

Highway Development Control Consultation Response

Planning Application Ref: PL/2026/04365

Site Address: Co-operative Food, Mill Street, Calne, SN11 0HT.

Proposal: The construction of a new 60 bed Care Home with associated landscaping and car parking facilities on the former site of the Co-op store accessed from Mill Street. The development also includes 7 Assisted Living units to the north on the former car park accessed from The Pippin. Both sites are linked by existing pedestrian bridges across the River Marden. The demolition of the Co-op store has been approved under a separate application (PL/2025/02050).

Date of Consultation Response: 12/08/2026

I refer to the above application dated 27/07/2026 seeking permission for the construction of a new 60 bed Care Home with associated landscaping and car parking facilities on the former site of the Co-op store accessed from Mill Street. The development also includes 7 Assisted Living units to the north on the former car park accessed from The Pippin. Both sites are linked by existing pedestrian bridges across the River Marden. The demolition of the Co-op store has been approved under a separate application (PL/2025/02050).

The site is located with existing access from the south on Mill Street and the North on The Pippin, both are unclassified sections of public highway subject to a speed limit of 20mph. There is a single vehicle access onto Mill Street and two access points from The Pippin. It is proposed to retain access from both the north and south, with the north only retaining the eastern point of access.

The western access point will be required to be stopped up and footway provisions should be sought to provide continuous footway across the frontage.

Both retained access points will connect to the vehicle parking areas proposed for the site.

A PROW footpath CALN51 runs along the eastern site boundary and any impact on this will require consultation with the Countryside Access Team. It would appear from the plans submitted that there would be no alteration to the PROW footpath.

It is noted that there is also a proposed public footpath on the western extents of the development site between Mill Street and The Pippin is it intended to be dedicated as public highway, if so then a S38 agreement will be required and the footpath will require suitable lighting.

A transport Statement has been submitted with the application, this was requested at pre-application stage, however in regard to development quantum the proposals would trigger the need for a full Transport Assessment, in line with Wiltshire Council Guidance this can be obtained through contacting HighwaysDevelopment@Wiltshire.gov.uk. It is recommended that all TA's contain the following detail as a minimum:

- Introduction
- Site assessment in transport terms
- Policy context
- Accessibility assessment
- Walking
- Cycling
- Bus

- Rail
- Impact on the surrounding highway network
- Mitigation measures
- Summary and conclusions

I believe that the statement provided does cover the majority of these points suitably and therefore is acceptable to support the application.

All TA's should be accompanied by a Travel Plan for both staff and residents/visitors. It should seek to reduce single-occupancy vehicle mode share and include suitable mode share targets, measures and monitoring, including full travel surveys in years 1 (baseline survey six months after first occupation), 3 and 5. A Travel Plan monitoring fee of £7,500 will be required. As the development quantum meets the threshold for the provision of a Travel Plan, I would consider that this can be appropriately conditioned as part of any approval.

The Transport Planning team have made the following comments:

I am satisfied with the pedestrian routes proposed through the site and welcome the applicant's intention to connect these with existing footways and pedestrian links. It is positive that previous comments regarding the provision of new pedestrian routes with a minimum width of 2.5 metres have been taken on board, and the proposed seamless connection to the existing path alongside Abberd Brook is particularly welcomed. Subject to the detailed design maintaining these standards, the pedestrian provision is considered acceptable. However, I cannot identify any evidence demonstrating that the routes through the site have been designed to safely accommodate cyclists. Whilst pedestrian provision appears to have been considered, it remains unclear whether the internal routes are intended for shared pedestrian and cycle use or whether alternative arrangements for cyclists are proposed. Further clarification is therefore required to demonstrate how cyclists will safely and conveniently travel through the site and connect to the wider active travel network. Further clarification required on number of cycle parking spaces – its says both 6 and 12 in the Transport Assessment.

In addition, given the nature of the proposed development as a care home, the sustainable transport needs of both residents and staff should be considered. Whilst some information has been provided regarding accessibility for residents and visitors, there is very limited evidence to demonstrate how staff travel to and from the site has been assessed. As staff are likely to generate the majority of regular daily trips associated with the development, further evidence is required to show how staff travel has been considered in the context of national and local policy objectives, particularly with regard to opportunities for travel by walking, cycling and public transport.

Given the scale and nature of the development, a Travel Plan should be submitted. This should set out the measures that will be implemented to encourage staff and visitors to travel by sustainable modes, establish targets for reducing reliance on private car travel, and include arrangements for monitoring and review to ensure the effectiveness of the proposed measures.

Finally, the Calne Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) identifies Corridor 2, Town Centre to Sandpit, as a priority active travel route, with part of the corridor following The Strand, The Pippin and Mill Street. In order to support the delivery of the Council's active travel objectives and mitigate the transport impacts of the development, a financial contribution of £35K is requested towards a feasibility study and/or the implementation of identified improvements along this section of Corridor 2. This contribution should be secured through an appropriate planning obligation.

In regard to the detail of the Transport Statement the points raised by my Transport Planning Colleague should be addressed in regard to accessibility, cycle infrastructure and parking.

I also make the following observations with regard to the TS. The content of the TS is suitable to make an assessment of the proposals and would not require additional information in regard to traffic impact assessment. This clearly demonstrates that the proposal would not intensify the site in terms of trip generation existing use class and floor areas.

The vehicle parking provision is in accordance with the required standards and as such is acceptable.

The cycle parking provision requires some clarification in terms of the level of provision proposed as mentioned in my Transport Planning Colleagues comments above.

Further detail of the accessibility through the site for cyclists should be given additional consideration as well as access via all modes for staff as per the comments above.

PIC data has been obtained for the most recent 5-year period and in summary this demonstrates there is no highway deficiencies highlighting common causality for accidents.

The closure of the roundabout access from The Pippin has not been identified or discussed, it would be expected that any closure of this will require a continuous footpath to be constructed and this will also require consideration of vehicle movements over the roundabout to ensure safe operation of the junction and the footpath. The works in this location would be required to be subject to a S278 Highways agreement with detailed design to be submitted to the Local Highway Authority for approval. There is footway located within the site, however this is not public highway and therefore would be required to either be adopted through a S38 or provided within public highway in a S278.

The internal site pedestrian facilities would, I assume, remain private and maintained by the site owner/management company. The footpath link to the west should be dedicated as public highway or maintained in perpetuity as a route for access by the general public as indicated. It would be useful to understand the intentions for this area. The path from Mill Street/Church Street appears to be 2.5m wide which would not be considered an appropriate width for shared use facilities as per LTN1/20 guidance for minimum widths for anything up to 300 pedestrians/cyclists. This has not been addressed within the TS.

The construction of the proposals would require a Construction Management Plan, which can be conditioned as part of any approval.

Whilst there is an agreement that the principle of the proposed development would likely be acceptable subject to conditions, highways agreements (S278/S38) and contributions through S106, there are a number of details or points which need further information or clarification prior to any further highways comments and condition recommendations.

If you have any queries regarding the above advice, please contact:
HighwaysDevelopment@wiltshire.gov.uk