

Land at Blackmore Farm, Melksham: Transport Response Note

Ref: EP/ITB12069-024

Date: 20 August 2026

1 Introduction

1.1.1 iTransport is appointed by Gleeson Land Ltd to provide highways and transport advice in support of an outline planning application for up to 275 dwellings with associated access, infrastructure and open space. An outline planning application (*planning reference: PL/2026/02966*) was submitted in March 2026. This Technical Note responds to the following consultation comments:

- Wiltshire Council (WC) Highways comments dated 10th July 2026.
- WC Public Right of Way comments dated 18th June 2026.
- Active Travel England (ATE) Comments dated 26th June 2026.

2 WC Highways Comments

2.1.1 WC Highways has provided a no objection response to the planning application. The following additional information was requested:

- Amendments to the proposed site access drawing to show vehicle visibility splays for the minor arm and pedestrian visibility splays for the crossing point on the site access road.
- Swept path drawings for the proposed site access for a large refuse vehicle and a bus.
- Confirmation as to how the connections to the Phase 1 site will be secured.

2.1.2 Updated access drawing ITB12069-GA-066 Rev G is attached. The amendment comprises the addition of visibility splays as follows:

- 1.5m x 43m pedestrian visibility splays from the pedestrian crossing on the site access arm to the south.
- 1.5m x 25m visibility splays into the junction to the north to provide appropriate visibility to a vehicle turning into the access from both directions.

2.1.3 ITB12069-GA-066 Rev G also shows 2.4m x 120m visibility splays from the proposed development access (these were also shown on Revision F of the drawing submitted with the application).

2.1.4 The following swept path drawings are enclosed:

- ITB12069-GA-075 providing swept paths for all movements into and out of the proposed site access for a large 11.3m refuse vehicle.
- ITB12069-GA-076 providing swept paths for all movements into and out of the proposed site access for a 12m single decker bus.

2.1.5 These drawings demonstrate that both a large refuse vehicle and a bus can turn appropriately into and out of the proposed access without crossing the centre line.

2.1.6 It is proposed that the access points to the Phase 1 site are secured by a S106 Planning Obligation. The wording of such an Obligation would be discussed with the Case officer in due course.

3 WC Public Rights of Way Comments

3.1.1 Table 3.1 below summarises the consultation comments made by WC and the applicant's response.

Table 3.1: Summary of Comments and Response

WC Comment	Applicant's Response
The Masterplan should show a connection onto public Bridleway MELW40 behind Lopes Close this path should also link through the estate so that it meets the Sandridge Common Road.	The ability to provide a further connection to the bridleway behind Lopes Close has been investigated. It is not proposed to provide this for the following reasons: - A new footway connection directly behind Lopes Close would be detrimental to the amenity of existing residents. - Further south there is a veteran tree – any new connection needs to avoid the RPA of this tree, limiting the ability to position a new connection. - An additional connection is also requested to be located further south (see below). From an ecological perspective it is necessary to limit breaks in the hedgerow to maintain wildlife commuting corridors. An additional southern connection would better provide for desire lines for leisure walking journeys along the Bridleway in a south-eastern direction. This is considered preferable to making an additional connection behind Lopes Close, which would only provide a connection to the lay-by off Sandridge Common (the public right of way does not extend across or further east along Sandridge Common).
A Bridleway should be dedicated from MELW40 into the development to provide an alternative route for equestrian users to avoid some of the A3102.	There are no equestrian facilities in close proximity to the site and the site does not create any additional demand for equestrian journeys. This is not necessary to make the development acceptable and it is not proposed to provide this facility.
A third connection from the development should be created just to the North of the Eight Acre Plantation.	Agree – a proposed location for an additional connection is now shown on the Composite Parameter Plan.

WC Comment	Applicant's Response
Surfacing of MELW26 required to a 2m width as per Phase 1. Culvert to be provided over Clackers bridge tributary	The Phase 1 development only proposed surfacing of MELKW26 in the northern part of that site. In the southern part of the Phase 1 site, where MELKW26 meets Phase 2 the path was to remain as a footpath for countryside access and surfacing was not proposed. The approach is to be continued through Phase 2 and surfacing to MELKW26 is not proposed.
Stiles within the redline boundary to be removed.	Noted – this can be conditioned.
MELW26 should be diverted where it passes under the oak tree to prevent root compaction	The footpath is to remain as a rural countryside path on its definitive alignment and will not be surfaced as part of the proposals. Diversion around the oak is therefore not considered necessary.
S106 contribution of £150 per dwelling to improve the surrounding PRow network.	Any financial contribution request needs to meet the tests set out in CIL legislation and the NPPF. Paragraph 57 of the NPPF states: <i>“Planning obligations must only be sought where they meet all of the following tests :</i> <i>(a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;</i> <i>(b) directly related to the development; and</i> <i>(c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.”</i> WC has not specified how the sum is calculated and where it would be spent. As such, the request does not meet the CIL tests and is not agreed.
The stile at MELW26 at 93062 63626 will need to be replaced with a more accessible piece of access furniture – to be undertaken with S106 funding.	This is agreed. For Phase 1, a financial contribution of £3,000 per location was agreed for countryside access furniture upgrade.

4 ATE Comments

4.1.1 **Table 4.1** provides a summary and response to the comments raised in ATE's consultation response.

Table 4.1: ATE Comments and Response

ATE Comment	Applicant Response
ATE does not consider the information submitted sufficient to demonstrate that appropriate pedestrian and cycle connectivity/permeability between the two developments will be secured.	This is covered in the response to WC Highways above. It is proposed that the connections to the Phase 1 site are secured by appropriately worded S106 planning obligation.

ATE Comment	Applicant Response
Every opportunity should be taken to maximise permeability to the surrounding PRow network, in particular MELKW40 and MELKW26	An additional connection is proposed to MELKW40 as set out in the PRow response above. Connections to the PRow network can be secured by planning condition. The proposal retains the routing of PRow MELKW26 through the southern part of the site. It is intended to retain the existing rural character of this route which is appropriate to the open space provision proposed in this part of the site.
A movement and access parameter plan is requested to secure connectivity between Phases 1 and 2 and to MELW40	This is not proposed – the Composite Parameter Plan submitted with the application is sufficient for this purpose. As set out above it is proposed that the connections to the Phase 1 site are secured by appropriately worded S106 planning obligation.
Connectivity to MELW41 – Clarity requested on whether the routes extend into the south-east corner of the site.	Connectivity to MELW41 is not proposed from the south-east corner of the site. This part of the site is planned for ecological habitat enhancement, with internalised, managed footpath access only. Instead, connectivity to MELW41 is proposed through the Phase 1 site (in the direction of the destinations beyond in Melksham), with the connection secured as set out above. Wider connections eastwards along MELW41 are already catered for with the existing PRow route through the site which connects to MELW41 in the next field south east of the site.
Absence of cycleway provision on Sandridge Common.	There is insufficient space on Sandridge Common for provision of a shared use cycleway. Footway widening is proposed to achieve a 2m footway connecting to the new footway provided as part of the Phase 1 Development. Facilities and services are located to the west and south-west and are appropriately accessed by cycle through the connections to the Phase 1 site and the infrastructure delivered through the adjacent site.



