22 states: "Given the generally level terrain, the layout presents no real obstacles to the mobility impaired and is within easy reach of the main village facilities." What village? What facilities? This statement indicates that these speculators have no clue about the nature of Rudloe.

Para. 3.22 states: "Buildings of an appropriate scale, shape and layout help define streets and spaces and reinforce a sense of identity, particularly where they respond positively to the scale and materials of a place." There is a section in Private Eye called Pseuds Corner which repeats pompous and pretentious quotations from the media – this nonsense would be a prime candidate. In fact, most of the Planning Design and Access Statement would fit comfortably in Pseuds Corner.

Para. 3.27 states: "The accompanying Transport Statement clearly shows that the site is well located in respect of distances to existing facilities enabling non-car trips to be undertaken for most journeys." If previous statements were nonsense than this takes the biscuit - this application should be refused on the grounds of this fatuous statement alone.

Para 7.4 states: “ The proposal represents a sustainable development in a location which has been identified as the most appropriate location for further growth within Corsham Community Area, and as evidenced from the Statement of Community Engagement, the application has been developed with extensive engagement with the local community.” Almost every objection to this application mentions that this greenfield site is NOT the most appropriate location – brownfield sites, of which there are a number in Rudloe/Hawthorn, should be used.

Para. 7.4 again states: “As evidenced from the feedback received from the most recent public consultation event, there appears to be a good level of local support for this application.” Another downright lie - as indicated elsewhere, there are scores of objections to this application on Wilts CC’s website and none in support.

I could go on but I’m running out of steam so let’s finish with a piece used in the objection to the Gladman speculation at Pickwick ...

Baldwin’s, “The sounds of England, the tinkle of hammer on anvil in the country smithy, the corncrake on a dewey morning, the sound of the scythe against the whetstone, and the sight of a plough team coming over the brow of a hill, the sight that has been in England since England was a land, and may be seen in England long after the Empire has perished and every works in England has ceased to function, for centuries the one eternal sight of England” **is gone and is now superseded by**, “The twinkle in the eyes of landowners and developers who have discovered cash cows over the brow of the hill. Communities and local planners cut down by the scythe of central government viewing not centuries but five-year terms. Grey blocks on every street corner as a reminder of a time of barbarism and infamy.”

I urge Wilts CC planners to reject this planning application.

Sincerely

Paul Turner