

The four statements from Elma Lawer, Bill Ford, Edward Buchan and Phil Jones must be seen as being supplementary to a hard copy and e-mail shot to every member of the Strategic Planning Committee, which was undertaken over the weekend preceding the SPC meeting. The primary reason for that campaign was the impossibility of putting much meat onto the bones of our collective objections in a mere three-minute speech (four, in Phil's case as a Parish Councillor - although that rather limited his remit to the impact upon Sutton Bengier). The feedback received was that all four spoke extremely well and did as much as anybody could have done to expose the flaws in the arguments presented and to remind Councillors that they are meant to be constrained by their own Core Policies. You must judge for yourselves whether that happened.

In light of the SPC decision, updated advice has subsequently been taken from both legal and planning experts and we shall meet with all interested parties in the near future, to consider the options. Phil will be writing to the SPC members and Jane Scott (the Leader of Wiltshire Council) and he will be writing to James Gray seeking his further assistance next week.

The 'No to Chippenham Gateway Group' is particularly grateful to those lovely people who went to County Hall to observe the discussions and he hopes that they were satisfied with what the group's speakers put before the Committee".

1. "I am **Elizabeth Lawer** and I have lived in North Wilts since 1980.

Developing the site at Junction 17 of the M4 is premature because it does not meet any of the criteria contained in the Strategic Plan for Additional Employment Land.

We understand St Modwen insists that it has clients who are committed to this site, but has not shared this information with us. How is this democratic? And how confident can you be about potential end user commitment? This is surely a speculative development.

We appreciate that the sequential consideration of planning applications

needs to be followed but when a huge proposal, like this, that is in open countryside and not on employment designated land, then this approach, at best, is short sighted. This B8 application offers only a small number of jobs for its size, many minimum wage for unskilled work. And the Gross Value Add claimed is overstated by 35-50%. We've had this independently reviewed by the University of the West of England.

We should be providing more aspirational work and career opportunities, like Dyson at Hullavington, with plans for some 3,500 employees and higher Gross Value Add. It would be sadly ironic, would it not, if a truly high-tech, large-scale employer such as Dyson had to curtail plans because Junction 17 was unable to cope with it!

There is no urgent compelling demand for jobs that justifies bypassing the plan led system. Only by working through the Swindon and Wiltshire Joint Spatial Framework, and the next phase of the Strategic Plan, will we ensure equity of employment land allocation throughout the whole county. We owe it to our younger generations to ensure the right buildings for employment use are built in the right places.

Moreover, approving this application would adversely impact employment opportunities elsewhere in the county because it would significantly reduce the amount of land available elsewhere. Again, sadly ironic.

We appreciate you have a very difficult decision to make but the people of Wiltshire have put their faith in you. We are sure that you, like us, want the best outcome for our future generations, the best job opportunities and the least despoiling of our countryside. Is approving this application, the scale of which is massive, worth all the risks? The developer's GVA calculations might be enticing but it's a gamble. Following the plan led system, removes that risk.

Thank you."

2. "My name is **Bill Ford** and I live in Draycot Cerne. There are two specific areas that I would like to bring to councillors' attention, traffic and flooding.

The focus by St Modwen has been on traffic to & from M4 junction 17. However, traffic flows south east on the B4122 have not been properly addressed. Our own traffic surveys have proved material underestimates in the

forecasts used and this is before the additional traffic generated by the Birds Marsh View & Hullavington developments.

The B4122 runs for only 1 ½ miles from junction 17 past the site to a T junction on a right-angle bend with the B4069. It is sometimes impassable from floodwater by the bridge over the Sutton Benger brook and yet it is also the Google maps diversion route used whenever the M4 is closed in either direction between junctions 17 & 16.

This short road has had 42 accidents involving personal injury or damage to property in the latest five-year period for which data is available. The accident rate per road mile in Wiltshire would give an expected rate of one accident every two years. This link road therefore has sixteen times more accidents than average and is evidently dangerous.

Moving to flooding, I used to be the Director responsible for 27 acres of factory roof immediately adjoining a triple S I in South Wales and I have direct experience of managing water including capture and filtering coming from more than 1.1 million square feet of roof.

Unlike the North-East quadrant of junction 17 this site is not flat and is a natural upland bowl. The allowable water release, calculated from the soil type & from drainage pits, is a maximum run off rate of 192 cubic metres an hour. Only 25mm of rain on the impermeable surfaces of the site will generate over 6000 cubic metres of water. And this excludes water run off onto the site from the adjacent roads and junction 17. It would therefore take, assuming no more rain, well over a day before this water could be completely released downstream.

On 28th July, 2016 rain fell in Lyneham at 33.6 mm per hour which is a similar rate to that which inundated Coverack and destroyed Boscastle – fortunately this time it fell for a shorter period. However, a Coverack type event here with 100mm of rain in three hours or even three hours of heavy rain over a two day period, would breach the holding capacity of the site and water will then surge downstream far faster from concrete than from greenfield land with direct consequences in Sutton Benger both at Brook Cottages and in the new housing development adjacent to the stream.

I urge councillors to look into the calculations used to generate the modest size of the retention ponds and the allowable water discharge rate. This is a gigantic scale of development in the wrong place and councillors should look

closely at both the traffic risks on the B4122 & the massive downstream flood risk that this development will cause and reject this application. Thank you for your attention”.

3. “**Edward Buchan**, Kington Langley

My career has been in corporate finance and I was for 8 years a director of a leading international logistics group, now part of DHL.

Gateway should not be approved for three economic reasons: a wasted strategic opportunity to use Junction 17 for high value-added employment; unproven demand for a new logistics hub, and it is not sustainable in the medium term.

The Council’s Economic Land Review acknowledges the development potential at Junction 17 in high value sectors like advanced manufacturing, technology and life sciences. Equally the Swindon & Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership have 9 priority sectors in their Economic Plan 2016. **Neither include B8 Storage & Distribution.** B8 warehousing is not of strategic importance to Wiltshire.

Secondly, demand for B8 space has reduced significantly in the South West, by 65% in 2017. **Gateway is aiming to compete with well-established clusters in Swindon, Bristol and Avonmouth**, where there is no shortage of suitable vacant space, notably at Symmetry Park in Swindon, Filton in Bristol and Centre Park and Western Approach in Avonmouth.

With overwhelming evidence that demand was centred on Bristol, Avonmouth and Swindon, St Modwen now argue that the changing nature of logistics markets, plus land shortages and restricted highways at the traditional hubs, has increased the demand for in-fill hubs, e.g. between Swindon and Bristol. We’ve heard this argument before and it’s not proven: “Bridgwater 24” in 2012, equidistant between Bristol and Exeter, 1m sq. ft of B8, 100m from the M5 junction. It was never built. There are at least 100 acres of “oven ready” land available at Avonmouth, where they’re building a new M49 motorway junction. A few hush hush expressions of interest after 18 months marketing doesn’t make Gateway a viable new distribution hub of 1m sq. ft. 61 feet high.

Finally, the project is not sustainable. Gateway ticks just one key factor in big shed location – transport, but that only partially as there is no intermodal rail link. The consensus is now that outside the major hubs, availability of labour and infrastructure, especially power, and proximity to urban centres have overtaken transport links as the critical determinants of logistics distribution.

Tritax, a big investor: "Big boxes require a pool of suitable workers in the local area and have substantial power and infrastructure requirements". Gateway has only transport links which is why the market leaders like Prologis, Segro, Goodman, Gazeley, Panattoni are not competing at Junction 17.

St Modwen's track record at Avonmouth and Gloucester suggests it will take 15 years for the whole site to be built and let. But more automation, electric vehicles and same day delivery times are pushing logistics hubs closer to the urban consumer. St Modwen (via Savills) started claiming that Gateway would appeal to international B8 users and make a significant contribution to the growth of the UK economy (yes, they really did say that, para 43). More likely, with industry trends Gateway will become marginal, close to the motorway and nothing else - a classic case study of what happens if you let opportunism dictate strategy.

Thank you".

4. "**Philip Jones**. Chairman of Sutton Benger Parish Council.

It is impressive that this application has generated over 430 erudite letters of objection, on sound planning grounds. That total includes no less than nine - EVERY - local Parish Council objecting and I do find the dilution of the strength of those objections in the Case Officer's report somewhat distasteful because, if you ignore NINE Parish Councils....why do we exist?

I protest, in the strongest possible terms, that allowing this application WILL cause yet more flooding in my village. Sutton Benger has long been subject to flooding - and the infamous "once in a Century" event has flooded us TWICE in just five Winters! A brook, about ten feet wide with banks of about three feet, runs immediately to the North of 'our' latest 100 home development. As the Case Officer states, that is the ONLY route for water drainage from the proposed site, due to rising ground to the South and West and North. IT SIMPLY WILL NOT COPE, as evidenced by Mr Ford's calculations. So, where is the Flood Impact Assessment, which my PC was obliged to fund before we were allowed to divert over £30,00.00 of S106 and WC monies into flood mitigation just two years ago? We do not have the funds to do that again. Surely, this application cannot pass without our village's safety being guaranteed beforehand? Mention is glibly made in the Case Officer's Report of

diverting the brook - but there ISN'T anywhere else for it to go and you cannot overcome physical geomorphology.

Conflicts will inevitably arise between us but when they do we ALL have Core Policies to guide – and, where necessary, DIRECT - us. To quote CP 34: any development HAS TO BE “essential to the wider strategic interest”. ESSENTIAL does not mean “quite nice to have”. That is a point of law, which your own case officer may well have interpreted incorrectly. Similarly, the expression that things are “not in direct accord” with CP34 may well lead others to take the stronger view that they are TOTALLY CONTRARY TO MANDATORY POLICY! EG, the wording reads: “evidence that this is required to benefit the local economic and social need”. (Pause) EVIDENCE. REQUIRED. LOCAL. NEED. No jury would ever convict on such inadequate evidence.

One report, which involves the self-same Savills but is presented as being extra “evidence of B8 demand at J17” actually CASTIGATES the SE quadrant, as the worst of the four quadrants for development. Your Core Strategy doesn't come out of it too well, either! See Conclusion 7....

For Wiltshire's sake, let any development be PLAN LED, following the impending SDP Review. NEVER by speculators! This application, fails every test: economics; on planning grounds; in terms of impact and appropriateness and (above all else) on the grounds of being premature and contrary to your own SDP.

Our inputs provide ample grounds for refusing this application. Directors with proven expertise have demolished the economic argument and shown the inevitability of flooding to my village. Soundly collected data “irrefutably suggests” that the £1.5 million, currently being spent to mitigate the J17 traffic problems of today, is nowhere near enough.

In truth, the Case Officer's report accepts much of that but attaches greater store to opinion and modeling. However, had reality matched modeling, Titanic would not have sunk!”

End of presentations by No to Chippenham Gateway

