

	Online Comments
Application No	17/03417/OUT
Comments:	<p>Church Farm, Middle Common, Kington Langley, Chippenham, Wiltshire, SN15 5NN 01249 750264 email: kate.bicknell@churchfarmuk.co.uk</p> <p style="text-align: center;">9th May 2017</p> <p>Mr Lee Burman Wiltshire Council</p> <p>Dear Mr Burman,</p> <p>Outline Planning for the Erection of up to 1,000,000 sq ft of Class B8 (storage and distribution) Employment Space and Associated Infrastructure. (Ref 17/03417/OUT)</p> <p>I am writing to formally object to this planning application.</p> <p>I have reviewed a large amount of the documentation for the above application and will provide a brief summary of my issues with the proposals.</p> <p>My reasoning can be divided into 3 categories as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concerns with the documentation provided;• Concerns as a resident in the area; and,• The planning process. <p>Concerns with the documentation provided</p> <p>In the documents I noticed a number of inconsistencies in important parameters such as the height of the buildings proposed. I also felt that the results of the consultants' surveys had not been acted upon and that there was little discussion between the consultants leading to conflicts in the mitigation measures. If the results of the landscape and ecology reports had been taken note of the developer would not even be considering Option B.</p> <p>The process is continually described as iterative in the Planning Statement but there is little evidence of this in the masterplan outlined. For example, it would be relatively easy to reduce the number of Important Hedgerows affected by the development by repositioning the individual elements within the site.</p> <p>The responses to the issues raised during the Exhibition (Section 4, Statement of Community Involvement) are not specific to the site do not give any confidence in the consultation process actually having an effect on the masterplan design. This is a common theme within the consultants reports as well; I need convincing that hedgerows can be translocated or that</p>

shuttle buses operate at similar sites and alleviate traffic. There seem to be a lot of rather simplistic statements in the documentation with little back up or evidence of feasibility. The Planning Statement puts rather a positive spin on the findings of the technical reports.

I note the responses from the consultees such as Natural England and Highways England which I assume will have a significant influence on the planning discussions.

I have a few specific comments to make on the Ecology Report. The location of the bee orchids should be established and considered in the design proposals (Section 4.2.2). Further survey work is required to find out how the badgers are using the site and the setts linked to the one found on-site. There is considerable risk to the badgers in the area and not enough is known about their behaviour in the local area to devise effective mitigation measures. I am worried that the badgers will have difficulty accessing foraging areas being wedged between the A350, B4122 and the development.

Concerns as a resident in the area

Kington Langley village cannot cope satisfactorily with the existing traffic - in particular for the school and various events in the village hall. It is used as a "rat run" at dangerous speeds between the A350 and B4069 . Any incident on either of these roads result in the village being used as a diversion - the sharp bend with poor visibility in the middle of the village requires the road to be used as single lane and comes to a standstill.

Lighting of the buildings – dark corridors mentioned for bats - but the buildings will be lit. These seem in direct conflict. This problem does not seem to have been considered in any great detail.

Bridle way walk – I often walk along the bridle path and was horrified to see Viewpoint 4 in the Landscape Report which, though one of the more distant viewpoints, shows the enormity of the warehouse development. To destroy this beautiful view would be a tragedy. There is very little focus on the operational impacts in Paragraph 5.3.1. The conclusions in Paragraph 5.1.5 totally understate the impact of the development and over emphasise the efficacy of the mitigation measures proposed. I assume the Council will employ an independent firm to assess the likely impacts and not rely on a firm which clearly has an interest in downplaying the impacts.

The planning process

The difference between the 2 options being assessed is so large that I find it difficult to consider them as one application. I worry that if Option A is given outline permission there is nothing to stop the developer then justifying why Option B should be built at the full planning permission stage. With some design changes and strict, enforceable conditions I could be persuaded of the merits of Option A but this is not the case for Option B. I would be very grateful if you could explain the process to me or direct me to a section within your website which outlines the process.

Paragraph 4.3 in the Statement of Community Involvement should be acted upon and Option B should not be considered further.

I understand that development is required in the countryside but feel that the need for the development has to be established; I do not feel that this is the case in the development.

Mention is made in the various reports of other developments in the area (eg Dyson at Hullavington) and that as they are not so far advanced it is not necessary for the cumulative

	<p>impacts to be assessed; I assume that the Council will be assessing impacts of all the developments in the area. In this respect I am particularly concerned with the potential traffic impacts at such a busy motorway junction.</p> <p>The Planning Policy Context outlines a lot of policies (CP50, 51, 52 and 57 for example) which the development will not be able to satisfy – how does the Planning Committee deal with these conflicts?</p> <p>I most sincerely hope that my concerns are taken into consideration and my objection to this development is counted. I am one of many who are horrified by the scale and impact a development of this kind would have on our village and our lives.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Kate Bicknell</p>
Name:	Mrs Kate A Bicknell
Address:	<p>church farm</p> <p>middle common</p> <p>kington langley</p> <p>chippenham</p> <p>wiltshire</p> <p>SN15 5NN</p>
Date:	9 May 2017
Case Officer:	Lee Burman