

Extract from a second email from Mr P Turner 15 October 2015

Dear John

Paul Turner wishes to raise an objection to the development plans included in both Box and Corsham's proposals.

Sincerely

Alan Payne

**From:**

**Sent:** Thursday, 15 October 2015 13:31

**To:** [Alan Payne](#)

#### **14th October 2015 - Community Governance Review meeting at Corsham Community Campus**

This meeting of the Working Group on Parish & Community Governance Reviews was arranged in order to take views on the proposals for the Corsham and Box parishes. The meeting agenda, which includes 'frequently asked questions' and a three-page survey can be found in the pdf file at the foot of this article (note that there is no 'Page 2' which was blank).

Probably a couple of hundred people attended the meeting, principally Box and Rudloe residents, and many good points were made for keeping the status quo. The impression was that if any proposal were to be accepted, it would be the 'counter' proposal from Box Parish Council (agenda item 3b) for the part of Rudloe Estate which is presently in Corsham Parish to be moved to Box Parish.

[To the shame of both councils (Corsham and Box) support was given for proposed speculative development on this pastureland at Rudloe when there are more than enough brownfield sites to satisfy housing demand. Photo courtesy Paul Turner.]

As the photo indicates, when it comes to throwing Rudloe to the development wolves both parish councils are happy to do so without any thought for the problems that existing householders have. There are no services at Rudloe - the only shop, on Rudloe Estate, closes this month. Do the councils not appreciate that a substantial amount of money is foregone on bus or taxi fares in order simply to get to shops? Parts of Rudloe have been described by Wiltshire Council as "deprived". So where better to put another 88 homes than in a deprived area without services?

Corsham Town Council (CTC) Planning Committee voted "unanimously" to support the 88-home development at Rudloe and, interestingly, voted unanimously against the 150-home proposal at

Pickwick. This, I believe, indicates CTC's true view of Rudloe - that they care little for the community. At tonight's meeting, the only arguments we heard from CTC were about "new" residents (of new developments) and what community they would wish to be part of (we heard nothing about how they support or propose to support existing residents) and the boundary anomalies (however, CTC's proposal would simply replace one set of anomalies with another - see next para). The author of the Corsham proposal, the former Town Clerk, now CEO, was conspicuous in his silence.

So, no good rationale was offered by CTC for their proposal. Even their proposed boundary which was to be based "on fixed features which are likely to remain in place for many years" has been arbitrarily modified to follow a new access road to Wadswick Green which divides Manor Farm's holdings (so part of Manor Farm would be in Box, another part in Corsham). The poor showing from CTC indicates that there really is no solid foundation to their plan.

Returning to sporting analogies, as made in my piece in the 7th October article, if this was a boxing match, Box won by a KO in round 1 or if a tennis match, by a WO (walkover).

With regard to the meeting agenda below, the included survey is a bit of a minefield as, for example, question 7 says "How far do you agree or disagree that the proposed changes to the parish boundaries where you live will improve the following factors". But what proposed changes? Those proposed by Corsham or those proposed by Box? The only solution is not to insert any ticks in boxes but to provide a narrative answer. Surveys should be returned either to the email or postal address given on 'Page 8' of the survey by 30th October.

Paul Turner of [www.rudloescene.co.uk](http://www.rudloescene.co.uk) .

Sent from Windows Mail

