

Director of Planning, Economy and Regeneration
Wiltshire Council
Monkton Park Offices
Monkton Hill
Chippenham
SN15 1ER

29 The Green
London
N21 1HS

07825 646 365

Your ref: PL/2025/03422

Our ref: 2569

Via Planning Portal (PP-14624064)

11th February 2026

Dear Sir / Madam

Former Vauxhall Car Dealership and Workshop, Bath Road, Chippenham SN14 0UX
Section 73 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Application to Remove Condition 22 (Number of Storage Units)
Planning Permission (ref: PL/2025/03422)

I write on behalf of the applicant, Cinch Self Storage, to apply to remove Condition 22, which prevents the increase in the number of storage units within the building.

Along with this letter, the following documents have been submitted to the Council:

- i. Application Form.
- ii. Location Plan.
- iii. CIL Additional Information Form.

The application fee of £2,000 has been paid to the Council via the Planning Portal.

On 8th January 2026, the Council granted planning permission (ref: PL/2025/03422) for:

Demolition of existing building and redevelopment of site to create new building for Class B8 (self-storage) use arranged over ground, first and part second floors with associated servicing and parking areas, tree planting, landscaping and external plant.

The permission was granted subject to 23 conditions. Condition 22 reads as follows:

Condition 22

The development hereby permitted shall not, at any time, be subdivided into a larger number of units.

REASON: To enable the Local Planning Authority to consider individually whether planning permission should be granted for additional units on the site.

This letter sets out the reasons why Condition 22 does not meet all the Government's six tests for planning conditions and should, therefore, be removed.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's policy on the use of planning conditions. Paragraph 57 states that:

Planning conditions should be kept to a minimum and only imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

The approved floor plans show only an indicative layout, they do not show the detailed arrangement of storage units, which range in size from 10sqft to 200sqft. This is common for self-storage schemes. The building's footprint, reception/back of house spaces, main entrances, loading/unloading bays, lifts, stairs and circulation spaces must be designed at the planning stage, but the detailed arrangement of storage units is produced during the detailed design stage.

Cinch are a well-established, mainstream self-storage operator. Their facilities are typical of the industry. Excluding Bath Road, Cinch have a portfolio of 24 stores across England. They range in size from 3,124sqm to 9,768sqm and in storage units from 334 to 826 units. The average Cinch store is 5,504sqm and has 533 storage units.

The approved Bath Road storage scheme will have between 250 – 300 storage units and will, therefore, be typical of purpose-built, self-storage facilities across country.

The TRICS database uses gross floorspace to predict the number of vehicle trips generated by self-storage schemes. This was the basis used to assess the approved scheme. The assessment was accepted by the Council's Highway Officer, who did not object to the scheme.

With the use of the building silent, the potential sources of impact to residential amenity are external plant noise, external lighting, hours of operation, and the size and number of vehicles entering/leaving the site. Plant noise, lighting, operating hours and vehicle sizes are all controlled by condition. The number of vehicles is predicted, via the TRICS database of self-storage facilities, on the basis of floorspace. In the case of Bath Road, the predicted number has been found to be acceptable. There is no evidential basis or need for an alternative assessment of the activity arising from the facility based on the number of storage units it may contain.

In the light of these considerations, Condition 22 does not comply with four of the six tests for planning conditions for the following reasons:

Necessity

- i. There is no planning reason for the condition. It is not needed to make the development acceptable because it has already been assessed (on the basis of proposed floorspace) and found to be acceptable.

Relevance to the Development

- ii. The condition is not justified by the nature or impact of the development proposed.

Enforceability

- iii. In practice, it would be impossible to detect a contravention of the condition if, for instance, one additional unit was created within the building which would give rise to no discernible change in activity at the site.

Reasonableness

- iv. The requirement to apply every time Cinch wished to increase the number of units is not justified by the assessment of the approved scheme and places a disproportionate burden on the applicant.

For the reasons set out above, Condition 22 does not meet all six tests and should, therefore, be removed.

I look forward to hearing from officers in due course.

Yours faithfully



Jon Dingle

On behalf of Jon Dingle Ltd