

Highway Comments

Application No: PL-2026-01431

Application Location: Southpoint Business Park (Plot 100), Chippenham, Wiltshire SN15 2NU

Application Description: Erection of health, fitness and racquets club, including three outdoor tennis courts within an enclosed air dome structure, three outdoor padel courts enclosed within canopies, indoor and outdoor swimming pools, outdoor multi use court, outdoor battle box exercise facility, external spa garden, child activity area, lounge facilities including a business hub and terrace, together with ancillary facilities, car parking, servicing, landscaping and associated works.

Date of Comments: 16th April 2026

HDC Officer: David Lear

I refer to the full planning application in respect of a proposed David Lloyd Health and Racquets Club at Plot 100 on the Southpoint Business Park. In doing so I refer as required to earlier highway comments made in respect of the pre-application inquiry made concerning the same proposal under ENQ-2025-00641.

I have reviewed the following documents submitted in support of the application as follows:

- Proposed Site Plan: Drawing 24245-HCD-ZZ-00-DR A-PL-003/Rev P01
- Transport Assessment - Parts 1 and 2
- Design and Access Statement - Parts 1 and 2
- Proposed Bike Shelter Details: Drawing 24245-HCD-ZZ-00-DR A-PL-017/Rev P01
- BREEAM Travel Plan

Comments are set out below.

Proposed Site Plan

In previous highway comments on ENQ-2025-00641 I stated that *"the route for cyclists between the shared use path (SUP) on the western side of the new link road and the proposed cycle parking area is less than ideal. The SUP would ideally extend into the site to a point beyond the proposed barriers" and "it should not be necessary for cyclists to meander through the car park with no defined route to the cycle parking"*. The layout now submitted avoids a need for cyclists to traverse the car park, which is good. However, the proposals show the path between the roundabout (and the 3.0m SUP here) and the cycle parking reducing to what appears to be only a 2.0m footway. Furthermore, there are two right-angle bends in the path which would be awkward for cyclists to negotiate whilst mounted. It thus seems that the intent is to force or require or cyclists using the SUP on the western side of the link road to dismount on entering the site (so where the path narrows). As such, the route to the cycle-parking area needs improvement by upgrading the path to a 3.0m width and making the alignment direct by removing the two 90-degree corners currently proposed. There does appear to be ample space within the site plan to make this change.

The number of general cycle parking spaces shown in 3nr shelters and based on details within Drawing 24245-HCD-ZZ-00-DR A-PL-017/Rev P01 appears to be 30. Paragraphs 4.17 and 4.18 of the TA state that the Wiltshire Cycling Strategy requires a minimum of 26 cycle spaces. However, it is evident that the lower "all other areas" formula has been used, not the higher "Principal Settlements and Market Towns" formula. Chippenham is designated as one of Wiltshire's Principal Settlements. Therefore,

cycle parking provision which meets the requirements of the higher formula is required. This creates a requirement for a minimum of 32 spaces, which is not met by the current proposals. Additionally, whilst there is no specific policy requirement, it is disappointing to see such a minimal amount of cycle parking being provided given that customers of this facility will naturally be far more likely to cycle than elsewhere. I would highly encourage the applicant to exceed the policy requirement. The minimum requirement of 32 spaces must be met. By way of additional guidance, **LTN1/20** (Table 11-1) would require a minimum of 130 cycle parking spaces for a leisure site of this size. Whilst it is acknowledged that 32 is the Policy minimum for this site at present, LTN1/20 is strong guidance which indicates that a far higher number of spaces should ideally be provided. There is certainly opportunity to increase provision within the land available in the immediate vicinity of the three covered shelters proposed.

I comment on the proposed number of parking spaces in reviewing the Transport Assessment. However, it would be helpful to see confirmed by dimensions or notes on the drawing the intended bay sizes and critically the aisle widths between the rows of end-on parking bays. These aisle widths to the back of the end-on bays should be a minimum of 6.0m for ease of access/egress (MfS). However, they appear to be no wider than the bays looking at the layout, which I would expect to be 4.8m in length. If so, the number of parking spaces shown may exceed what it is physically possible to provide. However, I do note that Drawing **PD01** in **Appendix D** to the Transport Assessment does show the proposed bay sizes (5.0m x 2.5m) and aisle widths of 6.0m, which is acceptable. However, it would be helpful to see notes to this effect on the main site plan too.

Transport Assessment

Car Parking

Paragraph 4.11 of the Transport Assessment states that *"The proposed development provides 277 parking spaces comprising a mix of:*

- *206 Standard Parking Spaces.*
- *28 EV charging bays.*
- *28 Bays for Future conversion to EV.*
- *10 Disabled Parking Spaces; and*
- *5 Parent and Child Parking Spaces".*

Assessment has been made against the new LTP4 DRAFT parking standards, where a set of 'Optimum' car parking standards for non-residential uses has been developed, this in response to the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 recommending a move away from the previous 'Maximum' standards. The parking ratios stated are generally considered to be the minimum level of car parking required for each use class. In the case of Use Class E (d) 'Indoor sport, recreation, fitness', the parking space requirements are set at 1 per 5m² (less than 1000m²), 1 per 22m² (*greater than 1000m²) + coach parking as necessary. This would require only 209 spaces based on the 4,600sqm GIA of the Heath and Fitness Club stated in paragraph 4.1, but 293 spaces if the additional 1,850sqm GIA of the Tennis Dome is assumed to be extra. This is unclear but, even if additional, the participants using the tennis dome would only be expected to add an extra demand for 12 people, if all three courts were in use at the same time. This suggests the proposed 277 spaces is rather 'in excess' of the 'optimal', so could simply encourage short-distance car trips to the facility.

Traffic Generation and Parking Accumulation

Paragraphs 5.3 to 5.8 consider and update (TRICS) the expected traffic generation for Plot 100 in the weekday peak hours with the consented B1b/c, B2 land use mix under planning application N13/00308/OUT. Figures shown in Table 5.1 are accepted, noting that the TRICS update gives an increase in the predicted vehicle trip generation in both peak hours, although the increases are not significant as noted in paragraph 5.8.

The predicted traffic generation associated with the site does not use generic trip rates based on GIA data (TRICS), but rather average person trip data derived from 93 DLLC across England. Data in Table 5.2 presents 'average' trip arrivals and Table 5.3 the duration of stay. These data have then been used to calculate a person trip arrival and departure profile between 6:00am and midnight (Table 5.5). This first principle's approach is supported. However, it would be helpful to know how this derived average in person arrivals compares with the MIN-MAX range obtained from the 93 DDLC, and how the arrivals in each case correlate with the GiA of each site. It is accepted there will be variation and perhaps no direct correlation, as alluded to in paragraph 4.14, where it is stated *"The traffic generation forecast associated with the development is expected to be similar to other Health and Fitness Clubs run by David Lloyd Leisure Ltd and does not relate to the GIA of those facilities (See Section 5). Essentially regardless of the GIA of these sites, Health and Fitness Clubs run by David Lloyd Leisure Ltd generate similar amounts of traffic and essentially the demand for car parking"*. However, that statement needs to be supported by a view of the site-by-site visitor number/GIA figures.

The external vehicle trip forecast is then based on a 75% car driver mode share. Whilst 25% by sustainable modes does seem high, this will include car passenger as a mode and it is not thus unreasonable to assume that people will travel to the leisure facility in groups, so multi-occupancy car trips. As such the vehicle trip figures in Table 5.6 are supported, subject to seeing how the average visitor arrivals look in terms of the MIN-MAX range (see above). The maximum parking cumulative forecast shown in Table 5.7 of 234 vehicles (18:00) also shows that proposed car parking provision of 277 spaces is not exceeded.

Operational Assessment

It is accepted there will be an element of 'Linked/Pass-By' trip behavior with leisure trips which would not necessarily occur with B1b/c/B2 employment development on Plot 100. Whilst the analyses presented in paragraphs 5.19 to 5.21 are noted, it is further noted that operational analyses do not apply the discount to DLLC trips. This is acceptable in presenting a worst-case scenario in the operational modelling undertaken. Table 5.10 shows that the net effect in the weekday AM peak hour (8:00-9:00am) is very low. However, the increase in the PM peak hour (5:00-6:00pm) is more notable. However, the biggest change in in the inward arrivals.

ARCADY modelling has been undertaken for the A350/Showell Avenue RBT (referred to as the 'Southern Site Access'), the B4643/Showell Avenue RBT (referred to as the 'Northern Site Access') and the internal roundabout on Showell Avenue which provides direct access to Plot 100. The 'horizon' year of 2036 has been used, so consistent with previous modelling for Southpoint Business Park, with DLLC traffic volume changes added and outputs compared to the previous model results. This methodology is accepted. Results for the critical A350 RBT shown in Table 5.15 give no cause for concern, as the highest RFC with the DLLC development is well below 0.85. Furthermore, in the PM peak hour, when the DLLC flow increase changes are greatest, the RFC and delay changes are minimal. The results for the northern B4643/Showell Avenue RBT (Rowden Park RBT) again show negligible

changes to previous results with the DLLC flow changes. However, the arm titles in Table 5.16 need correcting as there is incorrect reference to the A350 N and A350 S.

In summary, I have no concerns with the operational modelling of the three roundabouts and the additional impact of the additional DLLC traffic in the weekday peak hours.

Delivery and Servicing

Drawing Nos **PD01_AT01** and **PD01_AT02** in **Appendix D** show the swept path analyses for a refuse vehicle and large rigid service vehicle routing from the access roundabout to the service yard and return. This demonstrates that the vehicle swept path in each case is accommodated via the 6m aisle widths with no wheel over-run or body overhang to the parking spaces or footways. This is all acceptable, noting that on some occasions the parking of cars in the two ranks of bays closest to the entrance could be suspended temporarily if a delivery was due and ample parking existed elsewhere in the car park at that time.

Proposed Bike Shelter Details

Following review of Drawing **24245-HCD-ZZ-00-DR A-PL-017/Rev P01** I am content with the provision of spaces as Sheffield stands and the design of the cover. However, an increased width of at least 1000mm (1.0m) between stands would be preferable to ensure that all stands can be used without obstruction. I note the separate comments from CCNDG make the same point so “Increase distance between Sheffield stands to 1.0m to ensure sufficient room for two cycles to be tied to each stand”.

BREEAM Travel Plan

The Travel Plan submitted appears to be solely focused on achieving BREEAM credits. As such, the submitted plan is considered inadequate for the purpose of reducing vehicle travel to and from the site. The measures contained within it are insignificant and do not meet our usual expectations or our Development-Related Travel Plan Guidance for a site of this scale. As a minimum, we would expect this site to include the provision of staff travel vouchers, so a similar incentive to those provided to staff by the travel plan of the adjacent Siemens site. The submitted plan is focused solely on staff travel, even though most travel associated with the development will be customers. **For the avoidance of doubt, the Travel Plan must contain targets, measures and monitoring for customers in addition to staff.** I would prefer that a revised Travel Plan is submitted before the application is decided. However, if this does not happen and a full Travel Plan is subsequently conditioned, it should take account of the comments given here.

Miscellaneous

S106 Contributions/Obligations

The proposed development is located in an area which has significant potential to achieve a high cycle mode share. As stated in paragraph 3.13 of the Transport Assessment, the development is within a suitable cycling distance of the entirety of both Chippenham and Corsham, providing a potential cyclable population of over 50,000 people. Nonetheless, cycling infrastructure in the area is poor and beyond the immediate estate roads of South Point Business Park, there are very few safe cycling options available to nearby residential areas.

The ‘Chippenham LCWIP’ identifies this area as a location in need of significant improvement. Two LCWIP routes directly serve the site, CC11 and CC15. Route CC11 is an LCWIP priority route and would provide connections not only to nearby residential areas, but also a safer connection to the Easton Lane cycle route towards Corsham. Route CC15 would provide improved cycle connections towards

the town centre. National and local planning policy including the NPPF, Wiltshire Core Strategy (Policies 60 and 61) and Chippenham Neighbourhood Plan (Policy T1) are clear that development of this scale would be expected to make a significant contribution towards improved active travel infrastructure.

We would therefore request that a financial contribution is made towards the delivery of off-site active travel infrastructure to ensure that this leisure site is suitably accessible by sustainable means and so encourage future trips by walking/cycling as opposed to short-distance car trips. In terms of the scale of the contribution, the adjacent Siemens facility has in place a required s106 contribution of circa £200,000 towards the delivery of off-site cycling improvements, namely the provision of a new Toucan crossing on Patterdown Road to the north of Rowden Park roundabout. It is therefore considered that a similar level of contribution would not be unreasonable to require for this development.

The Council's Passenger Transport Team has separately reviewed the proposals and has commented as follows:

"The nearest bus stop is currently on the B4643 at Showell Farm and is served only by the Lackham College bus, once in each direction and on college days only. The X34 bus between Chippenham and Frome currently runs along the A350 and, whilst there is the possibility that the route could be diverted to run through Southpoint Business Park along Showell Avenue then back along the B4643 to Lackham roundabout, this route is run commercially by Faresaver and there isn't currently enough slack in the timetable to accommodate this additional running time. Therefore, the most likely bus provision for this site, and Southpoint as a whole, will be an extension of the bus which is intended to service the Rowden Park development. We understand from the SPB developers that they are in discussions with Stagecoach to provide a service to the housing area, which will extend down the small roundabout in Showell Avenue which serves the development site, before 'U' turning there to return to Chippenham Town Centre"

Whilst a bus stop 'pair' has been provided on Showell Avenue, these simply have raised Kassel kerbs and a bus stop 'flag'/post in each case. As part of the Plot 100 development, we would therefore seek a commitment from the developer to an upgrade of this stop provision to include 3-bay enclosed bus shelters to our standard design (from Bus Shelters Ltd's Titan range) with integral bus stop flags and timetable cases.