

Comments and objections for **PL/2026/04823**

Land at Forest Farm, Pewsham, SN15 3RP.

Form : Object.

We object strenuously to the proposal to develop the land in question for the building of 600 houses with sole access from London Road A4. The reasons are as detailed below:

1. The road infrastructure in the centre of Chippenham is inadequate for the traffic flow and could not possibly cope with additional traffic coming off the A4 via Pewsham Way and Avenue La Fleche.
The site plan does show a 50mph estate road which appears to go no further than the site. If Gleesons are intending this to be a resurrection of the HIF Southern Route bid where developers would meet the cost (Road plus Bridge estimates at "north of £200m" by Richard Clewer at a public meeting in Calne on 26 October 2023, however no written note of the meeting was published) the whole financial structure of this application would be impossible.
2. In the statement of Community Engagement Document dated July 2026 it states that 537 forms were submitted and lists the matters raised. However, there is no mention of letters sent to Engage Planning Ltd objecting to the proposal nor is there any reference to the online petition where there have been 2279 individual objections to date.
(https://www.change.org/p/stop-the-proposed-development-near-london-road-and-pewsham-way?recruited_by_id=8c4e6050-6774-11f1-8317-517103a747d2&utm_source=share_petition&utm_campaign=psf_promote_or_share&utm_term=psf_promote_or_share&utm_medium=facebook&share_id=TWcKwthLLL&fbclid=IwVERDUAScwI9leHRuA2FibQIxMABzcnRjBmFwcf9pZAwzNTA2ODU1MzE3MjgAAR7f1TOPz0AWRQXpBNf-56OLkZXOQrV3FW1QN-S6MEpooQAC2cQRMg-C_7ey-w_aem_S9d561DnIIhM2DnKzVuYKQ)
Gleesons appear to have completely disregarded the previous planning application for part of this site which was refused by Wiltshire Council and at Appeal: The main reasons being detailed in the Councils refusal notes on planning application 15/11153/OUT, Inspector Patrick Whitehead CSAP Examination Notes and Inspector Lesley Coffey dismissal of Appeal APP/Y3940/W/16/3150514.
3. The site is not the best available for this size of development as indicated in the site selection documents. The better sites elsewhere would provide far better access to major infrastructure such as A350 / M4.
4. In the document covering consultations there is a difference between the Applicants view and reality.

The Applicant states:

1. A briefing meeting was held with Chippenham Town Council councillors on 17 June 2026, prior to their Full Council meeting. Representatives of Gallagher Developments and Gleeson Land attended, together with the project planning consultant and transport consultant, to cover specific details of the proposals. The briefing included a presentation covering the masterplan for the site, access details, transport aspects and the planning background. Councillors had the opportunity to raise questions and offer their views about the plans.

However the meeting record shows: *several important issues were raised for which no definitive answers were provided. In some cases, responses suggested that decisions would ultimately rest with future housebuilders rather than the developers themselves.*

2. *A consultation letter was sent to 1,628 addresses within the vicinity of the site. The letter provided an overview of the proposals together with a location plan and directed consultees to visit the project website for further information and to submit feedback on the proposals. The letter was also sent to Chippenham Town Council, Derry Hill & Studley Parish Council, the Wiltshire division members for the site and adjacent areas and the Chippenham Town councillors for the site ward. The project website is <https://www.pewshamchippenham.co.uk/>*

I would suggest that this was a limited consultation as there was no media coverage which for proposal of this magnitude should have had as it affects a vast number of residents who were not included.

3. In the documentation for this application it is significant to note there is no reference to the Gallagher proposed development therefor hiding the fact that this is only part of an even bigger sprawl.

4. In the document produced by Tor & Co entitled Environmental Statement Chapter 1 Introduction it is stated *The withdrawal of the draft local plan was not attributable to any specific concerns relating to Policy 7, but instead reflected wider issues concerning the overall soundness and deliverability of the plan as a whole.* This is not correct as Policy 7 included the link/distributor road and *a crossing over the River Avon allowing onward travel through Rowden Park to the Chippenham Community Hospital site.* It was the cost of this that determined the withdrawal of the HIF bid as it presented an unacceptable financial risk to the Council. This risk has not been eliminated so the road and bridge will not be built with Council funds. Similarly, no prudent housebuilder would buy the land from Gleasons knowing that planning permission would have to include a substantial cost for the road and bridge (Approx: £40,000 per property) in addition to the S106 cost of £7330 per property just for education. This would be in addition to the additional "hidden" costs that will arise such as "gas protection" for houses due to elevated levels of CO2 in parts of the site.

5. Tor and Co document Chapter 11 states that the Cumulative effects. 11.8 states that the number of dwellings remaining to be constructed is 3697. Conveniently they have omitted various other sites such as the Gallagher site which is being jointly promoted and the approved development in Stanley Lane. Including those sites the number rises to 4297 which generates a population increase of 10317 which is an increase of over 25% not 21% as the document states. Such an increase must diminish the air quality.

Paragraphs 11.15 to 11.48 indicates that there will be no cumulative effects on the built heritage or landscape. This development will be the final destruction of the historic forests which existed on this and other local land since time immemorial and once it is built over it can only be referenced from history documents.

Paragraphs 11.49/50 state there will be no significant effect on Natural Heritage but the development will wipe out the resident animal population: Deer, Brown Hare, Otters, Badgers, and bats. It also states that *"There will not be any cumulative effects on habitats, plants, invertebrates, reptiles, amphibians or birds"* which is incorrect as Red Kites are regular visitors, Greater Crested Newt DNA was found on a previous surveys during the hibernation period (and

have been seen), and Bee orchids which randomly grow on adjacent land. It would appear that ad hoc site visits and surveys to not convey the true diversity of this landscape and as such are being dismissed by the applicant.

In my opinion the Tor and Co Document Chapter 11 needs correction to reflect the true position. 6. The application form states that there are no employees on site but as it is being farmed at present there must be employees to do the work albeit that they may not be resident on the site. The form also states that there will be no trade waste however as a "local centre" is proposed there must be some trade waste e.g.: from retail shop, Health facility, etc.

In conclusion I would suggest that this application is speculative in as much as it merely repeats previous applications and appears to be trying to pre-empt the new Local Plan for the financial benefit of the applicant with total disregard of the wishes of a large number of Chippenham residents both now and in the past. **Wiltshire Council should refuse the application outright and proceed with the production of the new Local Plan from scratch.**