
CHAPTER 14 – APPENDICES & PROPOSALS MAP

Chapter 14 - Nature Conservation Sites of National Importance in North Wiltshire: Appendix 1

Objections

0254/507 Minety Parish Council Appendix 1

Issue

- a. The location of Acres Farm Meadow.

Reasoning and conclusions

- 14.1 **Issue a.** The Council has confirmed that Acres Farm Meadow, Oaksey and Acres Farm Meadow, Minety are one and the same. Consequently, no alteration is required to the Local Plan.
- 14.2 Although not related to the above objection, I consider it appropriate that the appendix should be modified in accordance with PIC 130 and 131.

Recommendation

- 14.3 **I recommend that Appendix 1 be modified in accordance with PICs 130 and 131. I recommend no modification be made to the Local Plan in respect of the above objection.**

Chapter 14 - The Ten Areas of Special Archaeological Significance in North Wiltshire: Appendix 2

Objections

0104/501 Lydiard Tregoz Parish Council Appendix 2

Issue

- a. Whether the appendix should be deleted.

Reasoning and conclusions

- 14.4 **Issue a.** The objector deplores the removal of the appendix, although no reasons are given for the objection. Nature conservation sites of local importance are not statutory designations and the location, extent and number of sites is likely to change over time as paragraph 6.19 of the Local Plan explains. Consequently, I consider that it was appropriate for the appendix to be deleted as it could soon have become out-of-date and misleading.

Recommendation

- 14.5 **I recommend that no modification be made to the Local Plan in respect of the above objection.**
-

Chapter 14 - County Wide Parking Standards: Appendix 3

Objections

0422/026	David Wilson Homes/Westbury Homes/Heron Land	Appendix 3 (Appendix 4)
0523/059	Government Office for the South West	Appendix 3 (Appendix 4)
0686/502	Freshfield Developments	Appendix 3

Issue

- a. The main issue raised in the above representations is whether the parking standards are appropriate.

Reasoning and conclusions

14.6 **Issue a.** The standards in some cases exceed those set out in Annex D of PPG 13. The advice in PPG 13 is that the levels set out in Annex D should be applied as a maximum throughout England, although authorities may adopt more rigorous standards where appropriate. In addition, objectors are concerned that the level of residential allowance is greater than that recommended in PPG 3. The Council points out that the standards apply countywide and that they reflect the rural nature of the area. I appreciate that developers are not necessarily required to provide more car parking than they or potential occupiers might want and that developments may not therefore provide the maximum level of parking provision set out in the Local Plan. Nevertheless, I share the objectors' concerns that the standards set out may result in forms of development that are unsustainable, particularly as the standards in Appendix 3 apply to both urban and rural areas. However, as the standards apply countywide, I consider that any review of those standards should be undertaken by the Highway Authority, so as to ensure consistency of approach between the Districts within the County.

Recommendation

- 14.7 **I recommend that no modification be made to the Local Plan in respect of the above objections.**

Chapter 14 - Transport Assessment and Travel Plans Thresholds: Appendix 4

Objections

0456/503	Taylor Woodrow Developments	Appendix 4
----------	-----------------------------	------------

Issue

- a. Travel plans should not be required for residential developments.

Reasoning and conclusions

14.8 Policy T2 and Appendix 4 identify the need for transport assessments and travel plans for developments of 100 dwellings or more. While a transport assessment may be required for such developments, PPG 13 does not advise that travel plans need be prepared in association with residential developments. The Council has accepted that only a travel plan is required for housing developments over 100 dwellings and PIC 132 makes an appropriate alteration to the Appendix.

Recommendation

14.9 **I recommend that the Local Plan be modified in accordance with PIC 132**

Chapter 14 - (Appendix 5 - deleted)

Objections

0355/002	The Skelton Group	(9.15 Appendix 5 deleted)
0387/094	David Wilson Estates	(9.15 Appendix 5 deleted)
0422/506	David Wilson Homes/Heron Homes/Westbury Homes	Appendix 5 (deleted)

Issues

The main issues raised in the representations are:

- a. Whether the land use implications of the proposed cycle network should be detailed.
- b. Whether the cycle network plan should be updated to include the integrated cycleway routes and connections proposed to the south of Wootton Bassett.
- c. Whether the appendix should be deleted.

Reasoning and conclusions

14.10 **Issue a & b.** As the appendix is deleted in the RDDLP there is no need for me to consider the objections further.

14.11 **Issue c.** An objection has been made to the deletion of the appendix. I accept that the cycle network plan could provide helpful background information to Policy T5. However, as the cycle network is likely to be subject to change, the plan could quickly become out of date and misleading. For that reason, I support its deletion.

Recommendation

14.12 **I recommend that no modification be made to the Local Plan in respect of the above objections.**

Chapter 14 - (Appendix 8 - deleted)

Objections

0156/538	CPRE (2)	Appendix 8 (deleted)
----------	----------	----------------------

Issue

- a. Whether the appendix should be re-instated [0156]

Reasoning and conclusions

14.13 **Issue a.** The CPRE object to deletion of the appendix in the RDDLP, as it identified areas of open space subject to Policy CF1 and so made the plan easier to use for the benefit of the general public. However, the Council states that the appendix was out-

of-date, and having regard to the changes made to the wording of Policy CF1 and the reasoned justification for the policy, I consider the appendix to be unnecessary. Regarding areas of open space that are of public value, all such spaces are protected under Policy CF2.

Recommendation

14.14 **I recommend that no modification be made to the Local Plan in respect of the above objection.**

Chapter 14 - (Appendix 9 - deleted)

Objections

0387/096 David Wilson Estates (Appendix 9)

Issue

a. Whether the appendix should be replaced with a more appropriate plan.

Reasoning and conclusions

14.15 **Issue a.** The appendix, which only provided a general indication of the extent of the floodplains in the District, was deleted at the RDDLP stage and a reference made to the Environment Agency's detailed floodplain maps at paragraph 6.58 of the plan. Paragraph 51 of PPG 25 advises that local planning authorities should show the areas of flood risk on local plans where specific policies are to be applied to minimise and manage the risk. The extent of the watercourse network and the consequential areas at risk of flooding within the District is extensive. Although desirable, it would be a time consuming task to indicate accurately the extent of the floodplains on the Proposals Maps. At this late stage in the Local Plan process, and bearing in mind the limited life of the Plan, I do not consider such a significant modification to be justified or necessary, given that the Environment Agency's maps are now readily accessible to developers and landowners.

Recommendation

14.16 **I recommend that no modification be made to the Local Plan in respect of the above objection.**

Chapter 14 - Proposals Map

Objections

0375/501 Corsham Civic Society Proposals Map
0714/553 Pegasus Planning Group Proposals Map

Issues

The main issues raised in the representations are:

a. Whether the Proposals Maps should be more detailed.

- b. Whether the Proposals Maps require amendment.

Reasoning and conclusions

- 14.17 **Issue a.** The objector raises a number of points relating to the preparation of the Local Plan. Some of the points are general observations relating to development in Corsham in recent years, and the consequent changes sought to the Proposals Maps are not specified. In my view, the Proposal Maps show in appropriate detail those sites and areas that are subject to specific policies and proposals within the Local Plan. The inclusion of additional detail is unnecessary and potentially confusing for the reader.
- 14.18 **Issue b.** The objection is related to site specific objections that I have considered earlier in the report. No modifications are required to the Proposals Maps, other than those I have previously recommended.
- 14.19 Although not related to the above objections, for the avoidance of doubt, I consider that the proposals maps should be modified in accordance with PICs 133, 134, 135, 136, 138, 140, 141, 142 and 163 for reasons that I have explained previously in my report/

Recommendation

- 14.20 **I recommend that the Proposals Maps be modified in accordance with PIC 133, 134, 135, 136, 138, 140, 141, 142 and 163. I recommend that no modification be made to the Local Plan in respect of the above objections.**