

SOUTH WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY

REPRESENTATIONS ON ADVERTISED SUBMISSION DRAFT CHANGES WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

18 JUNE 2010

This page has intentionally been left blank.

SOUTH WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY

REPRESENTATIONS ON ADVERTISED SUBMISSION DRAFT CHANGES WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

REF: MAP 5

NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
11047 (DPDS)	<p>Core Policy 9 adopts a comprehensive approach to guide and give certainty to the future management, use and development of Old Sarum Airfield to secure and enhance the heritage and character of the site, local amenity and sustainable development. Blanefield objects to the change because removal of the land adjacent to Ford has no clear planning justification and prejudices delivery of this policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The three ‘potential areas for development’ originally identified on Map 5 all have a range of opportunities and constraints affecting the type and quantity of development that may be achieved and more work is required to define and refine this. More particularly the specific consideration of amenity and identity, cited as the reason for the deletion, are not exclusive to the deleted area so there is no valid site specific planning justification.• Core Policy 9 provides no certainty as to the types and quantities of development that will be permitted. Therefore, the deletion of one area at this stage risks that the development that can be realised will be sufficient neither to achieve the benefits sought by Core Policy 9 nor to	<p>These matters were discussed in detail under matter 11 at the EIP. The Council’s position was set out at EIP and has not altered in the meantime.</p>

	<p>encourage Blanford.</p> <p>For these reasons the change is unsound. The land to the south of the airfield, adjacent to Ford, should be reinstated.</p>	
--	---	--

SOUTH WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY

REPRESENTATIONS ON ADVERTISED SUBMISSION DRAFT CHANGES WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

REF: PARAGRAPH 6.41

NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
11048 (DPDS)	Blanefield has no objection to this change of wording subject to amendment of map 5 to reinstate the potential area for development adjacent to Ford.	This matter was discussed in detail under matter 11 at the EIP. The Council's position was set out at EIP and has not altered in the meantime.

SOUTH WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY

REPRESENTATIONS ON ADVERTISED SUBMISSION DRAFT CHANGES WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

REF: PARAGRAPH 8.20

NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
11043 (Pegasus)	Changes go some way to addressing some of previous points. Changes are supported and help confirm strategy for Amesbury and in particular Solstice Park. However, would like to see Policy E8A saved for reasons previously set out. Broadly support SA but this should acknowledge that Solstice Park site was allocated in Local Plan and many criteria have been addressed in support of recent planning applications for RDC and Data Centre.	These matters were discussed in detail under matter 4 at the EIP. The Council's position was set out at EIP and has not altered in the meantime.
11044 (ACT)	Gives the impression that such a late change to documents already under strong challenge from the local community is an attempt to divert attention from unacceptable development in the Salisbury and Amesbury areas. The extension of large areas of housing and employment development into what is quintessentially a rural, agriculturally dominant region, probably the richest heritage landscape in this, and probably any other European country, is wrong in the eyes of a large proportion of the local electorate. If, as it seems to be, the dictate of the current government, it is even more objectionable not only because it will be embodied in the Core Strategy for the next decade and a half but also because it comes so close to an election where there is a strong chance of a change. To add material to the proposed strategy so late in the day smacks of a determination to use every artifice to get the proposals through	Disagree. This was the appropriate time to publicise the changes requested by Council Members prior to submission of the document.

	<p>despite the strong disapproval of the communities involved. Specifically, any increase at Solstice Park is unwarranted, as is evident from the DTZ consultants Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Delivery Plan report dated August 2009, which suggested an addition of just 10 hectares to the space currently authorised. Your notice is an unwelcome example of changes after the official consultation period, a seriously flawed process which few members of the public are aware of or understand. On behalf of the officers and members of the ACTSW, I object to the advertised late change to paragraph 8.20 being imposed now. This objection adds to the concern of the Association over errors and departures that appear to have occurred recently in the planning process under the terms of the existing Local Plan which has some eighteen months to run. The further urbanisation of this highly sensitive region with its concentration of attractive tourist sites, lacking essential improvements to the infrastructure, is wholly abhorrent. I call on you to withdraw the changes just published.</p>	
<p>11046 (Fish)</p>	<p>I object to the proposal to amend the document (after para 8.20) by inserting "The Strategy for Amesbury seeks to make the town a more self-supporting community and add diversity of scale, range and choice of jobs....." I object as I do not believe that by encouraging the development of the 64 hectares of Solstice Park will achieve any of those objectives. Distribution centres and the like do not provide employment in any numbers as they are all highly mechanised. There is also the problem of the traffic they generate onto an A303 which is not going to be dualled and which suffers from congestion now. If the development was on a smaller scale and included several smaller units then perhaps employment might offer a scale, range and choice of jobs. Where is the public transport to this site? In the present economic climate and with a view to</p>	<p>The Examination into the South Wiltshire Core Strategy is not an appropriate forum to reopen the debate into the decision to grant planning permission for the RDC at Solstice Park.</p>

	<p>reducing our carbon footprint building speculative development would not seem to be far from criminal activity in my opinion. Sites in neighbouring Somerset alongside the A303 remain vacant; if the A303 were the answer then that would not be the case. Regional Distribution Centres are not environmentally friendly. When shoppers are seeking local produce how can this be justified?</p>	
<p>11049 (Gillham)</p>	<p>The proposed development of Solstice Park cannot, under any reasonable analysis be regarded as something likely to lead to ‘balanced’ growth in the Amesbury Area. Nor will it add anything to the range and diversity of employment in the area. The originally proposed 64ha of development for Solstice Park was conceived at a time when there was some prospect of major increases to the capacity of the A303. We now know that that will not happen and furthermore that with a Government asserting that the traffic already at Stonehenge constitutes a ‘national disgrace’, it would be preposterous to consider anything that further exacerbated that disgrace. This is exactly what the Megashed proposal at Solstice Park does (the regional distribution centre will contribute a large amount of additional HGV traffic alongside the monument) and Wiltshire Council’s approval of it cannot be described in any terms other than disgraceful and highly irresponsible, since it compromises the setting of the World Heritage Site (it does this not just in traffic terms but in actual landscape intrusion – the sheds will be visible from the WHS). Regional distribution centres operate at the very lowest end of the employment scale. A huge area of Wiltshire’s precious countryside is being assigned to a very low density provision of very low paid jobs. By turning what was originally a grandiose idea of a hi-tech industry park into a lorry park it not only demonstrates the vacuity of the original vision and the desperation to retrieve something out of its failure, but actually compromises the</p>	<p>These matters were discussed in detail under matter 4 at the EIP. The Council’s position was set out at EIP and has not altered in the meantime. The Examination into the South Wiltshire Core Strategy is not an appropriate forum to reopen the debate into the decision to grant planning permission for the RDC at Solstice Park.</p>

	<p>viability of the few (the only one?) higher tech companies that have gone there. Your own consultants, DTZ recommended in a report dated August 2009 that only 10 hectares of Solstice Park be made available for development additional to the 22.75 hectares already approved for development in the current period to 2011. Wiltshire should accept that the original plan for Solstice Park was a bad mistake that is not going to be made better by retrospective ‘strategic’ approval, when all the conditions for success have vanished or further deteriorated. Strategy is not about ‘anything goes’ development, but ought to be looking at Wiltshire’s strengths and playing to them. Solstice Park was never a logical place for development – the transport realities now make it seem absurd and irresponsible.</p>	
<p>11050 (SCfBT)</p>	<p>1) It is being claimed that implementing the planning permission at Solstice Park means that balanced growth will be delivered in Amesbury. However the evidence base presented with the South Wiltshire Core Strategy has identified that there is too much employment land allocated at Amesbury, see for example the following: (a) South Wiltshire Core Strategy, 5.46 (f) Review of existing employment and land supply “There is a large oversupply of employment land within the TTWA at the current time. However this land is not in the optimum location. The RSS recognises Salisbury as the key employment centre with the key strategic aim being to extend and enhance the city as an employment and retail centre. It recognises that there are opportunities for some modest job growth at locations such as Amesbury, but is clear that the majority of the extant employment land available in south Wiltshire no longer conforms with the RSS because it is not located in Salisbury. Some 64ha of employment land is available at Solstice Park, which no longer directly conforms to the RSS. However this land is</p>	<p>These matters were discussed in detail under matter 4 at the EIP. The Council’s position was set out at EIP and has not altered in the meantime. The Examination into the South Wiltshire Core Strategy is not an appropriate forum to reopen the debate into the decision to grant planning permission for the RDC at Solstice Park.</p>

consented and remains available for development. Therefore although employment development on this site can proceed in accordance with its planning permission, the allocation will not be relied on to meet the strategic requirements of the RSS and the allocating policy will not be saved. If the site is not developed in a timely manner it will be reviewed through the Site Specific Allocations DPD to identify whether the site is more appropriate for another use.” (b) Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Delivery Plan produced by consultants DTZ (August 2009) concludes that: “There is a very large supply of available land at Amesbury, which is not dissimilar to the requirement at the SSCT’s. arguably, the supply of land is disproportionate to the role and function of the settlement. As Solstice Park benefits from planning permission we recommend that, for the purposes of creating a reasonable balance of supply between the market towns, Amesbury is excluded. Including Amesbury could result in under allocation at other market towns given that Solstice Park represents a significant proportion of the forecast demand for the 7 market towns. However, we also note that this approach could result in an over allocation that could place sites under pressure for change of use to alternative sites. No site-specific actions are required because Solstice Park has planning permission and the supply of available land is more than sufficient. Boscombe Down and Porton Down are both allocated, but are special cases. If the existing outline consent lapses at Solstice Park we recommend that a reduced area of about 10 hectares is brought forward at Solstice Park.” The above extracts show that, far from delivering balanced growth, the continued development of the full 64 ha Solstice Park site would lead to an excess of jobs in the Amesbury area. Since Amesbury is not on the rail network this would result in an unsustainable level of in-

commuting on a road network which is already under pressure. (2) It is being claimed that the development of Solstice Park can add diversity in the scale, range and choice of jobs on offer. However, rather than offering a range of jobs, Solstice Park is now being promoted as a venue for B8/Distribution uses, since this is lower intensity employment and because it has been determined (see (1) above) that the 64 ha site is far more employment land than is required for balanced growth at Amesbury. Thus Topic Paper 9 tells us (para 5.10) that “Solstice Park could well be used for lower intensity employment such as distribution”. There are serious flaws in the assumption that Solstice Park is suitable for a high level of distribution-type employment, the main issues being: The surrounding road network is largely unsuitable for high volumes of HGVs. Following cancellation of the A303 Stonehenge improvement scheme in 2007 there are now no plans to dual the A303 west of Amesbury or to improve the Countess Roundabout. There are no strategic lorry routes south of the A303 within Wiltshire so placing a road-based distribution centre here will add to HGV traffic on unsuitable, and in many cases residential, roads in south Wiltshire. PPG13 says that in preparing their development plans local authorities should “promote opportunities for freight generating development to be served by rail...”, and Solstice Park is not served by rail. The Employment topic paper (June 2007 date, but subsequently updated) suggests that the employment land requirement to 2026 “translates into employment land requirements of between 25 and 30 hectares (approximately 50% for B1 office, 10% for B2 general industrial and 40% of B8 storage and distribution)”. (Key issue 8b). This would suggest a maximum 12 hectares of B8 storage and distribution for Salisbury TTWA as a

whole. Similarly, paragraph 6.17 of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy document indicates that “The Strategy will deliver 13,400 jobs including on 36 ha of employment land based on B1, B2 and B8 uses and up to 40,000 sq m gross external area retail and leisure floorspace. Evidence suggests that the market need is for around 19 ha of B1 business use (offices), in the region of 4 ha for B2 general industrial uses and the remaining approximately 13 ha for storage and distribution.” Thus the consensus from the evidence base is that there should be 12-13 hectares of storage and distribution in the whole Salisbury TTWA, and the majority of employment land is supposed to be focused around Salisbury. There is now another distribution outlet operational on Solstice Park - namely Robert Wiseman Dairies. Further B8 usage in the Amesbury area is not supported in the South Wiltshire Core Strategy evidence base. (3) The outline consent for Solstice Park states (Approval of S/1999/721, para 20) that the development area is restricted to 22.75 ha under policy E8a of the replacement draft for deposit Salisbury District Local Plan “and there is a need to review the wider requirements after the stated period”. The Section 106 agreement dated 26.1.2000 confirms at para 5.1.2 that “at the date of the next deposit draft local plan the Council shall review the extent to which it would be appropriate to vary this restriction [the 22.75 ha limit] in the light of policies contained in such draft plan”. This review now needs to take place in the light of cancellation of the A303 Stonehenge scheme, the recommendations in the Regional Spatial Strategy, and the removal of policy E8a from the Core Strategy. (4) It would appear that the development of the full 64 ha site at Solstice Park has not been included in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy. We would draw your attention to the following: Since

policy E8a is not retained it does not feature in the list of policies to be screened in Appendix 7 of the HRA. When the full 64 ha site at Solstice Park was included in one of the preferred options at a previous consultation stage (PO42, Core Strategy Preferred Options, February 2008) it was noted that this policy “is likely to have a significant location specific adverse effect” with Natura 2000 sites of concern being cited as Porton Down SPA, Salisbury Plain SAC, River Avon SAC and Avon Valley SPA/Ramsar. (Appendices 4a & 4b of the Interim HRA, August 2008). In view of the omission of the Solstice Park site from the final version of the HRA, and the potential adverse effect identified when this was an included policy, the inclusion of this site in the Core Strategy seems likely to be a breach of the Habitats Regulations. We supposedly have a plan-led system where planning applications are determined in accordance with the Development Plan in force (see PPS1, para 8: “This plan-led system, and the certainty and predictability it aims to provide, is central to planning”). The approach in Amesbury seems, on the contrary, to be developer- and planning application-led. This is not the way local planning is supposed to work and it is certainly not in the best interests of the community, or of South Wiltshire as a whole. We request that the role of Amesbury be clarified in the Core Strategy not by rubber-stamping an ill-considered planning application but by a proper review of the transport infrastructure and consideration of transport alternatives including the potential for rail/light rail links. There needs to be an appropriate role for Solstice Park, and a revised Master Plan for the site. The scale of development here needs to be reviewed in the light of the recommendations arising from the RSS and from DTZ, Wiltshire Council’s consultants. Some 10 ha of further development

	<p>at Solstice Park above the 22.75 ha already allocated in policy E8a might be appropriate in the period to 2026. Development of the full 64 ha site is clearly not in the best interests of Amesbury or South Wiltshire.</p>	
<p>11051 (Counsell)</p>	<p>Solstice Park can indeed offer diversity in the scale, range and choice of jobs on offer, but not if the majority of remaining development land is given over to an RDC, which offers none of these benefits to the local community, and certainly does not help to achieve the aim of a 'self-supporting community'. Please see my letter to the local planning authority attached which sets out why this RDC development is wholly unsuitable for this site. Accordingly I object to the amendment of the Core Strategy using the words in italics above, which appear to retrospectively sanction any scale of development on the Solstice Park site. Also, if the RDC takes up the majority of remaining development land, there is not going to be any land left to attract further investment! In addition, I understand that Wiltshire Council appointed consultants DTZ to consider how much future employment land might be needed. Their report recommended (dated August 2009) that 10 hectares of Solstice Park be made available for development additional to the 22.75 hectares already approved for development in the current period to 2011. This would be in addition to employment land allocated at Boscombe Down and Porton Down. The RDC development is therefore well outside the scope of this more limited development objective, and approval for its construction should be refused. Also, there is no comprehensive transport strategy for the area around Amesbury, and with the continuing transport difficulties caused by the lack of any decision to improve the Stonehenge and Countess Roundabout bottle-necks, no development should take place without reviewing the long term</p>	<p>These matters were discussed in detail under matter 4 at the EIP. The Council's position was set out at EIP and has not altered in the meantime. The Examination into the South Wiltshire Core Strategy is not an appropriate forum to reopen the debate into the decision to grant planning permission for the RDC at Solstice Park.</p>

	<p>transport needs of the area, and the likelihood of finance becoming available to improve them. Finally, I am appalled that the concerns of local residents have not been sufficiently taken into account regarding the noise that will be caused by 24/7 RDC operations. Their lives will be made a misery and the whole process of approving this application at local level did not give sufficient weight to this problem. No proper noise survey has ever been done, and the whole application relies on glib assurances based on a computer model with no publication of the key assumptions and certainly with no guarantees as to noise performance.</p>	
11052 (Holbrow)	<p>Whilst I totally support further development of the site, I did not expect such a huge building project to be determined within such close proximity to a residential area. My property is at the end of Coniston Close and my rear boundary adjoins Solstice Park. As a result of this my bedrooms will be approximately 150 metres from the nearest of the proposed buildings and my concerns are how noise and light pollution will affect our life with regard to continuous lorry movements over every 24 hours. The recent development of a dairy distribution centre on the extreme edge of Solstice Park adjacent to the A303 has shown us how much light pollution it generates even though it is on a much smaller scale. Furthermore the expected increase in lorry movements on local roads will create further problems.</p>	<p>The Examination into the South Wiltshire Core Strategy is not an appropriate forum to reopen the debate into the decision to grant planning permission for the RDC at Solstice Park.</p>
11053 (Barron)	<p>This is an attempt to bolster support for major development at Solstice Park which is NOT provided by the rest of the Core Strategy. The development of the full 64 hectares of the site for employment use is now considered far too much for Amesbury to support, especially since there is no prospect of improved transport links (following the cancellation of the A303 improvement scheme</p>	<p>These matters were discussed in detail under matter 4 at the EIP. The Council's position was set out at EIP and has not altered in the meantime. The Examination into the South Wiltshire Core Strategy is not an appropriate forum to reopen the debate into the decision to grant planning permission for the RDC at Solstice Park.</p>

<p>in 2007). Wiltshire Council appointed consultants DTZ to consider how much employment land might be required in the future and they recommended in a report dated August 2009 that 10 hectares of Solstice Park be made available for development additional to the 22.75 hectares already approved for development in the current period to 2011. This would be as well as employment land allocated at Boscombe Down and Porton Down. I object to the proposed change to paragraph 8.20 of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy adding support to the full-scale development of Solstice Park. I do not feel that a Regional Distribution Centre occupying half the site contributes to ‘balanced ‘ growth and it will not provide a good choice of skilled jobs for Amesbury. A Transport Strategy is needed which will demonstrate how the transport needs of housing and employment at Amesbury will be met. The traffic problems already caused by the A303 does not help the local population in their day to day activities and the noise generated by the parts of the site already in use (including a smaller Distribution Centre, as per the original Master Plan for the site) causes problems for the residential bordering Solstice Park.</p>	
--	--

<p>11054 (Lewis)</p>	<p>This is an attempt to bolster support for major development at Solstice Park which is NOT provided by the rest of the Core Strategy. The development of the full 64 hectares of the site for employment use is now considered far too much for Amesbury to support, especially since there is no prospect of improved transport links (following the cancellation of the A303 improvement scheme in 2007). Wiltshire Council appointed consultants DTZ to consider how much employment land might be required in the future and they recommended in a report dated August 2009 that 10 hectares of Solstice Park be made available for development additional to the 22.75 hectares already approved for development in the current period to 2011. This would be as well as employment land allocated at Boscombe Down and Porton Down. I object to the proposed change to paragraph 8.20 of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy adding support to the full-scale development of Solstice Park. I do not feel that a Regional Distribution Centre occupying half the site contributes to ‘balanced ‘ growth and it will not provide a good choice of skilled jobs for Amesbury. A Transport Strategy is needed which will demonstrate how the transport needs of housing and employment at Amesbury will be met. The traffic problems already caused by the A303 does not help the local population in their day to day activities and the noise generated by the parts of the site already in use (including a smaller Distribution Centre, as per the original Master Plan for the site) causes problems for the residential bordering Solstice Park.</p>	<p>These matters were discussed in detail under matter 4 at the EIP. The Council’s position was set out at EIP and has not altered in the meantime. The Examination into the South Wiltshire Core Strategy is not an appropriate forum to reopen the debate into the decision to grant planning permission for the RDC at Solstice Park.</p>
--------------------------	---	--

<p>11055 (Yapp)</p>	<p>This is an attempt to bolster support for major development at Solstice Park which is NOT provided by the rest of the Core Strategy. The development of the full 64 hectares of the site for employment use is now considered far too much for Amesbury to support, especially since there is no prospect of improved transport links (following the cancellation of the A303 improvement scheme in 2007). Wiltshire Council appointed consultants DTZ to consider how much employment land might be required in the future and they recommended in a report dated August 2009 that 10 hectares of Solstice Park be made available for development additional to the 22.75 hectares already approved for development in the current period to 2011. This would be as well as employment land allocated at Boscombe Down and Porton Down. I object to the proposed change to paragraph 8.20 of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy adding support to the full-scale development of Solstice Park. I do not feel that a Regional Distribution Centre occupying half the site contributes to ‘balanced ‘ growth and it will not provide a good choice of skilled jobs for Amesbury. A Transport Strategy is needed which will demonstrate how the transport needs of housing and employment at Amesbury will be met. The traffic problems already caused by the A303 does not help the local population in their day to day activities and the noise generated by the parts of the site already in use (including a smaller Distribution Centre, as per the original Master Plan for the site) causes problems for the residential bordering Solstice Park.</p>	<p>These matters were discussed in detail under matter 4 at the EIP. The Council’s position was set out at EIP and has not altered in the meantime. The Examination into the South Wiltshire Core Strategy is not an appropriate forum to reopen the debate into the decision to grant planning permission for the RDC at Solstice Park.</p>
<p>11056 (Rowse)</p>	<p>Objecting to RDC: A development of this magnitude will have a very bad effect on the area if only from the extra traffic. The roads in Amesbury are already breaking up with the increase in traffic as lorries use the new section of road from the A345 to Solstice Park to gain access to the A303 and if the increase in traffic that the</p>	<p>The Examination into the South Wiltshire Core Strategy is not an appropriate forum to reopen the debate into the decision to grant planning permission for the RDC at Solstice Park.</p>

	<p>developers say will happen does come about we will have gridlock in the area. The A303 is sometimes at a stand still already even out of the 'peak' season so I hate to think what it will be like with up to 3000 extra vehicles per day which we have been told will come here. Before I moved to Amesbury I lived near the M25 – about the same distance as the RDC will be away from us – and although we were assured that we would not have any effects from it because it met all the necessary criteria I can assure you that the M25 ruined our quality of life with the noise and atmospheric pollution. PLEASE do not allow this monstrosity to be built and use Solstice Park as we were told it would be used. If the RDC is built it will leave little room to build anything else and on its own will not offer as much work as the original plan would.</p>	
<p>11057 (Naughton)</p>	<p>Being a long standing resident of the Stonehenge estate I wish to object to the proposed change to para. 8.20 of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy which appears to bolster support for major developments such as the RDC at Solstice Park. This is not the type of growth that was envisaged for the site and would not benefit Amesbury with the diversity of jobs that are needed in this area. A huge development such as the RDC will be highly automated, specialist work, creating few jobs for local people and offer nothing for the future except traffic chaos on all local roads, round the clock noise and light pollution to name only the obvious. The light pollution from the dairy vehicle site is already very obvious in any weather condition and much worse when cloudy or misty conditions prevail (this is England so this occurs very frequently) These observations have been made from a position where the lights are below the immediate horizon i.e. not in direct line of sight where these undesirable effects would be less noticeable. The environmental impacts of the RDC and similar developments appear</p>	<p>These matters were discussed in detail under matter 4 at the EIP. The Council's position was set out at EIP and has not altered in the meantime. The Examination into the South Wiltshire Core Strategy is not an appropriate forum to reopen the debate into the decision to grant planning permission for the RDC at Solstice Park.</p>

	<p>to be considered individually and would not necessarily have taken into account the effects of neighbouring projects as they come to fruition and start to impact on the local population and surrounding infrastructure. Adding further light pollution to a site in a rural setting will vastly increase the night time light levels on the Northern side of the estate comparable to that experienced near a sports stadium, the white lighting currently in use is very intrusive. In the absence of a Transport Strategy, the 303 and surrounding roads are destined for further gridlock with added inconvenience to all and increased danger to some with the Emergency Services unable to reach the victims of fires and accidents that occur. Just try crossing the Countess roundabout when the 303 is choked; the traffic does not leave a gap when it come to a standstill during busy periods and the addition of a constant flow of LGV and the redistribution lorries that an RDC would bring can only add to the misery. Again I wish to register my objection on these and other grounds previously submitted.</p>	
<p>11058 (ACT)</p>	<p>As an organisation which has spent over two decades trying to solve the desperate state of the main roads network in South Wiltshire and been summarily rejected by highly contentious means, my organisation, is also extremely concerned at the plans for extensive housing and employment development in the proposal for the new local plan. We represent a membership of local electors, many resident in the areas where major developments are proposed. The whole philosophy for the new plan smacks of domination from above without due recognition of the very special nature of this region, a strictly rural area peppered with history and heritage, probably the most archaeologically rich and sensitive land in Britain. To push urbanisation, with a surprising measure zeal, to the extent proposed is unforgivable. It is astonishing to find the steps</p>	<p>These matters were discussed in detail under matter 4 at the EIP. The Council's position was set out at EIP and has not altered in the meantime. The Examination into the South Wiltshire Core Strategy is not an appropriate forum to reopen the debate into the decision to grant planning permission for the RDC at Solstice Park.</p>

	<p>that have been taken to disregard and conceal normal procedures and ignore errors that have occurred, much of it far from the view and understanding of the electors – the advertisement in the local paper on 28th January being an example of an attempt to bolster unwarranted late changes. There are a multitude of reasons recorded in the objections to the RDC in Solstice Park for the planning approval to be reviewed, with special reference to its impact on closely located homes and the transport infrastructure. The issues raised here and in the letter from the Salisbury Campaign for Better Transport similarly demand a positive response and should be drawn to the attention of the Inspector at the imminent Examination in Public. You should be aware that I have submitted a formal complaint, prior to referral to the Local Government Ombudsman, on the validity of the County Strategic Planning Committee’s processing and approval of the planning application S/2009/07904 for a Regional Distribution Centre (RDC). To treat such a development in the same way as the former District Council committee would an application for a conservatory on a private house is questionable.</p>	
<p>11059 (Savage)</p>	<p>I wish to object to the proposed change to paragraph 8.20 of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy adding support to the full scale development of Solstice Park. I do not believe that a Regional Distribution Centre (RDC) occupying such a large proportion of the site contributes to balanced growth, nor does it provide a variety of skilled jobs for Amesbury. The additional traffic on the local roads is not supported by a Regional Transport Strategy, and there is no indication of how the transport needs of additional housing and employment in Amesbury s going to be met. I have previously objected to the planning applications for the RDC at Solstice Park as outlined below, and despite planning being granted I have seen little</p>	<p>These matters were discussed in detail under matter 4 at the EIP. The Council’s position was set out at EIP and has not altered in the meantime. The Examination into the South Wiltshire Core Strategy is not an appropriate forum to reopen the debate into the decision to grant planning permission for the RDC at Solstice Park.</p>

to address my objections.
Size and scale of the RDC is disproportionate to the area.
Proximity of RDC to residential areas and impact of 24hr, 365 day operation on local community.
Impact on local roads including A303.
Questionable employment benefit.

1. Size and scale of the RDC is disproportionate to the area. The RDC consists of 2 main buildings; Plot 2 is 125m (410ft) from our property. As indicated on Plan no 14976/A3/003 Rev B Scale 1:10,000 – Ridge Level Location Plan, our property is Building No 13 and Plot 2 is Building No 23. The difference in ridge heights is 11.5m (38ft). This indicates that the Plot 2 building (Total – 37,588.20 sq mtr GEA) will dominate our skyline to the north. The proposed shielding using landscaping will take 15-20 years to fully develop, and because of the limitations on tree varieties imposed by the proximity to Boscombe Down airfield will not include coniferous planting. The effectiveness of the shielding will be limited to the months of May till October, with merely the branches of the shrubs and trees for the remaining months. The mocked up pictures within the Environmental Statement show the landscaping in midsummer, yet still show the buildings to have an undesirable impact on the vista of the area (Note there is no image showing the likely view looking North from the Stonehenge Estate.)
2. Proximity of RDC to residential areas and impact of 24hr, 365 day operation on local community. The development plan for Solstice Park did not envisage 24hr operation of buildings in proximity to the existing residential areas. The 24 hr services and the Robert Wiseman RDC are both situated on the Northern end of Solstice Park yet still have an impact on the residential areas. An enormous RDC in close proximity (125m) of housing will have long term

impact in terms of noise, vibration and air pollution. Despite the reports showing that sound barriers will reduce this noise to statutory levels, it does not mean they will be eliminated, and in the summer months when windows need to remain open, sleep patterns will be disturbed. The lighting necessary to safely illuminate a transport yard will mean heightened lighting pollution, raising the ambient light levels, also affecting sleep. The proposed 3m high acoustic fence runs in very close proximity to the boundary line of our property, a mere 6 metres from my lounge windows.

3. Impact on local roads including A303. The original plans for Solstice Park were based upon the proposed improvements to the A303, including the Stonehenge bypass and upgrading to dual carriageway. These improvements have since been shelved, and the Highways Agency budget for the A303 precludes anything but ongoing maintenance. The documents for the forthcoming closure of the A303 at Mere indicate that further improvements to the A303 are unlikely before 2016. The Andover Airfield RDC has gained planning approval and that will undoubtedly impact the number of HGVs using the A303 to the West of that site. The A303 already suffers congestion problems in the area of the Countess Roundabout, you only have to see the queues extending from it each Friday to witness that, and any development on Solstice Park will exacerbate this, particularly increased HGV movements associated with an RDC. The traffic movements between the ports of Southampton and Portsmouth and the RDC will normally use the M3, A34 and A303, but modern Sat Nav systems automatically reroute in the event of congestion, and the only other likely route is through Salisbury, north on the A345 and ultimately along Porton Road. The new link road around Archers Gate estate is not yet populated on Sat Navs, and the roundabouts with their tight radiuses and high kerbs are wholly

	<p>unsuitable for HGVs. Similarly traffic from the north will route through Marlborough and south on the A345. 4. Questionable employment benefit. Appendix 1 to the Planning Statement indicates the likely employment within an RDC. The Thurrock example shows 250 drivers and 49 agency drivers, approximately 32% of the RDC workforce. I could not find a proposed figure within the application submission for the number of employees at the RDC, but figures of 1500 to 2000 have been mentioned elsewhere. If 30% of these are drivers, there is either a requisite increase in the number of HGVs on the roads in the vicinity of the RDC or, as alluded to in the Planning Statement, since the HGVs are already on our roads, there will be no creation of posts for drivers as the jobs are already taken. This leaves a handful of management jobs created, and the remaining warehouse operatives' jobs which will likely be filled from outside the Amesbury area, as unemployment within Amesbury does not sit at that level. Studies into recently constructed RDCs reveal that they are highly automated, with a very small workforce. A recent program on Discovery Channel showed the workings of a Waitrose RDC, and there were no more than 30 people employed on any one shift, as the remainder of the RDC was a huge, fully automated conveyor belt stock picking system.</p>	
<p>11060 (Mogg)</p>	<p>Objection to the changes made in the above Core Strategy in Para 8.20. It is our opinion that the planned RDC occupying over half of the site at Solstice Park cannot contribute to a balanced growth of the area and this will not give a good choice of skilled jobs in the area. It is well known from other Distribution centres that modern warehousing of this type gives minimal employment and is by no means requiring a skilled workforce. The only employment is for a few fork lift truck drivers, and office staff and of course lorry drivers. Which takes me to the next issue of a business operating</p>	<p>The Examination into the South Wiltshire Core Strategy is not an appropriate forum to reopen the debate into the decision to grant planning permission for the RDC at Solstice Park.</p>

	<p>24.7.365 days per year and all the noise, light pollution and traffic snarl ups that this will bring to the locality whose current road system struggles to cope with the increased lorry movements, since the opening of the link road between the Salisbury road and the 303, and the carpark which is the 303 in the summer months from Thursday nights to Monday morning. We have the threat of our rural life being reduced to one of sleepless nights, polluted air and unnaturally light nights due to this travesty of local planning mistakes. Just look at the abomination which passes as new development for much needed low cost housing next to the Baptist Church - friends who live opposite that have their properties overlooked and overlit by the lighting coming from the stair well, and look how out of character that building is. Please, please listen to the local community who do not deserve to have this unwanted RDC thrust upon them - let us have small and plentiful businesses occupying the area, which is what we were all told would be happening, not these 2 HUGE businesses - once they are built we can never go back. This is not a case of NIMBYism but one of we do not need this, but we do need careful planning and more businesses not operating 24 7 365 days.</p>	
<p>11061 (Bryder)</p>	<p>I wish to register my objection to Wiltshire Council's proposed change to paragraph 8.20 of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy adding support to the full-scale development of Solstice Park. Amesbury is not on the rail network and so the result would be to put an unacceptable additional load on the local road network, in terms of both commercial vehicles and employees commuting by car from well outside the Amesbury area. Furthermore, this outcome would be aggravated by the recent decision by central government not to effect long-needed improvements to the A303 in the immediate area.</p>	<p>These matters were discussed in detail under matter 4 at the EIP. The Council's position was set out at EIP and has not altered in the meantime.</p>

<p>11062 (Lewis)</p>	<p>I object to the proposed change to the submitted version of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy. The grounds for our objection are as follows: During the consultation period on Solstice Park local residents were informed that no comment could be made on the large site which is currently being discussed as that plot of land was for future development after 2011, but no matter what happened the land nearest the residential border would be designed as large open space with wooded walkways! Amesbury has no train link for freight use (as per Government Guidelines) and therefore the only method of transport will be local roads. Solstice Park would also be taking a large un-proportioned share of the allocated employment land for the area. Our local councillors are already approving grants to local villages and towns for road safety due to the likely increase of traffic with the impending development of both the RDC and the New Stonehenge Visitor Centre, yet they are still willing to allow the development of Solstice Park by saying that there will be traffic impact, after all that is what the Highways Agency have told them. I feel that the Inspector must be made aware of Wiltshire poor judgement in some of the more contentious planning decisions.</p>	<p>These matters were discussed in detail under matter 4 at the EIP. The Council's position was set out at EIP and has not altered in the meantime.</p>
<p>11063 (Lewis for NASH)</p>	<p>Objection. Our Local councillor, in the Avon advertiser dated 24th February, is already stating that the local towns and villages need grants for road safety measures due to the impending development of an RDC in Amesbury and the new Stonehenge Visitors Centre and I quote "with the potential increase in traffic due to the Stonehenge development, temporary closure of Bulford Bridge and the Amesbury Distribution Centre". How can this be when Councillors at meetings to discuss the development of the RDC informed Councillors from outside the area that they had been assured (by the developers!) there would be no adverse effect on the local roads or to local residents (they are not going to say</p>	<p>These matters were discussed in detail under matter 4 at the EIP. The Council's position was set out at EIP and has not altered in the meantime.</p>

otherwise). The grounds for our objection are as follows: During the consultation period on Solstice Park local residents were informed that no comment could be made on the large site which is currently being discussed as that plot of land was for future development after 2011, but no matter what happened the land nearest the residential border would be designed as large open space with wooded walkways! Amesbury has no train link for freight use (as per Government Guidelines) and therefore the only method of transport will be local roads. Solstice Park would also be taking a large un-proportioned share of the allocated employment land for the area. Our local councillors are already approving grants to local villages and towns for road safety due to the likely increase of traffic with the impending development of both the RDC and the New Stonehenge Visitor Centre, yet they are still willing to allow the development of Solstice Park by saying that there will be traffic impact, after all that is what the Highways Agency have told them. I feel that the Inspector must be made aware of Wiltshire poor judgement in some of the more contentious planning decisions.

11064 (Wicks)	<p>I wish to register my objection to Wiltshire Council's proposed change to paragraph 8.20 of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy adding support to the full-scale development of Solstice Park. Amesbury is not on the rail network and so the result would be to put an unacceptable additional load on the local road network, in terms of both commercial vehicles and employees commuting by car from well outside the Amesbury area. Furthermore, this outcome would be aggravated by the recent decision by central government not to effect long-needed improvements to the A303 in the immediate area. Bulford village already has an increase in traffic especially on summer weekends as sat-nav directs drivers off the A303 onto the unsuitable c road then A3028 to Durrington. Further development at Solstice Park will only increase this ad-hoc redirection, to the increased detriment of our village.</p>	<p>These matters were discussed in detail under matter 4 at the EIP. The Council's position was set out at EIP and has not altered in the meantime.</p>
------------------	--	---

REPRESENTATIONS ON CHANGES TO PARAGRAPH 8.25

NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
11045 (CPRE)	Concerned that proposed clarification change does not follow guidance in Circular DCLG 07/2009. The overall protection of the WHS is required, not simply the prehistoric monuments. It would therefore be helpful to re-word the whole of this paragraph: to include much of the new 'clarification' text proposed by the Council; to correct the current text to make it clear that the WHS is more than simply the henge; to amend the 'clarification' to make it clear that the requirement is to protect the whole WHS and not just the prehistoric monuments; and to correct the spelling mistake in the first sentence of the clarification from 'extension' to 'extensive'.	The Council has now agreed a further change with English Heritage, which should address this concern.

END