

	Online Comments
Application No	17/03417/OUT
Comments:	<p>I object strongly to this application on the following grounds</p> <p>TRAFFIC</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic at M4 Junction 17/B4122. The Transport Assessment fails to address in any realistic way the present traffic flows at this junction and on the B road leading to the villages to the East that I have experienced in commuting in both directions on the M4 from this junction on a daily basis for the last 13 years. Map the forecast 600 total increased daily vehicle movements (including 350 HGVs) onto a junction that is already overloaded at peak times from all directions (with traffic from the West backed up to the M4 Services on busy mornings and queues from the East frequently a mile long in the evening) and even if “signalized” the delays and pollution will massively increase. 2. On the B4122 the “Warning of Queues” sign placed on the approach to the waste disposal site evidences the degree to which this road is already overloaded. With local traffic, lorries visiting the Pit Stop and vehicles accessing the waste site the road becomes dangerously overloaded, with lorries often on the wrong side of the road overtaking waste site queues. The plan to place a roundabout here, a very short distance from the busy and fast moving traffic flow at Jct 17 will quickly cause traffic to back onto that roundabout and the M4. It will affect the traffic flow on the A350. The statement that such a roundabout “will operate well within capacity under all development scenarios” is simply not credible in these circumstances. 3. No account has been taken of the proposed Dyson development to the North of the junction nor to development 12/00560/OUT of 750 homes to the South East, nor of any development in the designated North Chippenham area on local traffic flows. Without the East/West Link Road (which appears to have been abandoned) these can only add massively to congestion in the local area, and on the B4122. 4. Traffic build up in Kington Langley. A traffic study undertaken by villagers, now adopted by the Parish Council and sent to Wiltshire Council for consultation highlights key traffic problems that presently blight the village and a Local Speed Watch project has been approved. The village is a cut-through, heavy traffic flows and speeding pose real risks to children and families along the main road through the village particularly where pavements are negligible or non-existent. Lorries routinely ignore the weight restrictions and misuse Days Lane (often Satnav led). This study document can be provided to the Development Management department if required. 5. The inevitable traffic build-up and delays at the Jct 17 roundabout arising from the forecast 600 extra daily movements are bound to cause drivers to seek the alternative route through Kington Langley. Add to that the extra traffic flow from the site’s construction traffic (of which no mention is made in the plan) and approved future developments and this village will very quickly become choked with traffic, destroying its rural character and unique open-commons nature.

SCALE OF THE PROPOSED SITE

6. Most of the site is to be occupied by a very large scale building of over 760,000 square feet and 75 foot high. This is big enough to house, conservatively, up to fifteen 747 Jumbo jets (professional advice from the aerospace industry approves this outline calculation where aircraft are to be stored) and is equivalent to a 6 storey building (see CTBUH Tall Building calculator) or Terminal 5 at Heathrow. This is a shockingly massive building, entirely out of keeping with the surrounding agricultural area.

7. The height alone means the building will be visible for miles around, at least as far as Bremhill (if not beyond to the Lansdowne Monument which can be seen from Kington Langley). It will completely dominate a rural, agricultural area in beautiful countryside either side of the M4 and the Zone of Visibility diagrams completely underplay this. Is this what Chippenham really wants at its "Gateway" and on the edge of the Costwolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?

8. The suggestion that the development will be screened by native trees in time is simply not credible. Native trees don't grow to 23m/75ft, even in an average human lifetime.

FLOODING

9. The effect of surface water run-off from a 1,000,000 sq ft of development hasn't yet been fully calculated because the End User is not known. But it will discharge into recognised Flood Zones at the head of the tributary to the river Avon that rises there. cursory examination of the Environment Agency's Flood Map shows the Proposal is incorrect to say the site is not within an area at risk of flooding. Rainfall alone in recent years has led to flooding down Day's Lane, the B4069 and Seagry Road, flooding houses on that road in Sutton Benger. The Flood Risk assessment envisages further modelling once the end-user of the site is known. So its conclusions are purely speculative on this important issue.

NOISE AND LIGHT POLLUTION

10. With 24 hour vehicle movements sodium lighting will be required as forecast in the plan, and pollution from traffic will obviously increase considerably. If a distribution centre is the End User operations will be 24 hour, and any night time cross-docking logistic operations carried out in the open air will be extremely noisy. Light and noise pollution will increase exponentially in this rural area.

EMPLOYMENT

11. The location of the development surely envisages a distribution centre. Chippenham, with its near full employment and almost full light industrial sites will not benefit from such an operation. Very few jobs will be created and public transport infrastructure will have to be improved if there is not to be yet further increase in local traffic.

CONCLUSIONS

12. I am deeply concerned that the effects of hugely increased traffic flows, light and noise pollution, water runoff and flooding from such a development will profoundly affect the immediate area and destroy the character of Kington Langley as a rural small village. The current plans dismiss this without proper argument or addressing the issues.

	<p>13. Because no End User has been identified at this stage, much of the plan is necessarily speculative. The proposal appears to be outside the Wiltshire Core Strategy, and fails to comply with any of the 6 Key Challenges at para 2.10 of that document and therefore little of the “Chippenham Vision”. Nor does the plan comply with several of the key parts of Wiltshire Core Policy including paragraphs 10(5), 34, 51, 57, 63 and 65.</p> <p>14. In sum the proposal amounts to countryside vandalism of the worst sort, with real environmental risks to the immediate area, destruction of the character of this village and surrounding area, has little economic benefit, and is out of line with current local policy and planning. It will transform virgin farmland into an industrial landscape.</p> <p>I am grateful for the opportunity to express these views.</p>
Name:	Mr. Simon Cooper
Address:	Chedd's Cottage Kington Langley Chippenham SN15 5PE
Date:	9 May 2017
Case Officer:	Lee Burman