

Comments Summary - Inlands Farm (S/OUT/18/1943)

Consultee	Comments
External Consultees	
Environment Agency (revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Object to the proposed development.</i> • <i>The Swindon Water Cycle Study (January 2014) states a new wastewater treatment works in this area is unviable and it is unclear whether upgrades to the waste water network required for the proposed development would impact the Liden Brook.</i> • <i>The Liden Brook is a Water Framework Directive (WFD) waterbody and the proposed development should in no part prevent the waterbody getting to 'Good' status or in its deterioration.</i> • <i>The EA object to the application as submitted because of the risk of pollution to the water environment. The applicant has not supplied adequate information to demonstrate that the risks of pollution posed to water quality can be safely managed. We recommend that planning permission should be refused on this basis.</i>
Highways England	<p>Due to the location of the site, the proposed development has the potential to impact on the operation of the Strategic Road Network (SRN), namely the A419 Commonhead Roundabout and M4 Junction 15.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trip Generation – To ensure the overall trip generation for the proposed development is suitable, additional information was requested in relation to the traffic survey data to establish the AM Peak hour. • Trip Distribution (full Scheme) – Highways England have previously accepted the trip distribution for Phase 1 and Phase 2a of the development. Highways England, along with Swindon Borough Council, believe that there is the possibility to reduce the distribution from 'Swindon Outskirts', which currently stands at 25.2% in the TA. The TA should be updated to reflect this. • Development Impact - The impact of the proposed development has been assessed using the SBC SATURN model. It should be noted that as Highways England have not yet agreed trip generation for the site, results of this model have not been reviewed. At time of writing, no assessment of the proposals using the Highways England Paramics model have been undertaken. It is noted that WSP propose to assess M4 Junction 15 using a traffic flow comparison methodology. Details of this methodology should be provided to Highways England so that it can be agreed, prior to any further work being undertaken. • Summary: We have reviewed the submitted Transport Assessment. There currently is insufficient information for us to make a positive recommendation on the proposed development as the impact on the SRN is currently unclear. In addition, there appears to have been little progress in assessment related to the SRN since our previous correspondence with the applicants' consultant in October 2018. • On this basis, our recommendation: Swindon Borough Council shall not grant planning permission for the Swindon Science Park development proposals (ref: S/OUT/18/1943) for a period of 3 months. • Throughout the course of the application process, Highways England renewed their Direction of Non-approval every 3

Consultee	Comments
	months.
Highways England (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since the initial submission of the Highways England Planning Response (HEPR), further holding directions were issued to the Local Planning Authority (LPA). • A HEPR was received on 8th April 2020 recommending that planning permission not be granted for a further 6 months. • It stated that the key concerns relate to the operation and safety of the SRN, in particular the A419 Commonhead junction, the A419 White Hart junction and M4 junction 15. The outstanding issue has related to consideration of the need for WSP to further test the development proposals on the SRN, namely at the A419 Commonhead Roundabout and at M4 Junction 15, to determine the traffic impact of the full proposals (including any phasing strategy) and determine the need for mitigation, over and above the works to accommodate the Southern Connector Road. Any necessary mitigation would be secured by planning condition. • It also advised that should the LPA disagree with this recommendation the LPA should consult the Secretary of State for Transport, as per the Town and Country Planning (Development Affecting Trunk Roads) Direction 2018, via transportplanning@dft.gsi.gov.uk. • Formal comments in response to the revised consultation, received 7th May 2020, stated that there were no further comments due to the required information not being submitted. The recommendation to not grant planning permission remains in place.
Historic England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application is located within proximity to a number of sensitive, designated heritage assets including the Upper Wanborough, Lower Wanborough and Liddington Conservation Areas, each containing a number of listed buildings; and a group of listed buildings located on The Marsh. Further afield are the Scheduled Monuments recorded as 'Site of Roman town, West of Wanborough House' (NHLE ref. 1004684) and 'Liddington Castle' (NHLE ref. 1016312). • The application has the potential to impact on the setting of these designated heritage assets, possibly leading to a loss of significance. • There are concerns with aspects of the assessment within the Environmental Statement. These relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the reference to the 'direct' and 'indirect' impacts, which is very different to the Highways Agency DMRB. ○ Each asset or receptor should have their individual identity expressed and assessed, rather than being grouped (EIA methodology). ○ In relation to Liddington Castle, chapter 10 concludes that the proposals will result in a 'Neutral' effect to this asset (table 10.7), whilst in chapter 9 this has been assessed as a 'minor adverse' effect. We appreciate that these assessments are in different contexts but we are concerned that the specialists responsible appear not to have followed the pre-application advice we offered to work together closely. ○ We are concerned that the assessment of impacts to the Upper Wanborough Conservation Area has not taken full account of the special qualities and character of this asset as described in the Conservation Area Appraisal, and that this has led to a potentially erroneous conclusion of a 'Minor Adverse' effect.

Inlands Farm, The Marsh, Swindon (S/OUT/18/1943)

Consultee	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We note and concur with a number of statements in the Upper Wanborough Conservation Area Appraisal which refer to the landscape setting of the village. ○ In our view, the impact of the proposals to the Conservation Area is greater than that assessed in the ES. This is because the proposals would feature prominently in key views of and from the Conservation Area (especially on the approach on Pack Lane and from the network of paths on the west side of the knoll). The proposals would also erode the current landscape setting of the village as rural in character by introducing a very substantial modern built environment to the currently green landscape that separates the village from the urban mass of Swindon to the west. We strongly suggest that the applicants are advised to re-consider assessment of setting in accordance with our published guidance 'The Setting of Heritage Assets; Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3' (Second Edition). ● Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds. In our view, the application contains a number of errors and discrepancies that do not enable an informed planning decision to be made. ● Following the submission of additional clarifications from the applicant (07/03/2019), Historic England provided additional comments confirming that the information was sufficient to overcome their concerns with the discrepancies in the submission. Historic England maintained that the likely impacts on the setting of the Upper Wanborough Conservation Area would be greater than 'minor adverse', as identified within the submitted ES.
Historic England (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>HE previously raised a concern that the assessment of impacts to the Upper Wanborough Conservation Area has not taken full account of the special qualities and character of this asset as described in the Conservation Area Appraisal and that this had led to a potentially erroneous conclusion of a 'Minor Adverse' effect in the context of the setting of the Conservation Area.</i> ● <i>It remains our view that the impact of the proposals to the setting of the Conservation Area is greater than that assessed as 'minor' at 8.89.</i> ● <i>Notwithstanding these comments, it is still our view that the proposals have the potential to result in impacts to the setting of the Upper Wanborough Conservation Area (including the listed buildings within) greater than those presented in the ES. It is also our view that the impact to the setting of the Conservation Area is unlikely to cross the threshold of 'substantial harm', as set out in paragraph 193 of the NPPF).</i>
Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposed development is immediately adjacent to a nationally designated landscape namely North Wessex Downs AONB. Natural England advises that the planning authority uses national and local policies, together with local landscape expertise and information to determine the proposal. ● The statutory purpose of the AONB is to conserve and enhance the area's natural beauty. You should assess the application carefully as to whether the proposed development would have a significant impact on or harm that statutory purpose. Relevant to this is the duty on public bodies to 'have regard' for that statutory purpose in carrying out their

Inlands Farm, The Marsh, Swindon (S/OUT/18/1943)

Consultee	Comments
	<p>functions (S85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, 2000). The Planning Practice Guidance confirms that this duty also applies to proposals outside the designated area but impacting on its natural beauty.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should it be judged that the proposal does harm the special qualities (whether significantly or less so), but that none the less, permission should be granted, we advise an appropriate compensation package should be secured. This should ensure no net detriment to the special qualities of the protected landscape. • It is noted that the site includes a number of rural public rights of way. Whilst the proposal may maintain their extent, their quality is likely to be degraded by being urbanised. We advise that this is carefully considered so that the development does not lead to a net detriment to the green infrastructure resource of the area.
Natural England (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>NE advise that the decision should be guided by paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework which gives the highest status of protection for the 'landscape and scenic beauty' of AONBs and National Parks.</i> • <i>The statutory purpose of the AONB is to conserve and enhance the area's natural beauty. You should assess the application carefully as to whether the proposed development would have a significant impact on or harm that statutory purpose. Relevant to this is the duty on public bodies to 'have regard' for that statutory purpose in carrying out their functions (S85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, 2000). The Planning Practice Guidance confirms that this duty also applies to proposals outside the designated area but impacting on its natural beauty.</i> • <i>Natural England notes the significant response regarding the aforementioned proposal at Inlands Farm. We ask that great weight should be given (but not limited) to the following stakeholder responses when considering the proposals impacts on the nearby NWD AONB.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>John Somers Conservation Officer SBC – 18/05/2020</i> ○ <i>Phil Smith SBC (policy) – 12/03/2019</i> ○ <i>Andrew Norris SBC (landscape) – 26/05/2020</i> ○ <i>Rebecca Davies Principal Landscape and Planning Officer NWD AONB – 4/02/2018</i>
North Wessex Downs AONB Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object on the grounds that the principle of development remains the same and there are no overriding benefits that outweigh the landscape harm. • Primary purpose of AONB designation is to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area. • The proposed development has the ability to affect the AONB setting. Inlands Farm and its surrounding field network provides expansive views up towards Upper Wanbrough and the spire of St Andrews Church and of Liddington Hill an iconic and well known landscape feature in the AONB. • The development encloses itself within a woodland cocoon (approx. 30m buffer) via landscape mitigation which would not relate to the existing form or character of the local landscape in this locality, where predominantly boundary edges are defined by hedgerows. • The current parcel of open countryside due to its open character at the foot of rising landforms merging with the wider open countryside provides a sense of separation and spaciousness which reinforces the separation of Swindon,

Inlands Farm, The Marsh, Swindon (S/OUT/18/1943)

Consultee	Comments
	<p>Wanborough and Liddington.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The green spaces detailed within the illustrative plan are very poor and provide little usable space; it is poorly integrated into the site and appears to simply act as a buffer to the AONB. • A development should be appropriate in its own form and any planting/mitigation carried out as a means of enhancing the setting and scenic beauty of the NWD AONB, it should never be used as a means to make a development acceptable, landscaping cannot be easily controlled by condition and is prone to change as a result of poor weather, disease and poor maintenance. • There are major concerns with the use of Ivy walls, as these would appear alien in this environment. • Disagree with para 9.111, the site is more open to views than surrounding fields due to the limited tree cover in this locality. Would also not agree that Inlands Farm is of low value, it forms part of the setting of the AONB and allows extensive views of Liddington Hill, the Ridgeway and St Andrews Church (Upper Wanborough). • One of the problems faced is the sheer massing of the building which makes it difficult to fade into the surrounding landscape. The length and height creates a heavy and dominant structure, the vertical Ivy towers adding further bulk to the structure. The palest shade of green at this scale would draw your eye rather than filtering into the backdrop. • The roof lights add a level of concern over potential light spill and the protection of dark skies, a special quality of the AONB. From my assessment of the lighting report the rooflights did not appear to be included.
<p>North Wessex Downs AONB Board (Revised)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Comments made in the North Wessex Downs (NWD) original response dated 4th February 2018 remain valid and relevant, in particular to the principle of development within a non-coalescence area, the landscape impact of the massing of the building, alternative site assessment and use of landscape buffers.</i> • <i>The NWD Management Plan sets out key issues including the threat of expansion of the main urban areas just beyond the boundary of the NWD, the loss of rural character through suburbanising influences from new development, impact on dark skies and tranquillity, potential for certain forms of development to intrude on the wider landscape.</i> • <i>The revised documents makes reference to the new Management Plan but goes no further in addressing the content of the document, which given that it forms part of Swindon Borough Councils Development Plan is somewhat disappointing.</i> • <i>In terms of the landscape value of the site, it should not be any less because of its proximity to the urban edge of Swindon. The landscape value should be greater as it forms the transition beyond the urban into the rural landscape a landscape which connects into the AONB forming the setting of the protected landscape. The updated LVIA undervalues inlands farm as low-medium value.</i> • <i>Tables 19.1 and 19.2 does not include the effects of lighting.</i> • <i>Table 19.5 states the proposals will have a localised urbanising effect on the character of the site and surrounding landscape, this effect will suburbanise this edge of the AONB which would fail to conserve and enhance the character and quality of the AONB landscape and its setting, contrary to local plan policy EN5, NWD Management Plan policy DE01 and para 172 of the NPPF.</i>

Consultee	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The accurate visualisations (fig 7.1) demonstrate that even with the colour coding work the buildings would still dominate the landscape, this is due to the sheer mass of the building, it also demonstrates an over reliance on landscaping buffers, which themselves would negatively impact upon the Landscape Character Areas (LCAs). Vegetation as referred to in the documents is put forward as screening (to hide), the cumulative impact of this alone would affect the local LCAs and the character and quality of the AONB and its setting.</i> <i>The opportunities and constraints plan only notes key views from the south but there are also key views from the north looking towards the AONB and in particular the landmark of Liddington Hill.</i> <i>The new plan for the site as shown on page 41 demonstrates an over reliance on landscape buffers which essentially cocoons the site, i.e. they are trying to hide it, which suggests harm. This is an unacceptable landscape approach and as per my original comments would be out of character with the local LCAs and that landscaping should be primarily used to enhance a site and not to screen/hide it.</i> <i>Again the site selection process is unjustified.</i> <i>Given the indivisibility between LCAs within and outside the AONB, all elevations are within a landscape that is sensitive to change, this has not been recognised within the new design of the building in that the colour coding has not be accurately used on all elevations.</i> <i>The use of polycarbonate cladding on the west elevation which provides the white and purple spectrum of colour is a poor choice of materials, polycarbonate is simple and can modernise a building, adding colour and interest, however it has a natural sheen finish to it which would only make the west elevation stand out even more, an elevation which has the back drop of the AONB and Liddington Hill in it.</i> <i>The green roof is an improvement on the previously proposed white roof, however the solar panels will still be visible in addition to the grid network of paths on the roof, this rigid symmetrical pattern would be notable in comparison to the loosely defined field boundaries of the surrounding landscape.</i> <i>Furthermore the large car park proposed would introduce an urban element that ultimately suburbanises the site to the detriment of the quality and character of the NWD AONB and this sensitive rural fringe of Swindon, an area playing a key role in preventing urban sprawl between Swindon and the neighbouring rural settlements.</i> <i>The revised proposal would result in an incongruous built form within open countryside which would not provide any benefits that outweigh the harm to the AONB and its setting and thus fails to meet the requirements of para 172 of the NPPF.</i>
Thames Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing foul water network and existing water network infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this development proposal; and therefore recommend that planning conditions be attached to any planning permission. Thames Water also raise a number of limitations with the proximity of the proposed development to existing strategic water mains, and therefore recommend a number of further planning conditions be attached to any planning permission.

Inlands Farm, The Marsh, Swindon (S/OUT/18/1943)

Consultee	Comments
Thames Water (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Thames Water have identified that some capacity exists within the foul water network to serve 625sqm commercial space but beyond that, upgrades to the waste water network will be required.</i> • <i>We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures will be undertaken to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer.</i> • <i>The application indicates that surface water will not be discharged to the public network and as such Thames Water has no objection, however approval should be sought from the Lead Local Flood Authority.</i> • <i>Thames Water have identified that some capacity exists within the water network to serve 23,040sqm commercial space but beyond that upgrades to the water network will be required.</i> • <i>The proposed development is located within 5m of a strategic water main.</i> • <i>As a result of the above, Thames Water recommend that planning conditions be attached to any planning consent.</i>
Wiltshire Biological Records	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One pipistrelle species and one European otter record found within 500m of site. • Priority Habitats (Inland & Running Water and Neutral Grassland) within 500m of site.
Wiltshire Police	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application submission fails to mention Crime Prevention in relation to the buildings, the buildings users, vehicles or the wider users of the site. • The proposed footpath and cycleways through the site should be overlooked where possible, and properly lit, clear and wide with only low level planting alongside. • The D&A statement advises that there will be a high level of tree cover for the parking areas; this is contrary to good crime prevention and allows hiding places for offenders. I note also that the lighting for the car parks is intended to be a mixture of column mounted and low level bollard lighting. As stated above, bollards are not considered to be sufficient lighting for crime prevention and I would ask that all the lighting within the car parks is column lighting. • The safety of those using the footpaths and car parks should not be compromised. Landscaping is possible whereby the mantle of trees is no lower than 2.4m from the ground, and not above 1m in height. This would provide the sufficient green outlook, whilst maintaining good vision of vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. • In the event that the proposed building would be used for drug testing, I would ask what measures the company will be using to secure buildings and staff engaged in this type of activity.
Woodland Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Woodland Trust objects to this application, which is located just to the west of the Woodland Trust's Warneage Wood. Warneage Wood is a valuable amenity resource that is very well used by the local community and increasingly at risk from the expansion of Swindon. • This large application will negatively affect the wood as follows – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The lengthy construction process is likely disturb wildlife in the wood and reduce the local community's enjoyment of the wood. ○ The increased traffic from the development will impact the narrow lanes in the area, and those using them trying

Inlands Farm, The Marsh, Swindon (S/OUT/18/1943)

Consultee	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to access the wood. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Due to a direct Public Footpath link from the development site to Warneage Wood, there is likely to be increased useage of the wood by employees and visitors to the development site, resulting in increased management costs relating to litter collection, path erosion and entrance furniture wear and tear. ○ The development will cause visual degradation of the unspoilt landscape to the west of Warneage Wood. • If this development application is approved, the Woodland Trust would expect to see - <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Appropriate screening of the wood during the construction period. 2. An appropriate developer contribution endowment towards the increase costs incurred by the Woodland Trust resulting from development-generated additional management costs (litter, path erosion, entrance furniture useage and management) secured by way of a Section 106 agreement.
Woodland Trust (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Woodland Trust objects to this application, which is located just to the west of the Woodland Trust's Warneage Wood. Warneage Wood is a valuable amenity resource that is very well used by the local community and increasingly at risk from the expansion of Swindon. The Woodland Trust also reiterate the comments identifying the negative impacts on the wood and the required contributions if the application were to be approved.</i>
Internal Consultees	
Arboriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other concerns notwithstanding, I do not have significant concerns regarding the trees highlighted for removal as part of this scheme. The majority of significant trees associated with this site are located around the perimeter of the site and are scheduled for retention. • However, it would be necessary to understand what methodology is indented to be used for evaluating the existing trees and vegetation to be removed, to quantify what would be adjudged as “Appropriate compensation” for the those trees being removed, with particular attention being paid to; T1, T3, G13, T17 and T19. • It should be noted that there are two trees (T2 - L. Poplar & T3 – Ash) that are subject to Tree Preservation Order (TPO). Any, preparatory, demolition, construction and post-construction works need to take this into account and make appropriate applications before undertaking any tree works.
Arboriculture (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Reiterates previous comments (above).</i>
Archaeology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that the proposed development has only submitted a desk based assessment. • Given the potential for archaeology in the area, the Council’s Archaeological Adviser requested an Archaeological Evaluation adopting a 4% trench sample be undertaken prior to the determination of the application.
Archaeology (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>No objections in principle to the submitted Archaeological Evaluation, however has requested that an area to the west of the application, which shows remains from part of a roman settlement.</i> • <i>Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development and the level of floorspace</i>

Consultee	Comments
	<i>applied for can be delivered on the application site, whilst ensuring that an area of archaeology is preserved in situ.</i>
Biodiversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant new woodland planting would be needed to address GWCF policy and in particular to establish a meaningful link (i.e. not just 'tree belts') between the establishing woodlands at Packhill to the south and the Woodland Trust's Warneage Woods to the north-west. • Tree planting should include establishing substantial 'parkland' trees across the extent of the proposed arable to grassland reversion. • Proposals to provide net gain in biodiversity would need to be set out within a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan as recommended in the applicant's ecology report. Particular attention would need to be paid to the feasibility, means and ongoing management needs of converting arable land to herb rich and structurally diverse grassland.
Biodiversity (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Reiterate previous comments (above).</i>
Conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed scheme would cause irreversible harm to the surrounding designated heritage assets and open countryside which forms an integral component of the setting of these assets. As such the proposal is inappropriate from a conservation perspective. • In relation to constraints, the proposed site does not contain any known heritage assets, however is considered to be within the setting of a number of designated heritage assets, namely Lower Wanborough Conservation Area; Upper Wanborough Conservation Area; Liddington Conservation Area; Liddington Castle (SAM); Parish Church of St. Andrew (Grade I); Parish Church of All Saints (Grade I); The Lynch House (Grade II); Disney Cottage (Grade II); The White House (Grade II); Moat Cottage (Grade II); Lake Cottage (Grade II); Wrightsbridge Farmhouse and Coach House (Grade II). It is considered that as a result of this inherent relationship between these buildings and sites to the open countryside which is to be developed, that the development of the site has the ability to affect the setting of these designated assets. • It is noted that the assessment of significance in the Heritage Statement is focused upon the DCMS guidance for designation of listed buildings, which although related, is not an assessment of significance or setting in terms of its 'Heritage Value'. • Although it is not made clear in the Heritage Statement, it would appear that the report assesses the harm caused by both the Phase 1 full application and the Phase 2 Outline Application. In my opinion this statement is not a robust assessment or process to assess Phase 2 as an outline application due to the considerable potential for harm to the surrounding designated heritage assets which is unknown as the design of Phase 2 is unknown, and hence the principle of which cannot be determined. • I have given consideration to the preservation and enhancement of the character and appearance of the conservation areas and the significance of designated heritage assets, including their setting. On balance, I do not consider that there is 'clear and convincing' justification for the harm caused as required by Paragraph 194 of the Framework. I have concerns from a conservation perspective regarding the principle of such a development and its impact upon the character and

Inlands Farm, The Marsh, Swindon (S/OUT/18/1943)

Consultee	Comments
Conservation (Revised)	<p>appearance of the conservation area and the setting of designated heritage assets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Objects to the proposed development and reiterate previous comments (above) in addition to the following.</i> <i>The proposed scheme would cause irreversible harm to the surrounding designated heritage assets and open countryside which forms an integral component of the setting of these assets. As such the proposal is inappropriate from a conservation perspective.</i> <i>Section 8.13 and 8.14 assess the impact of Moat Cottage and Lake Cottage. This demonstrates a lack of appreciation of setting and I would draw attention to a recent appeal decision for dwellings within the setting of both cottages which was dismissed where the Inspector was of the opinion that as a result of the loss of the open views and the relationship of the proposed buildings to Lake Cottage and Moat Cottage, the proposed development would undermine the legibility of the buildings as historical, vernacular rural dwellings thereby diminishing their significance.</i> <i>The Built Environment Statement also concludes that the scheme would result in increased urbanisation to the setting of the cottages, however dismisses any harm because of screening caused by proposed trees. Whilst mitigation can be important to consider, is not part of the assessment for identifying harm and comes after harm has been identified. In this case, mitigation has been factored in prematurely into this assessment which is an incorrect approach.</i> <i>I have given consideration to the preservation and enhancement of the character and appearance of the conservation areas and the significance of designated heritage assets, including their setting. On balance, I do not consider that there is 'clear and convincing' justification for the harm caused as required by Paragraph 194 of the Framework. I have concerns from a conservation perspective regarding the principle of such a development and its impact upon the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of designated heritage assets.</i>
Ecology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have concerns that dormouse surveys have not been undertaken. They are a European protected species and the hedgerows on site may be suitable for them. Not all ponds within 500m of the site have been surveyed for great crested newts. This information is needed, particularly in view of the frequency of great crested newts in the Swindon area. I would like further assessment of the species-rich hedgerows on and around the site. There has been no assessment of their antiquity, which is usually a good proxy for ecological value. Assessment of the value of the site for birds, and its relationship for species using Coate Water SSSI is needed. Para 175b of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) says: "Development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted." No assessment is provided on whether biodiversity net gain will be achieved on the site in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019). Landscape and Ecological Management Plan is recommended. This should be conditioned. There are concerns with the number of trees proposed for removal, and whether it is necessary.

Consultee	Comments
Ecology (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall, the additional documentation that has been supplied in support of this application has provided useful clarifications and is considered to be of an appropriate detail and scope for us to determine the acceptability of the proposed development at this stage. However, some further clarifications with regard to great crested newts, dormice and arboricultural matters are still required, as is further documentation in relation to biodiversity net gain.
Environmental Health (Contamination)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WSP's ES Appendix 12.1 – WSP Preliminary Risk Assessment, dated November 2018, report ref 70027143, reviews information relating to the history of the site, the potential for contamination and concludes by making recommendation for intrusive site investigation. Further reports indicate that some invasive site investigation work has already been undertaken; however it is not clear all investigation data has been submitted.
Environmental Health (Contamination) (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is not situated on or near land that has been identified as being of potential concern with respect to land contamination. Therefore I have no objection in relation to land contamination human health risks from this proposed development and will not be requesting planning conditions.
Environmental Health (Pollution and Air Quality)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objection; subject to conditions.
Environmental Health (Pollution and Air Quality) (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>There are concerns the potential piling method would have an adverse impact on the amenity of Applegate House, particularly in terms of noise and vibration. Further information is required.</i> <i>Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the impact to air quality from the proposed development will not adversely affect the amenity of Applegate House.</i>
Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The application is wholly contrary to adopted planning policy (e.g. SD1/SD2/EN5/DE1/NC3). This development would create a substantial and incongruously tall development between the road corridor of the A419 that currently defines the edge of Swindon to the west and the village of Wanborough to the east. This will result in infill development that would be perceived as an eastward/southern expansion of Swindon/NEV. This would be further exacerbated with any future / further phases, thereby undermining the development aims of local plan policies (NC3/EN5 etc.) that exist to preserve the existing character and setting of existing settlements and the landscape setting of the AONB. As a consequence of this and the resultant harm to the landscape setting of Wanborough and the AONB, the application is not acceptable in either principle or detail. The applicants' interpretation of SBC's adopted Landscape Character Areas (LCA) and subsequent 'Development Considerations' (EN5 and related policies) appear to have been made in a way that is least prejudicial to development. The scale of this major development is incompatible with adopted LCA 'Development Considerations'. It also undermines the design principles for the planned NEV expansion area as set out in policy NC3. As a consequence, the application is not acceptable.

Consultee	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LLCA's are all representative of significant landscapes and all are highly susceptible to change. • I consider that the effect of the development on landscape character would be adverse. The visual impact of the development would be similarly adverse, although with a mixed cumulative picture presented. The grounds that determined the less adverse conclusions of these cumulative findings are unconvincing. The combined residual landscape and visual impacts (operational) at Year 1 (winter) and Year 15 (summer) on all receptors is not Beneficial, or even Neutral – it is Adverse. • Whilst there is a spectrum of potential landscape and visual impacts on the identified receptors, the overriding conclusion is that the balance of impacts are harmful with an adverse impact on landscape character and visual amenity. As a consequence of this, the application is not acceptable. • The incongruous large scale of this commercial application abutting and in the setting of the North Wessex Downs AONB is not compatible with local (EN5) and national planning policy (NPPF). As a consequence, the application is not acceptable. • The application depicts a development of substantial scale, in a sensitive rural location, which would create an unacceptable urbanisation of existing countryside. This would be detrimental to the rural setting of Wanborough and the protected setting of the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty that abuts the site to the south, and the planned NEV. Both phases of the application, or either phase if considered individually, are markedly incongruous in this location, presenting harmful and overwhelmingly adverse visual impacts. • The applicant has incorporated various techniques to minimise this impact, but visual mitigation can only achieve limited results as clearly shown by the submitted 3D views.
Landscape (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Object to the proposed development and previous comments remain unchanged.</i> • <i>The application is incompatible with the local plan. It is located in an area that has not been identified for development and is in a rural location abutting the nationally and locally protected AONB landscape. It is, therefore, an important part of the setting of the AONB. It is also within the Non-Coalescence Area identified in adopted local plan policy NC3 (NEV).</i> • <i>Policy NC3 exists specifically to establish a clear development framework balance between the rural countryside where this development is proposed, the existing urban area of Swindon, the established rural villages and the NEV. This application entirely undermines this considered approach.</i> • <i>The development will result in significant adverse impacts on both landscape and visual receptors, with a resultant level of harm in a sensitive location in landscape character areas that cannot be adequately mitigated.</i>
Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submission proposes above ground green drainage methods including filter drains, filter strips, swales, permeable car parks, detention basins and ponds. These would drain at greenfield QBAR runoff rates, which is lower than the site currently drains at and would connect to the existing network of drainage ditches. No objection; subject to conditions.
Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The site is generally well planned in terms of surface water drainage however, some information is missing from the submission. There is a discrepancy between the drainage strategy and the landscape strategy, the LLFA wishes the green roof aspect within the landscape strategy to be developed further and to be modelled to see if this can decrease the depth</i>

Consultee	Comments
	<i>of the surface water features.</i>
Local Highway Authority (LHA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raise concerns with the proposed temporary access from Pack Hill to serve Phase 1. Consider this to be abortive work and would present a conflict with the existing length of Pack Hill which could invite further usage. • Further details including capacity analysis are required to demonstrate that Commonhead can operate safely and effectively. • Data from the existing Wasdell plant and warehousing should be submitted as recorded trip survey data and parking accumulation data. • Delivery data will also be required to advise the development of the masterplan and appropriate service areas etc. • The A419 mainline flows are also required and an analysis of slip road design in light of any proposed changes to the Commonhead Junction operation. • SBC would welcome assessments for both the AM pre peak hour and the normal peak hours. • Concerns with the proposed parkin quantum and parking arrangement, to serve the use applied for.
Local Highway Authority (LHA) (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The local Highway Authority has considered the proposals for Phase 1 in light of the above and finds that the proposals comply with relevant national and local transport policy; that they would not result in significant traffic impact, the site access arrangements comply with relevant design guidance and that there will be opportunities for travel by sustainable modes for employees and visitors to the site along (enforced by a Travel Plan).</i> • <i>Overall, Stage 1 of the proposals are considered acceptable to the Local Highway Authority in transport and highway terms subject to an appropriate legal agreement and relevant planning conditions.</i> • <i>With regard to the Outline Element (Phase 2), which is for demolition of buildings, a further phase of land use class B1c and further land use class B1b with associated access, parking, landscaping, drainage and green infrastructure, with all matters reserved, including means of access, it is considered that there is currently insufficient information available in order to determine the impact of this element of the scheme on the Commonhead junction of the Southern Connector Road with the A419 Strategic Road Network.</i>
Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development proposed would be a major departure from the development plan. It is therefore necessary to consider whether other material considerations would outweigh that conflict. The retention and growth of a business presently located in the Borough is a significant matter in the proposals favour. At present I do not consider there is a compelling case for the proposed Science Park and would assign this limited weight in the planning balance. • There are significant potential issues in terms of landscape, transport, design, and conflict with policy in respect of the New Eastern Villages • It is necessary to consider the planning balance in the context of the scheme as a whole. Significant weight should be attached to those aspects where the NPPF directs the decision maker to refusal.
Policy (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The additional information supplied by the applicants does not significantly change previous comments (above).</i>

Inlands Farm, The Marsh, Swindon (S/OUT/18/1943)

Consultee	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The principle of the proposed development is in conflict with the Local Plan and thus, in view of the scale of the proposed development, this would be a major departure from the Local Plan that would lead to refusal. However it is necessary to consider whether other material considerations would outweigh that conflict in the planning balance.</i> <i>The most significant material consideration in favour of the proposal is the need to allow expansion (and retention) of a large local employer. The lack of available suitable sites in the area in the short-term to meet the applicant's requirements is a material consideration in the context of paragraph 80 of the NPPF. However it should also be noted that once granted there is no guarantee that the site would be occupied by Wasdell Group, nor for how long.</i> <i>With regard to the science park, while, in principle, such a park could encourage inward investment to the Borough, and enjoys some support from paragraph 82 of the NPPF, I remain unconvinced as to its sustainable delivery.</i> <i>The benefits of allowing expansion of a local business would need to be weighed against potential negative landscape impacts, including on the AONB, heritage assets and on the principle of non-coalescence which is important to planning of the New Eastern Villages with particular regard to those aspects where the NPPF directs the decision maker to refusal.</i>
Urban Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the location of this proposal, development on this site would fail to address the requirements of SBLP 2026 Policy DE1, particularly the principles of Context and Character. The proposed development in this location should be refused in light of the negative impact it would have on the existing and future context and character. An absence of design comments on the detailed proposals at this stage does not imply any tacit approval to the proposed design, layout, form or function, instead the issue in design terms is of this proposal's inability to integrate itself with the wider strategic and comprehensive masterplanning of the New Eastern Villages and the negative impact it would have to the character of Upper Wanborough.
Urban Design (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Object to the proposed development and refer to my previous comments on this application (above). While these alterations to the proposals would improve the quality of design, appearance and experience for occupiers of any future facility, the wider impact to the landscape setting of Wanborough would be negatively impacted by this proposal and be in conflict with the Swindon Borough Local Plan and in particular with the New Eastern Villages strategic allocation and associated policies.</i>
Members & Parish Councils (Swindon Borough unless stated)	
Robert Buckland MP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that the development is not within the development boundaries of the Local Plan and considered unsuitable for development by the Council as part of its Review of its Plan. The proposed development is located within the designated area of non-coalescence and the setting of the AONB, which has national protection. Previously in Swindon, other applications have been refused for similar reasons. Nationals guidance has confirmed that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs.

Inlands Farm, The Marsh, Swindon (S/OUT/18/1943)

Consultee	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies EN2 and EN5 are of particular relevance, with Policy EN5 advising that proposals which are within or abuts the AONB must accord with the relevant criteria in the AONB Management Plan and the NPPF. • Very supportive of the success of companies such as Wasdell and the significant contribution they make to our local economy and have worked with them and Cllr Gary Sumner to help identify more suitable sites in Swindon where they could expand. • For these reasons, I feel compelled to raise objections on behalf of me and my constituents.
Robert Buckland MP (revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>I have carefully reviewed the revised application and I still find that it addresses none of the fundamental concerns I raised to the previous application. This remains an unsuitable location for development.</i> • <i>The application relates to a site that is not within the development boundaries as outlined in Swindon's Local Plan. I also note this this land is not proposed as suitable for development by the Council as part of its Review of its Plan.</i> • <i>The proposed development is entirely within the designated 'Area of Non Coalescence' and remains in the acknowledged 'Setting' of the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which has national protection.</i> • <i>National guidance has confirmed that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs which have been confirmed as having the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.</i> • <i>I am very supportive of the success of companies such as Wasdell and the significant contribution they make to our local economy. I have worked with them and Cllr Gary Sumner to help identify more suitable sites in Swindon where they could expand. This application, however, is not the right answer and I would like to raise my objections on behalf of myself and my constituents. It is designed around giving one possible answer. Wasdell require a much smaller site for their business. That need is not objectively assessed in the application.</i>
Cllr Sumner (Ridgeway Ward Councillor)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am objecting to this application as a resident of Wanborough and as the Ward Councillor for Wanborough. • As this proposal is not for housing, our Local Plan can be considered 'up to date' and fully relevant in assessing this application. • The 2015 Swindon Local Plan carefully assessed the housing and employment requirements to 2026 as well as attendant infrastructure requirements. The applicants refer many times to the Southern Connector Road, yet any use by this huge employment allocation, focussed on distribution will have a detrimental impact on the planned use of that road and delivery of the NEV. • This proposal: The 'Science Park' or more precisely the industrial park would join Wanborough to the Urban area. The first and most obvious building is a 50' high, 33,000 sq.m distribution warehouse for Wasdell Packaging, with lorry loading bays and the main building filled with racking. The designs show it clad in coloured panels and (on one side only) they propose to shield it behind a 50' wall of ivy. • No data accompanies the application showing the precise number of existing employees at Wasdell Packaging in Blagrove. Their own website references 590 employees (nationally, across the Group) and further references storage capacity for 26,000 pallets - possibly this is the use of the large 'warehouse'.

Inlands Farm, The Marsh, Swindon (S/OUT/18/1943)

Consultee	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 'setting' of the hillside village and Conservation Area of Upper Wanborough has designated significance (as evidenced in previous appeal decisions) and again few people would argue that the village (when viewed from the area around 'Great Moorleaze' at the entrance to the AONB) would disappear behind the 50' high industrial building and its attendant lighting, noise and infrastructure. About 80% of the site sits in the Area of Non Coalescence designed to protect Wanborough, the AONB and other villages from coalescing with Swindon. It is an open landscape with few major trees for example meaning that anything which is built will be obvious. • This site is not allocated for development - housing or employment. It is largely within the SBC designated 'Area of Non Coalescence' and the 'setting' of the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty' • The applicants submitted the site through the draft SHELAA process of the new 'Local Plan' review and the entire site was rejected as unsuitable in the draft conclusions. • The employment site at Badbury Park was marketed for over 5 years (unsuccessfully) and due to lack of interest it is now going to become 300 homes. Brownfield and other allocated employment sites including Wichelstowe are available. • The New Eastern Villages (NEV) is a long term 'planned' urban expansion to the North of Wanborough - for developers it could be considered to be prejudicial to the delivery of that carefully planned residential led expansion, by having a highly visible industrial development at the Southern entrance, potentially blighting the countryside and the landscape features which could have made the NEV a unique place to live. Tree planting in the AONB at Pack Hill has just taken place supported by Nationwide and the Woodland Trust as part of the NEV infrastructure planning. this woodland will be within 100' of the first factory building. • The potential for harm on the setting of the area from large-scale urban extensions is substantial. Any new uses or development proposed outside but within the setting of the area should consider the North Wessex Downs AONB Position Statement on Setting. • Finally, I would state that at no time have the applicants considered the area in which they are siting the industrial development. The buildings are large and highly visible, harmful to the AONB and Upper Wanborough Conservation area. They have been less than generous with the buffers proposed and the employment site has no connectivity to the village of Wanborough nor does it add to the woodland or publicly accessible space.
Cllr Sumner (Ridgeway Ward Councillor) (Revised)	<p><i>Objects to the proposed development for the following reasons:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Planning Policy: The site remains outside of the adopted Local Plan (for development purposes) and was specifically rejected from inclusion in the Draft Local Plan, which has been through both the Regulation 18 & 19 Statutory Consultations.</i> • <i>The Draft Local Plan has identified sufficient land for the economic needs of the Borough and they have also taken steps to safeguard the employment use of the Honda site which will close in July 2021.</i> • <i>Whilst I am very supportive of the applicant and his business, their use is a small part of this site (although highly visible). The contrived 'needs list' and the 'alternative sites' study carried out by the landowner's agent (rather than an independent</i>

Consultee	Comments
	<p><i>and objective third party with suitable specialist knowledge) is meaningless.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>As this proposal is not for housing, our Local Plan can be considered 'up to date' and is fully relevant in assessing this application.</i> <i>Phase 1: The Phase 1 building will be a dark mass encircled by a HGV access road around the building - meaning that lighting (when viewed from the AONB and the Conservation area will be an issue) as well as noise.</i> <i>Access: The application claims early delivery of the roundabout section at the intersection of Pack Hill and the Southern Connector Road. This road is already fully funded and the section within the application boundary was already being delivered following the CPO Inquiry.</i> <i>Any additional burden on this road may lead to drivers choosing alternative routes in contravention of the Borough policy to minimise rat running in Wanborough and nearby villages.</i> <i>Delays at Commonhead roundabout as a result of both employee traffic (the applicant suggests a doubling of existing employees to 1200) on top of the 230 suppliers delivering in and the 85% of deliveries out heading to Heathrow for export. That is only phase 1.</i> <i>CAM-Sci have delivered a glossy report which discussed possibilities – they have not been commissioned to deliver the Science Park themselves and alternative Science Parks away from educational institutions such as Porton Down have required tens of millions of pounds of subsidy to deliver any notable employment.</i> <i>About 80% of the site sits in the Area of Non-Coalescence designed to protect Wanborough, the AONB and other villages from coalescing with Swindon. It is an open landscape with few major trees for example meaning that anything which is built will be obvious.</i> <i>The landscape assessment specifically references viewings out from the Conservation area but do not address the views towards nor the 'setting'.</i> <i>The applicants own 'Landscape & Visual Amenity Report states:</i> <i>Two adjoining blocks of recently planted woodland on the south side of Pack Hill (opposite the Site) would mature to form a new woodland block on the northern edge of the North Wessex Downs AONB. This will provide substantial enclosure to the south side of the Site and separation from the AONB.</i> <i>Flooding: The site is notable for ground water flooding. Water flows across the land resulting in considerable fast-moving flows at the entrance to Inlands Farm and which discharge into the roadside ditches heading North along The Marsh.</i> <i>Water Supply and Sewage: For the Planning Authority the consideration should be whether this identified deficit in a basic facility to serve the development will make other Phases of the NEW EASTER VILLAGES unviable in the short term as the capacity identified for residential development may be taken away by this un-planned development.</i> <i>AONBs are protected under the existing statutory requirements of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, specifically under Section 85 it is a legal duty for all relevant authorities to have regard to the primary purpose of AONBs to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area.</i>

Inlands Farm, The Marsh, Swindon (S/OUT/18/1943)

Consultee	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The AONB 'Setting Position Statement' couldn't be clearer - It is difficult to see how each of the criteria within Paragraph 5 is not relevant to this application.</i> <i>As a resident of the village and as the elected representative of the residents of Wanborough, and the area in which this scheme is proposed I would urge refusal. The site is not in accordance with local or National Planning policy, genuine alternatives are available if an employer is open to those alternatives. In this case we are on one hand being shown and employer who is undoubtedly important and on the other a speculative application to turn unallocated farmland into development land.</i>
Cllrs K & B Parry (revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Contrary to the local plan.</i> <i>It would damage an area of natural beauty.</i> <i>Concerned about the impact on Liden Drive with the lorry park on Faraday Road.</i> <i>Result in increased pollution.</i> <i>Covingham Drive would become a rat run and more lorries would be on Kingfisher Drive.</i> <i>Safety concerns with school children and pedestrians around Covingham Park Primary school and the pre-schools.</i>
Wanborough	<p>Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026 ('Local Plan')</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is located within the area of non-coalescence, as detailed within the Policy NC3 of the Local Plan and states "the character and identity of Wanborough will be protected". This proposed development is not small scale will not enhance the existing character of Wanborough and therefore is contrary to planning Policy NC3. Policy SD2 of the Local Plan allocates 77.5ha of employment land, whilst both the NEV and Wichelstowe have available employment land, and Badbury Park did for a number of years. There is no evidence to support allocating further sites. <p>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The southern boundary of the site abuts the North Wessex Downs AONB. The NPPF states that "Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection". Policy EN5 of the Local Plan also requires development to not affect the setting of the AONB. A large warehouse, 14.5m in height covering an area of 30,000 sqm right next to The North Wessex Downs AONB will have a severe detrimental impact on the landscape and setting of the AONB. The proposed mitigation would not cover the whole area of the building and would take a significant amount of time to grow. <p>Footpaths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development will also have a detrimental impact on the view of other footpaths in the wider countryside and AONB, which are protected through the NPPF and Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. <p>Local Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development would have an adverse impact on the character and setting of the Upper Wanborough Conservation area, and view from a number of listed buildings. The small wooded area proposed as mitigation is not sufficient.

Consultee	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development would have a huge impact on the historic environment along The Marsh, contrary to Policy EN10 and the NPPF. <p>Flooding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed site suffers from a considerable amount of surface water to the low-lying level of the site. The first part of the groundwater monitoring was undertaken during one of the hottest summers recorded, and therefore does not give a fair reflection of conditions at the site. From the groundwater monitoring survey carried out by WSP the report indicates that the “groundwater” level results are near to the existing surface level and this is without the results from the winter months. <p>Transport and Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The distances to bus stops quoted in the Transport Assessment are inaccurate. The routes to these bus stops also don’t include any pavement and is up a steep hill, so are therefore inaccessible to employees. There are other further inaccuracies in relation to the bus services on offer. The application proposes a shuttle bus to Swindon town centre for employees at peak times. This would need to be sufficient in size to accommodate the employees and work in accord with the shift patterns. It would be extremely difficult to achieve this and meet all the needs of the employees, and therefore not be sustainable. The lack of public transport options would force more employees to use the car for work. Pack Hill is a narrow lane and is therefore unsuitable for HGV’s. Commonhead roundabout is already busy, particularly at peak times, and is very hazardous. Additional vehicles will end up rat-running through Wanborough village in an attempt to avoid traffic. The proposed development doesn’t provide any improvements to the SCR scheme to allow provision for this addition traffic. The proposed parking quantum has been calculated by doubling the existing provision at Blagrove. The existing unit has better public transport links. Therefore, there is clearly an insufficient allocation of parking for Phase 1. There are a considerable number of equestrian businesses in and around Wanborough, however the submission does not make reference to equestrian movements. The transport scheme for proposed phase 1 of the development will have a detrimental impact on the surrounding area and is contrary to NPPF paragraphs 109 & 111 and SBC’s Local Plan 2026 policies TR1 & TR2. <p>Construction Traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The application states that during construction of Phase 1 there will be in the region of 150 – 200 HGV movements daily, in addition it is expected to be in the region of 200 construction staff. With the traffic from phase 1 industrial unit and the traffic from construction traffic for phase 2 will result in a complete stand still for Wanborough, isolating the village off and making it extremely difficult to carry out daily life. <p>Use Class</p>

Consultee	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development appears to be more akin to a Class B8 use, rather than that submitted for (Class B1c – light industrial). The racking and loading bays are far more than can be considered ancillary. The transport assessment (August 2018) also refers to the proposal being Class B8, it appears unusual that this would change. <p>Canal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This proposed development has re-aligned the route of the canal so that it is now pushed right up next to the Southern Connector Road (SCR). Not only will this result in a number of sharper bends along the canal route, which would appear to be unsuitable for canal boats, but it would also result in additional infrastructure (two extra bridges) increasing the cost and viability of delivering the canal. This is contrary to SBC’s Local Plan 2026 policy EN11. <p>Noise and Light Pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wasdell Packaging are a 24/7 working industrial unit, there will therefore be a continuous noise from the site which will have a detrimental impact on the peace and quiet of a rural setting. In addition there is considerable amount of lighting on site for both security and working of the industrial unit again this will have a detrimental impact on the rural setting and also the setting of the North Wessex Downs AONB. <p>Water Supply and Waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thames Water have confirmed that there is currently insufficient supply of water and waste capacity to cope with this development. This proposal could have a detrimental impact on the delivery of water and waste for the NEV. <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no research and development proposed within Phase 1. Phase 2 is indicative, and currently there have been no research and development companies looking to set up in Swindon, probably primarily because there is not a university to associate with in the town. The Parish Council are not against new business, however consider that this application completely ignores the due process of Swindon’s planning; the application is opportunistic, contrary to a large number of SBC’s Local Plan Policies and National Planning Policies, and for that reason should be refused. Parish Council urge Swindon Borough Council to refuse this application on the grounds that it does not comply with SBC’s Local Plan 2026 Policy NC3, SD2, EN5, EN10, EN11, TR1, TR2 and National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 109, 111, 170 and 172.
Wanborough (Revised)	<p><i>Local Plan 2026 and Local Plan Review</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Policy NC3 seeks to protect the character of Wanborough through the allocation of the non-coalescence area.</i> <i>A number of alternative sites are available including Symmetry Park, Honda and Wichelstowe, whilst the Local Plan is clear that it allocates sufficient land for employment.</i> <i>The applicant’s site requirements and methodology used in the survey has clearly been tailored in order to match the Inlands Farm site to the exclusion of other sites.</i> <i>Webb Paton’s “High Level Environmental Appraisal” again shows incorrect information and bias towards the Inlands Farm</i>

Consultee	Comments
	<p><i>site. There isn't a "regular or commuter" bus to the site, in fact there are no buses that go from Swindon to Wanborough during peak time. To state the Inlands Farm site has no impact on the Local Historic Environment when it will have a clear detrimental impact on Upper Wanborough Conservation Area is completely wrong. These inaccuracies clearly show significant flaws in the report.</i></p> <p><i>AONB</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The design of the proposal will not sit harmoniously within the landscape and will cause extremely high levels of harm to the AONB. The propose mitigation such as landscaping and planting will take a significant amount of time to grow.</i> <p><i>Heritage</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The view of the application site is recognised in the Upper Wanborough Conservation Area (UWCA), and is said to be important and demonstrate its distinct location. The proposed mitigation including the small woodland area will not overcome the view from the UWCA, principally because of the elevation change.</i> <i>The proposed development would also have an adverse impact on the views from St Andrews Church (Grade I) tower and Church Meadow, as well as the landscape setting of a number of Grade II listed buildings.</i> <p><i>Archaeology</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Wanborough is an historic village; it is an archaeologically sensitive area with a considerable number of archaeological sites and Roman remains.</i> <p><i>Footpaths</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>There are a number of footpaths across the site which are regularly used and enjoyed. The footpaths would need to be diverted, their character would be lost and they would no longer be able to bring the health benefits of walking in the countryside.</i> <p><i>Flooding</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The proposed site suffers from considerable surface water flooding, whilst the access road also floods.</i> <p><i>Transport and Access to Proposed Site</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The submitted information on bus access to the site is incorrect and misleading, as some of these are only for school children or certain residents. Even if the No. 1 bus extends, there will still not be a bus service to serve 24 hour shift patterns. The applicant also doesn't indicate how employees living in other areas of Swindon will be served by public transport to the proposed site. The application does not promote sustainable transport links and is contrary NPPF paragraph 102 and SBC's Local Plan 2026 policy TR1.</i> <i>The applicant states (ES V1 April 2020 par 12.145) "the SCR was designed to accommodate an increase in traffic flows / HGV volume", therefore "no further measures are required". The SCR has only been designed to accommodate the New Eastern Villages, a strategic site allocation within SBC's Local Plan, it has not been designed to serve a large industrial site and the additional HGVs and traffic this will bring.</i> <i>There is no proposal to widen the access road from Commonhead roundabout onto Pack Hill as part of the scheme.</i>

Consultee	Comments
	<p><i>Entering Pack Hill from Commonhead roundabout, there is a sharp bend to the left and the tightness of the road on this bend will be extremely hazardous for lorries (and vehicles driving in the opposite direction at the same time) to use.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• The additional traffic that this proposed development will bring will result in very large queues building up at the junction between Pack Hill and Commonhead roundabout; traffic will not want to sit in a lengthy queue and will therefore find alternative routes, including “rat running” through The Marsh, Upper Wanborough and Liddington.</i> <i>• It is not clear from the Transport Assessment how many lorries are expected to travel to and from the industrial site. There are a considerable number of equestrian businesses in and around Wanborough who regularly use the roads around the village, including The Marsh and Pack Hill. There is no consideration of equestrian movements.</i> <p><i>Water and Foul Drainage</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• To gain access to water and foul drainage is a key element needed to be able to deliver this proposal; without the means to supply water or foul drainage, surely this site cannot be classed as the “top performing site”.</i> <p><i>Construction Traffic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• The application states (ES V1 April 2020 par 4.85) that a “Temporary Construction Access” will be needed at the junction of Pack Hill and The Marsh, but there are no detailed plans to show this, nor any indication as to how long this temporary construction access will be needed.</i> <p><i>Protected Route of the Canal</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Wilts and Berks Canal Trust put forward a proposed new route (shown as the purple line on the extract to the left), being re-aligned due to the location of the Southern Connector Road (SCR) and to avoid the Roman remains. The applicant has completely ignored this new proposal, leaving the route of the Wilts & Berks Canal going through the centre of the SCR/Pack Hill roundabout, which is not logistically possible.</i> <p><i>Noise and Light Pollution</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Wasdell Packaging uses a 24/7-working industrial unit; there will therefore be a continuous noise from the site which will have a detrimental impact on the peace and quiet of a rural setting.</i> <i>• The applicant states that LED street lighting will be mounted on 10m steel columns on all vehicle access junctions. The proposed height of these columns will have a detrimental impact on the rural setting and also the setting of the North Wessex Downs AONB.</i> <p><i>Planning Classification B1c</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Parish Council question whether the proposed site should be classified under planning classification B8 as “storage and distribution”. The level of storage (racking) and distribution services (as indicated in 7.d above, the plans show two lorry loading bays for ingoing deliveries and four lorry loading bays for outgoing deliveries, plus driver facilities) is indicative of substantially more than being merely ancillary to any industrial processing (packaging) activities.</i> <i>• The covering letter states legal advice has been sought on this point, but there is no evidence of this.</i> <i>• The classification was questioned and highlighted in correspondence from Thames Water (dated 18th September 2019,</i>

Inlands Farm, The Marsh, Swindon (S/OUT/18/1943)

Consultee	Comments
	<p><i>copy as shown in Appendix C3 WSP February 2020 report). Thames Water raise the following question for the applicant: "The submitted information show that 50,000sqm warehouse, compared to the application it is mentioned to be light industrial can you clarify what type of premise it will be?". This sums up the clear discrepancy.</i></p> <p><i>Science Park</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Wasdell have commissioned CAM-SCI to assess the delivery of a Science Park in Swindon. The report is long, full of standard generalised statements highlighting the benefits of Science Parks.</i> <i>The report also fails to confirm of any Science Research companies who are showing an interest in moving to or expanding their Science Research in Swindon. Without the demand for Science Research in Swindon the promised Science Park in Phase 2 will not happen.</i>
Bishopstone (revised)	<i>Reiterate the comments made by Wanborough Parish Council.</i>
Boughton (Vale of White Horse)	<i>Reiterate the comments made by Wanborough Parish Council.</i>
Boughton (Vale of White Horse) (Revised)	<p><i>Reiterates comments made in January 2019.</i></p> <p><i>In addition Boughton PC make the following objections:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>- It contravenes National Planning Guidance and the Local Plan, particularly relating to setting of the AONB and NEV non-coalescence area.</i> <i>- It would undermine the NEV and result in additional traffic at Commonhead as well as extensive traffic on local roads, which would cause safety issues for other road users and increase pollution.</i> <i>- It deprive Swindon of a leisure destination</i> <i>- The proposed development is not consistent with Class B1c light industrial.</i> <i>- There is no demand for the Science Park, whilst the proposals would not create jobs because they would be relocating existing sites and workforce.</i> <i>- There are also concerns that the proposals do not represent a Science Park.</i>
Covingham	<p><i>Objects to the proposed development on the grounds that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• The site is outside of a settlement boundary.</i> <i>• The North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty abuts the south of the site and is within its setting</i> <i>• The site is within an Indicative Non-Coalescence Area (NC3) which permits small-scale development provided it meets the economic and social needs of the community. This clearly does not.</i> <i>• The site contains a significant area of low surface water flood risk</i> <i>• The site is along the safeguarded route for the canal and New Eastern Villages Southern Connector Road (SCR), which is designed to enable access to the New Eastern Villages.</i>
Covingham (Revised)	<i>Object to the proposed development and reiterate previous comments (above).</i>

Consultee	Comments
Liddington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are concerns that the proposed description ie. 'Science Park' is misleading and that form of the application ie. a 'Hybrid' would allow consent for part of the proposal without knowing the full details; which could result in a large industrial building being constructed in a very sensitive area. • Landscape: The surrounding landscape, including the AONB which abuts the southern boundary of the site, forms an important gap between the urban area and downs. This is would harm the area of non-coalescence and be contrary to policy. These areas such as Liddington Castle are regularly used by walkers and horse riders, whose view would be impaired by the development. • Pollution: There are significant concerns that the additional employee cars and associated HGV's would have an impact on the visual amenity of the area, as well has increasing noise and light issues. • Traffic: The existing roads bordering the site, The Marsh and Pack Hill, are narrow country lanes. They are most unsuitable to take the type of traffic which would result from the scheme. There is already significant queueing at the key junctions, resulting in rat-running through Liddington village. • Water and Drainage: It is quite clear from the correspondence with Thames Water that neither water supplies nor sewage disposal via main sewers will be available for this site for a significant period. • Alternative Sites: It is not accepted that there are no alternative sites available to accommodate the business. The Local Plan provides for 77.5ha of employment land, in addition to land already allocated. Inlands Farm is not allocated for employment land and should remain this way. • Wilts and Berks Canal: A protected route has been agreed through the application site. This could form an important feature, however it is understood that the alignment has been altered by this proposal, which could be a detriment to the canal scheme.
Liddington (Revised)	<p><i>Liddington PC raise four fundamental objections:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>It contravenes National Planning Guidance and the Local Plan, particularly relating to setting of the AONB and NEV non-coalescence area.</i> • <i>Approval of this scheme would set a dangerous precedent for future development in these areas.</i> • <i>The description of development is misleading, as the proposals do not represent a Science Park.</i> • <i>It is a "Hybrid" Application, i.e. it would give full permission for the first phase but would establish the principle of development for the second phase without any detail, thus leaving this open for numerous possibilities.</i> <p><i>In addition they support a number of objections and comments made by other consultees and stakeholders, and have the following concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Harm caused to the AONB and heritage assets. There are no overriding benefits that outweigh the landscape harm that would be caused by the proposed development.</i> - <i>The land availability evidence is deeply flawed, due to the site search requirements.</i> - <i>The Phase 1 designs confirm this building is intended for warehousing and distribution use (B8); however the applicant</i>

Inlands Farm, The Marsh, Swindon (S/OUT/18/1943)

Consultee	Comments
	<p><i>has applied for light industrial use (B1C).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>The Local Plan has allocated sufficient employment land to meet the needs of this development.</i> - <i>In reality this application is for a large warehouse built in open countryside, with a substantial area of adjoining land having a vague and imprecise designation unlikely to be realised. The CamSci report does not validate Wasdell as being suitable as host hub, nor does it define its area of expertise likely to attract suitable start-ups hubs. There is no detail on required incubation programmes or how they would be administered or marketed.</i> - <i>Greatly affects the viability of the Wilts & Berks Canal Route East of Swindon & Flood Prevention.</i>
Shrivenham (Vale of White Horse)	<p>Shrivenham Parish Council objects to this so-called Science Park for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) This is actually large factory in a rural setting and will be in open countryside. 2) It will have a massive impact on local roads used by Shrivenham residents as well as increasing the congestion on both the A420 and A419. 3) The constant flow of traffic 24 hours a day will have an unacceptable effect on air quality in the surrounding area.
Shrivenham (Vale of White Horse) (Revised)	<p><i>The revised plans do not alter our original objection which was that the application is not really a Science Park but a large factory in open countryside. The plans do not consider the massive impact that the development will have on the local roads or on the main arterial roads – the A420 and the A419. Further the 24 hour operation will result in a constant flow of traffic which will have an unacceptable impact on the air quality in the surrounding rural area.</i></p>
South Marston	<p>Please note that South Marston Parish Council has reviewed this application and have the following strong objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The site would appear to block the aspiration for an off-road cycle path leading from North to South through the NEV. We would ask that suitable amendment, or an acceptable alternative provision is put in place. 2) This application strays into NEV anti-coalescence areas. South Marston has these too and so as a matter of principal, these shouldn't be strayed into. 3) We would suggest that this development would only be viable if there is early delivery of the Southern Connector Road.
South Swindon	<p>Object to the proposed development on the grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Violates local development plan and the agreement of the area of non- coalescence and will also severely impact the rural character of the Ridgeway AONB. 2) Traffic through eastern village would see HGVs driving through to get to the A420. 3) SBC to work with Wasdell to identify other sites. 4) Commonhead Roundabout and infrastructure not sufficient for increase in volume and massing of traffic.
Third Party Representations	
Bassaire (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Support the proposed development because as a supplier and contractor for Wasdell it would enable them to continue receiving work from Wasdell.</i> • <i>They have worked with Wasdell for 16 years and would not have as successful a company as it does without that</i>

Consultee	Comments
	<i>relationship.</i>
Cambridge Sensors Ltd (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>We (Cambridge Sensors Ltd.) are a Cambridge medical device manufacturer that makes medical devices used in the treatment of Diabetes and have been talking to Wasdell, through an intermediary, regarding the supply of novel pharmaceutical devices.</i> <i>The process is involves sophisticated technology and is regulated by the UK, international standards (ISO) and foreign governments. Although referred to as 'pharmaceutical packaging' these processes have nothing in common with the type of warehouse packaging familiar to the general public.</i> <i>Support the proposed development to allow Wasdell to expand and develop its divisions.</i>
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Raises concerns with the reasoning for the proposed development to be split between a Phase 1 (full) and Phase 2 (outline), and the speculative nature of the outline element.</i> <i>Policy NC3 advises that the employment land should be around the existing employment uses and close to the key transport corridors of the A419 and A420, and that the character and identity of the villages should be protected by the non-coalescence area.</i> <i>Question how the proposed development would integrate with the Southern Connector Road (SCR) and whether the SCR is designed to accommodate HGV traffic.</i> <i>There are concerns in relation to the proposed uses for the Phase 2. On the basis the future businesses are unknown, it is not possible to predict the impact of the traffic and jobs created.</i> <i>Consider that there are better alternative sites for the proposed development such as Wichelstowe, which has good transport connections.</i> <i>Clearly the retention of jobs in Swindon is important, however the proposal is not justified with such a significant departure from the Local Plan, particularly with the need to protect the landscapes.</i> <i>The Symmetry Park site was chosen due to its good transport connections, something which is not the case for this location.</i>
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) (Revised)	<p><i>Reiterate previous comments and also raise the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Council and the local communities have gone to significant effort to plan positively for the area of the NEV. The proposed development would deliver a scheme which is clearly not anticipated or sought by the Council or the local communities through the NEV allocations.</i> <i>The overall strategy of the Local Plan is to direct development to the most sustainable areas and accord with the objectives of the Framework. The strategy for the development of the NEV was set out in the process of the long deliberations resulting in the Masterplan.</i> <i>Mr. Justice Holgate, at Uttlesford and Corby, ruled that NPPF policies, including the tilted balance, do not have the same "force of statute" and "have to be understood in the context of the development plan-led system".</i>

Inlands Farm, The Marsh, Swindon (S/OUT/18/1943)

Consultee	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Swindon and Wiltshire Strategic Economic Plan draws attention to the fact that science related economic growth is a priority for Swindon in the restructuring of the economic base of the area. We agree, since it is the cyber and digital economies and the higher value skilled employment that will be the future growth area. A science centre could well be accommodated within sites 4 and 59 and with an insecure economic future ahead probably at existing sites which may yet come forward.</i> <i>Warehousing, packaging and distribution are all elements with low, and low skilled, employment numbers and should be accommodated within existing, or allocated, industrial parks suitable for B8 use.</i>
County Recruitment (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Support the proposed development of a Science Park.</i> <i>Country Recruitment supply Wasdell with staff on a temporary contract, converting to a permanent position.</i> <i>Going ahead with the proposal will enable Wasdell to fulfil increased production.</i> <i>County Recruitment consider it crucial that Swindon do everything possible to secure more jobs in the town.</i>
Covingham Flood Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Covingham Flood Group has concerns that this proposed development could increase the flood risk to Covingham. We fully support and endorse the recommended conditions required by the Lead Local Flood Authority and insist that they are applied, should the proposal go ahead.
Envair Projects (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Support the proposed development on the grounds that it would safeguard and increase local employment.</i> <i>The proposed development would support local businesses during the build and the supply chains in the long term.</i> <i>Envair have worked with Wasdell on a number of projects over the years.</i>
Ramblers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the proposed development on the grounds that it forms open countryside between Swindon and Wanborough. The site is not allocated for development and was rejected as unsuitable in the recent Strategic Housing & Employment Land Availability Assessment. Whilst the development proposes to retain the public footpaths, albeit diverted, the character of these would be altered and no longer provide the benefits of walking in the countryside.
Ramblers Association (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The revised plans have no impact on our reasons for objecting. Development of the site is contrary to the Local Plan and the proposals contained in the Local Plan Review. The rural character of the public footpaths crossing the site will be irretrievably lost. We maintain our objection.
Residents (Object)	<p><u>Principle of development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The application site is located within the area of non-coalescence. The proposed development, is not considered small scale, and would therefore encroach on the character of Wanborough and the surrounding area, adversely impacting the community feel in the settlements. The Science Park would practically merge Wanborough with the Swindon urban area; and therefore contravenes Policy NC3 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026. The proposed development does not uphold national and local planning guidance, principally on the basis that the

Consultee	Comments
	<p>proposed development is located within the area of non-coalescence and adjacent to the North Wessex Downs AONB. This therefore undermines the desire for sustainable communities and environments in which we live and work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence provided to justify why the proposed development cannot be located at other sites in Swindon. The Local Plan proposed spaces for housing and employment uses, many of these are still available. The proposed site is outside of these areas and therefore should be rejected. Whilst some efforts have been made to find alternative sites, it doesn't mean the proposed development is correct for the application site. • The Science Park does not represent sustainable development as it would destroy the local environment and cannot be accommodated by the existing infrastructure. The surrounding area has already been adversely affected by lots of new housing and industrial development. It would also result in the loss of the existing farmland. • Policy NC3 of the Local Plan as allocated 8,000 homes and 40ha of employment at the New Eastern Villages, this proposed development is not required. • Demanding the need for a "freehold" site as an alternative to the numerous commercial development opportunities already planned or being provided for by SBC – is not a reason to grant permission in this rural location and contravenes SBC commercial policies. • The proposed development is not located within the catchment area for likely employees of the business. It is therefore not a sustainable location. • This 'Science Park' was not included in the shortlist of potential development sites for the first draft SHELAA consultation as it was deemed unsuitable. The site is also not allocated within the Wanborough Neighbourhood Plan or any plan prepared by the Council. • Regarding the second phase of the site - if there was no demand for these facilities at Badbury Park or at Symmetry Park and 50% of Cheney Manor has been demolished, then where are the "entrepreneurs" waiting to take residence of this speculative development. • Lack of availability of suitable employment land is not a valid reason to override clearly established protection policies, designed to preserve the countryside's rural environment. • The proposed development would result in a loss of agricultural land. <p><u>Landscape, Heritage, Design and Biodiversity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development would spoil the character of Wanborough village and the surrounding landscape, which includes the North Wessex Downs AONB which should have its character protected. The view of Wanborough on the approach from Commonhead is pleasant and in keeping with the entry to a small North Wiltshire downland village. The proposed development would be substantially altered forever, contrary to the Policy EN5 of the Local Plan and the NPPF. • The proposed development is contrary to Policy DE1 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026, in that the scale, design and appearance would not be appropriate for its context or respect the existing features. • The development proposes to plant trees to hide the development, however these are not sufficient to mask the

Consultee	Comments
	<p>warehouse and will not be high enough to the hide the building for years. It is considered that no kind of planting walls or landscaping will hide a 33,000sqm 14.5m tall building close to the AONB.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development will adversely affect the setting of the Upper Wanborough Conservation Area and the views to and from it, contrary to Policy EN10 of the Local Plan. It would also harm the significance and setting of the St Andrew's Church in Upper Wanborough, which is Grade I listed. • This site sits very close to a Roman town west of Wanborough and Liddington Castle hillfort, both scheduled monuments, and the Ridgeway an ancient trackway and England's oldest road. This area may still hide settlements and objects of historical importance. The destruction of this area would obstruct our right to preserve our countries heritage. • Finally, the application includes the following observation: "In summary, the character of the site will be markedly altered by the proposed development as appreciated in views, primarily due to urbanising effects of the use, associated activity and new built forms in an otherwise rural, countryside context" [Appendix 10.1 Built Heritage Statement, paragraph 6.7]. • Geophysical surveys have indicated there could potentially be important archaeological features on the site, which need to be preserved. • The Science Park would also have an adverse impact on the wildlife and ecology in the area. In particular it would impact the existing wildlife in the area including deer, buzzards, red kites, amphibians and other bird life. • Views from the GWH Hospital can have positive impacts for the employees and patients; the proposed development would harm these views. • Locally distinctive and characteristic pattern and species composition of natural features such as trees hedgerows, woodland field boundaries watercourses and water-bodies will be impacted unreasonably. • The North Wessex Downs AONB is highly ranked for dark skies. This environment should therefore be protected, particularly for astronomy. • The site adjoins a County Wildlife Site along its North Eastern boundary. <p><u>Transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development would substantially increase the traffic levels of cars from employees and HGV's on the local network, which consists of many narrow lanes without pedestrian pathways. In particular this would add to the congestion and delays on Commonhead Junction; Junction 15 of the M4; the A419; A346; and A4259 (Marlborough Road) and would result in more rat-running through Wanborough, Liddington and the other surrounding villages. No comprehensive access strategy, with fully costed improvements to these junctions has been provided. • A consequence of the traffic building up at Commonhead and M4 J15 is that vehicles may decide to leave the M4 at J14 and travel through the country road network, resulting in unacceptable levels of rat-running through local villages. It could also result in delays to the ambulances accessing the hospital. • The proposed access to the site is from Pack Hill, which has a 60mph speed limit. It is also located close to a blind bend making it very dangerous and inappropriate for heavy use by employee cars and HGV's, particularly during turning

Consultee	Comments
	<p>manoeuvres. Many of the local roads are also in a poor state of repair and would be made worse by the proposed development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no appropriate public transport links to the site, and the Transport Assessment is incorrect in the notation of bus services. Employees would therefore need to walk to the Hospital for a regular bus service, along a road with no pedestrian footway or lighting. Additional traffic would be dangerous to pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. • The proposed development undermines the delivery of the proposed Southern Connector Road (SCR), which has not considered the proposal in the transport modelling. • There are 141 parking spaces allocated in the Phase 1 development. This is insufficient for 1200 workers. Although the transport document indicates that there are buses running to and from Wanborough, it fails to point out that these are very infrequent and are highly unlikely to be used by Wasdell staff. • The existing road network is already stretched with the traffic and there have previously been serious traffic and pedestrian accidents in and around the village. The proposed development would result in these roads becoming over capacity with large articulated commercial vehicles and employee cars, resulting in additional rat-running through villages and more traffic on the village road network. The corner in to Wanborough at the top of Pack is narrow and restricted, and could not accommodate HGV's. This issue will already be exacerbated when the developments at the NEV commence. • The application proposes a Class B1c development, which is not correct for the nature of the use which will happen. A large proportion of the proposed building is for racking, thereby making it a storage facility, not 'light industrial'. This could significantly impact the transport modelling undertaken and submitted with the application. • The applicant has yet to complete Highways England's Paramics traffic model. • The proposed site has a service/emergency access road half way along the Marsh, however it is not clear what this will be used for and how frequently. • Wasdell would have no control over the routes the employees or HGV's would take, which could disrupt the quiet village roads. • The application does not appear to take account of 'Inclusive Mobility'. For example, the pedestrian crossing across the entrance is too long for physically disabled, partially sighted and wheelchair users. There is a risk of accidents. • The application does not appear to take account of equestrian movements. <p><u>Environmental and Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development would operate 24 hours a day, causing noise and light disturbance to nearby residents, businesses and wildlife. In addition there would be additional waste produced and air pollution which could adversely affect the current air quality levels. • Traffic through the village has increased in recent years due to new housing developments, which are needed due to a shortage. Further increases to the traffic will increase the noise levels for residents, present safety hazards for pedestrians and cyclists on the narrow lanes, and have an adverse impact on the local equestrian businesses.

Consultee	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application site is low lying land and regularly suffers from surface water flooding. Covering it with hard standing will result in further flooding issues to the River Cole as well as properties in The Marsh, Burycroft and Covingham. The proposed submission and mitigation is not considered sufficient to address the strong concerns with regard to flooding. • Groundwater test results as provided within the WSP report also clearly shows that groundwater is at or very near to the ground level within the site. • There was significant flooding along The Marsh and Burycroft during 2007/2008, including to parts of the application site. This development would exacerbate these issues. • The proposed development will increase the level of litter in the area, which is already an existing issue, particularly on Pack Hill and Commonhead. • The SBC Green Infrastructure Plan 2010-2016 refers to 'The flood plains of the river Cole and the river Ray and their tributaries are vital to managing flood risks'. • Currently the government is conducting a review "Landscapes review: National Parks and AONBs" in to how these areas can be better protected and this should be heavy taken in to consideration. <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that the application does not reflect the proposed development, which is actually more industrial and/or distribution in nature, and could have an even more harmful impact on the surrounding residents. The existing business of Wasdell appears to be in effect a packing and distribution centre. It is not, under any reasonable definition, a "science park". It does not meet the UK Science Park Association's (UKSPA) definition of a science park • There are concerns that the applicant is not being transparent with the proposal for a Science Park, which would only come forward as Phase 2 and 'subject to demand'. There is no commitment to bring forward the 'science park' element of the application. • Under permitted development rights, Class B1c can also change to Class C3 housing. It is unlikely that there will be any takers for the remainder of the Science Park, which will then be converted to residential. Improved transport links such as an airport would be required to attract businesses to a hi-tech science park. • There would be no benefit to the community. The proposal refers to 'much needed facilities' however it is not clear what these are or what they would bring to the local community. • The proposed development would have an adverse impact on the rural lifestyle of residents. The rights of way through the site would become less rural and the light would impact the dark countryside character. • The properties in the surrounding area are high in value and desirable. The proposed development would have an adverse impact on the house prices and make this area of the countryside, which is currently distinct from Swindon, less appealing for people to move to. • The safeguarded route for the canal runs through the centre of the application site, however the proposed realignment would be impractical and costly. The proposed shape of the canal route is inappropriate.

Consultee	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Environmental Impact Assessment put forward by land promoters Turley in August seems to be largely a desk-based exercise with many of the areas of impact glossed over without full investigation. This should be rectified before any consideration of the proposal. • There has been no attempt to reach out to the village in terms of people involvement, construction of footpaths or other such links to the village. • The nearby Badbury Park development also had an allocation for employment/industrial use for which no interest was shown after 5 years of marketing therefore further housing is now being placed on this site. • There are existing local facilities which could be utilised by the employees. • There is currently an insufficient provision of waste and utilities infrastructure. • The additional traffic, particularly HGV's could cause structural damage and foundation issues to a number of the older properties in the area. • There are a number changes which are likely to impact the industry such as the 4th industrial revolution, (i.e. the digitisation and automation of technologies and tools based on data science and artificial intelligence), will revolutionise logistics over the next 15-20 years. Warehousing is one of the easiest industries to automate which will lead to a reduction, not growth in the number of people employed in this industry. It is therefore likely that fewer people will be employed than is stated in the application submission and in the industry as a whole. The application therefore fails to demonstrate need or demand for this development. • The countryside has numerous health and mental well-being benefits for the residents of Swindon. This development would harmfully impact the countryside increased the pressure on the primary care services.
<i>Residents (Object) (Revised)</i>	<p><i>A number of residents reiterated previous concerns with the proposed development, as outlined above. The following comments are therefore in addition to those raised above.</i></p> <p><u><i>Principle of development</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The proposal is a speculative trading estate, rather than a Science Park. There appears to be no links to a university and the applicant has made no serious endeavour to it to identify and put forward such potential occupants of the buildings peripheral to his own factory. The Council has already made space available to start-up companies in the Carriage Works, which has sustainable transport links, whilst the Honda site will become available in 12-18 months.</i> • <i>The site requirements and methodology used in the survey cannot be justified as a reason for not being able to consider certain sites as available, for instance, "The site must be under the control of one landowner"; this will clearly narrow down site availability but it isn't and shouldn't be a reason for a site not being suitable. This also contradicts and undermines SBC's Local Plan process which clearly states they have allocated sufficient employment land to meet the needs of Swindon Borough.</i> • <i>If the application is approved, not only will it demonstrate complete disregard for the Strategic Plans and Policies which have been established by the Council to protect the Ridgeway villages and the landscape of the North Wessex Downs</i>

Consultee	Comments
	<p>AONB, but it will set a precedent for further development applications within the Non Coalescence Zone which the Council will not be able to reject.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no provision has been made for the business ceasing. As we have seen in other sites in Swindon, businesses which fail will leave behind mothballed eyesores which gradually decline. For this building with such a high environmental impact this should be a major concern and adequate provision for dismantlement should be made. • This site was rejected having been carefully assessed in the SHELAA carried out during the consultation for Swindon's Local Plan 2036, which concluded that this land was unsuitable as employment land due to landscape and heritage constraints. • It is unlikely to bring additional jobs to the area, it appears its main objective is to consolidate operations on one site, which may in fact lead to fewer jobs. • Porton Down Science Park, sponsored by Wiltshire Council, has needed £15m of public money and taken 5 years to establish. Wasdell have made no personal commitments to the Science Park in the application, stating that it would be subject to 'demand'. • The applicant has provided no evidence to substantiate its claim that it can provide a world leading R&D host hub facility capable of attracting the required talent to sustain a Science Park. With no plans to market, fund or operate the Science Park, it is likely, as history has shown with Badbury Science Park, that "no demand" will be forthcoming. Therefore this is a speculative unsupported application and should be rejected on those grounds. • The CamSci report does not validate Wasdell as being suitable as host hub, nor does it define its area of expertise likely to attract suitable start-ups hubs. There is no detail on required incubation programmes or how they would be administered or marketed. • Despite expansion Wasdell has created no new jobs in Swindon in last 3 years and instead has invested in new packaging capability to improve efficiency and productivity. Relocation to a single site, far from creating additional jobs, would very likely lead to redundancies among the existing workforce of fewer than 400 employees. • The "Science Park" name is an attempt to convey an impression of high value employment and thus seduce the planning authorities into approving the proposal. However, the most recent Wasdell Holdings annual report¹ reveals that, in the year to 30 April 2019, the company's total wages and salaries cost was £12,085,587 and the number of employees was 539 (down 8% compared to the previous year). This represents an average salary of £22,422. • This development is not needed as there is enough land available already for this sort of enterprise and with the Honda site becoming available not far away surely it makes more sense to use these sites rather than destroy yet more green space. • The relocation would result in the closure of the other three sites in Swindon, which is likely to create additional efficiencies and potential result in job losses rather than gains. • We are heading into a deep recession; it is likely that many more brownfield sites will become vacant across the town, so it makes little sense to develop in a new area rather than to improve a current brownfield site. The relocation of the three Wasdell sites will result in further redundant brownfield sites.

Consultee	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A science park/innovation centre nearly always requires huge investment and Wasdell has made no personal commitment to the science park, stating it would be 'subject to demand'. • The Cam-Sci report states “Swindon Science Park Operations Model: The most successful science parks in the UK are those in single ownership with an estate-wide operations strategy that integrates development and facilitates delivery of a single vision. This model is most common where the landlord funds development (directly or indirectly) and the tenant entity leases premises from the landlord. To retain control and maintain the enduring vision of the project, as well as to maximise capital value, this model grants only ground leases other than in exceptional circumstances” - This is the model which Wasdell identified as a block to them moving to somewhere like Symmetry Park where ‘freehold’ and flexibility in design’ were not available. • The Cam-Sci report suggests a hub and spoke approach, yet I can find no evidence to substantiate its claim that it can provide a “world leading R&D host hub facility capable of attracting the required talent to sustain a Science Park”. <p><u>Landscape, Heritage, Design and Biodiversity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The revised Wasdell Building gives the impression its height has been reduced by only highlighting the height of metal cladding panels at 12.575 metres, but the actual building is approximately 14.5 metres high and very large in overall scale, which will have an overbearing and negative effect on the AONB, Wanborough and the surrounding countryside. • The mitigation, buffering and screening is not effective in offsetting the overall scale and the negative impact that the scheme will impart upon this widely accepted area of sensitive and highly valued countryside. • Walkers, cyclists, and motorists leaving Swindon towards the south and east see a green landscape in front of them with the downs rising towards the villages of Upper Wanborough and Liddington isolated on the hillside. The importance of this “gap” between the houses and factories on the lowland, and the vista of the Downs rising up from the plain, is set out in SBC Local Plan 2026 and referred to as “Non-Coalescence” Policy NC3. • The amended design and proposed screening and buffer will not be effective in offsetting the overall scale and the negative impact that the proposal will have on an area of sensitive and highly valued countryside. • This application will have significant adverse impact on the landscape and character of the AONB, Heritage Assets, the rural landscape and setting of Wanborough (contrary to National Planning policy paragraphs 170, 172 & 127, SBC’s Local Planning policies EN5 & EN10). The public benefits stated within the application will not mitigate the irreversible damage this proposal will bring. • The rural gateway to Lower Wanborough via the Marsh and to the Ridgeway and the North Wessex Downs via Pack Hill that opens up when leaving the busy A419 at Commonhead Roundabout would be lost for ever; transformed into a visually intrusive industrial site. • One of the lovely things about Swindon is that it is surrounded by beautiful countryside. Once the fields are gone they are gone forever, the landscape is permanently changed and a precedent is set for further development. The countryside around Wanborough is enjoyed by people all over Swindon as it’s easily accessible and great for rural walks and country

Consultee	Comments
	<p><i>pubs. The proposed development would be better situated on a brown field site that needs regeneration.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Planted screening would take many years to grow. The first trees at Warneage Wood were planted as saplings in 1988. They are now only at a height of approx.10 metres.</i> <i>The applicant has stated that: "In summary, the character of the site will be markedly altered by the proposed development as appreciated in views, primarily due to urbanising effects of the use, associated activity and new built forms in an otherwise rural, countryside context" [Appendix 10.1 Built Heritage Statement, paragraph 6.7]. This should be sufficient reason in itself to reject the planning application, S/OUT/18/1943.</i> <i>The proposed development would compromise the canal route, and make the future delivery of the canal unviable.</i> <i>Any new developments must have sustainable credentials for the sake of all of our future.</i> <i>In the context of the Climate Emergency declared by Parliament in April of 2019, the proposal fails to demonstrate zero or negative carbon emissions in terms of both embodied and in-use energy usage to be achieved by 2030.</i> <p><u><i>Transport</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The surrounding lane network is not capable of supporting additional traffic from employees or heavy goods vehicles. The lanes are frequently used by walkers, cyclists, and horse riders and is close to The Ridgeway which has been promoted as a tourist leisure destination. It is extremely difficult for two cars to pass each other on a number of these lanes and there are no pavements, so additional traffic would cause safety issues for other users.</i> <i>The revised proposals remove the Phase 1 access and propose to access the site through the new roundabout provided by the SCR. There is nothing in the Local Plan which states that the road should provide access for an industrial estate, nor should the Council take any financial contributions from this application for the delivery of the SCR.</i> <i>It will compromise the effectiveness of the Southern Connector Road which is designed to support the NEV development not this huge development which is outside of the NEV area.</i> <i>The application does not appear to take account of 'Inclusive Mobility' or equestrian movements.</i> <p><u><i>Environmental and Amenity</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The proposed development indicates 24/7 operations, the impact of such a move will create significant light and noise pollution in a location that is currently tranquil and falls within the area of Non-Coalescence (NC3), which exists to protect Wanborough from this type of encroachment, particularly onto land that is not designated within Swindon's Local Plan as land for industrial developments.</i> <i>The development will attract large numbers of diesel-powered lorries, which so close to the village can only negatively impact air quality for the local residents.</i> <i>The surrounding area is subject to flooding which will be exacerbated if this development goes ahead.</i> <i>Many manufacturing companies and business to not last forever before they either move on or a forced to adapt by markets. The farming land will be lost forever and is desperately needed to supply food.</i>

Consultee	Comments
	<p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little consideration is given to the public footpaths that cross the site. Given the current COVID 19 restrictions these footpaths have been of enormous benefit to the local community and should be maintained at all cost. • Under the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, Class B1c is for light industrial use which could be carried out in any residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area. The supporting documents and plans for the Phase 1 development clearly show that Phase 1 would be used as a 24hour 7 day week 365 days industrial storage and distribution centre, which under the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended May 2017) is Class B8 (storage and distribution). The applicant's description of the development in Phase 1 on the Application Form is incorrect and misleading and should be for a Class B8 use. The application should be considered on that classification and for that reason should be rejected. • The noise, light pollution and traffic impact of this development would decimate the local equestrian, leisure and hospitality industries, forcing closures of stable and livery yards. • Thames Water has confirmed they cannot provide clean water or sewerage to this site, so in granting this application this will divert utility provision away from the NEV.
Resident (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal offers the opportunity to bring hi-tech jobs into Swindon. • Not only do Wasdell Group employ large numbers of people across the country - jobs which will be consolidated in Swindon, but they directly support over 120 local businesses who supply Wasdell and may be at risk, should the development be rejected. • Many misleading facts have been put forward about this development. • The development plans have been altered to take account of the abutment with the AONB on the Wessex Downs and the siting within the advisory area of non-coalescence. • An area of the development has been preserved for both the future routing of the Wilts and Berks Canal and Southern Connector Road. • The Wasdell development offers the best opportunity for the village to retain a distinct identity from the town, while supporting the wider economy and investment in highly skilled jobs, which the town desperately requires.
Residents (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the proposed planning application as it would allow an existing Swindon company to expand, bringing economic benefits. • The objections state this is cosmetic application and cite the availability of land to be made vacant by Honda. As you are aware, the Honda site was not available when this application was first submitted and the site is unsuitable for Wasdell's needs. • The objections also cite local SBC policy NC3. However this policy states that only a "principle of non-coalescence" shall exist and development may be permitted where there is a requirement "directly related to the economic or social needs of the community".

Consultee	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Do not consider that additional traffic will undermine the viability of the NEV. With over 8000 houses to be built in the NEV and the infrequent nature of deliveries to Wasdell site, which typically take place outside of commuter hours, the impact on traffic is negligible to the point of non-existence.</i> <i>The deprivation of this area as a "leisure destination" has not been factually explained.</i>
Snack and Sandwich Company Ltd (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Support the proposed development. They are a supplier for Wasdell so have a better understanding than most about the problems facing the company in trying to maintain growth.</i> <i>Enabling Wasdell to expand will strengthen Wasdell's future. It is important for Swindon to benefit from these jobs and the benefits to the economy.</i>
South Swindon Protection Group (SSPG)	<p>Rollinson Planning Consultancy have been instructed by SSPG, acting on behalf of the residents of Wanborough and the surrounding area to review the planning application and make representations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider it unreasonable to set a deadline for representations of 31st January. We believe that the use of the term 'Science Park' to describe this proposal is misleading. The only element of the application which can be afforded any certainty is the light industrial unit, and therefore the whole application should not be 'badged' as a Science Park. It therefore fails to satisfy the definition requirements of the UKSPA. There is no evidence that the research development elements of the application will be delivered. The perceived economic benefits of the proposal are the principal argument for the proposal, even though it is contrary to the Local Plan. The pre-application included other uses such as a petrol station, and therefore the proposed outline application is subject to change. It is also considered reasonable to question whether the full application element of the proposal is a B1 c development. The proposed Ground Floor plan would appear to indicate that the majority of the proposed floorspace is intended to be used for storage and distribution purposes. Furthermore, the description of the applicant company within the Planning Statement (paras 4.8 – 4.11) lends credence to the view that this could be considered a B8 Storage and Distribution use. The packaging, for instance, may well take place in pressure-sealed clean room environments, but is still packaging, part and parcel of a storage and distribution operation. SSPG agree with Highways England that insufficient information has been submitted with the application. PFA advise the Transport Assessment has failed to explain clearly how the trip rates have been calculated, the proposed land use appears to be largely B8 with many employees to satisfy the 24-hour operation proposed. It is vitally important that the transport implications are correctly assessed on a highway network that is already severely congested at times. PFA agrees with the objections of Wanborough Parish Council in respect to flood risk and the implications for the access. We believe this development has implications for the proposed Southern Connector Road, a vital element of infrastructure that is required to allow the development of the Eastern New Villages (ENV) to take place. The applicant's position is that Phase 1 can proceed in advance of the SCR. That will simply worsen conditions and fail to provide a safe and suitable

Consultee	Comments
	<p>access for all users contrary to NPPF paragraph 109.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We consider it be self-evident that the proposal represents a significant departure from the Local Plan, adopted in 2015. This can best be summarised by the following extract from the pre-application provided by the LPA: - <i>The key policy objections are:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The site is located within Policy NC3 Indicative Non-Coalescence Area thereby significantly impacting on the setting of the Wanborough village,</i> <i>The proposal impacts on the landscape context and views to and from the North Wessex Downs AONB (the boundary of the proposed development is contiguous with the AONB boundary),</i> <i>The proposal fails to constitute a comprehensive sustainable approach to planning as an extension of the NEV.</i> It is our view that the departure from the existing Local Plan would be so major (and the impacts of the development so significant) that the correct approach to considering the future of the site is through the Local Plan process and the review of the Local Plan. It needs to be considered in the light of all existing and other potential employment allocations. There are numerous constraints to the proposed development, such as the site's juxtaposition with the AONB, nearby heritage assets, the route of the Wilts and Berks Canal, footpaths which run through the site and, not least, the impacts on the Strategic Road Network.
<p>South Swindon Protection Group (SSPG) (Revised)</p>	<p><i>Rollinson Planning Consultancy have been instructed by SSPG, acting on behalf of the of residents of Wanborough and the surrounding area to review the planning application and make representations. In addition to the comments outlined below (received 8th June 2020), the SSPG wish to reiterate previous comments made.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Outlines the location of the proposed development as a departure from the Local Plan, as well as its proximity to the AONB and non-coalescence area.</i> <i>Considers that the Local Plan review is the appropriate forum for assessing the suitability of the application site for employment uses.</i> <i>Concerned that no personal consent is sought from the applicant, which indicates the proposal is speculative and therefore may or may not bring the economic benefits referred to.</i> <i>Remain sceptical of the proposed use class, particularly given the proposed floor plans indicate the proposed storage areas, which take up a large part of the Phase 1 building.</i> <i>Question whether the proposed development can be termed a Science Park. Also attach a letter from Dr Malcolm Parry (Managing Director and CEO of Surrey Research Park). This raises the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The proposed development fails to include all of the crucial elements required for a Science Park.</i> <i>Evidence from all projects listed within the CAM-SCI report have substantial connections with appropriate organisations and are on sites which have existing research facilities as a foundation.</i> <i>Paragraph 39 refers to several tests for a hub-spoke approach. The applicant should demonstrate these tests.</i> <i>Sufficient momentum will not be generated due to the proximity of the site to a technology and talent base.</i>

Consultee	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>The nature of the tenant base that characterises science parks makes them high risk developments.</i> ● <i>Highways England maintains a holding objection.</i> ● <i>Consider the impact of the proposed development on the setting of heritage assets would be greater than outlined within the submission.</i> ● <i>Concerned that the Planning Balance within the applicants submission is skewed, towards the economic growth resulting from the Science Park. However, there is no guarantee that the development would be occupied by the applicant, or whether the Science Park element is deliverable.</i> <p><i>In addition to the above correspondence from Rollinson Planning Consultants, an objection letter was received from the SSPG Chair, John Warr (27th June 2020). Thus outlines the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>The South Swindon Protection Group, which represents the views of over 600 Swindon residents, provided a lengthy objection letter on the first application dated 31st January 2019. The objections raised then still stand, together with some additional concerns the revised proposal has raised.</i> ● <i>The application site remains outside of the Local Plan development boundaries, whilst the SHELAA process reviewed and excluded the site.</i> ● <i>This proposed site contravenes your planning policies for non-coalescence and developments in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</i> ● <i>Claim1: The Science Park will provide a direct wage expenditure that equates to £22.4 million p.a.</i> ● <i>SSPG: Wasdell does not have the capacity, capability, commitment, funding or gravitas to set up a Science Park. We urge that before considering this application a full assessment should be undertaken on the viability of a Swindon Science Park, as per the criteria laid out by Dr Parry in his report under section 39.</i> ● <i>As Dr Parry explains in his review of the CamSci Report, on which these claims are based, state that to be a successful Science Park, you need a “critical mass and collaboration benefits alongside dedicated infrastructure”. Setting up a Science Park is a high risk strategy to achieve economic success. The CamSci report is careful to apply a disclaimer that it does not endorse Wasdell as a suitable anchor tenant; it simply takes Wasdell’s word for it.</i> ● <i>The analysis by Dr Parry shows that close proximity to a town centre or major road network is not part of any “critical mass” criteria and in fact most UK Science Parks are more than 15 minutes from their local town centre or major road network. There is no requirement that a Science Park has to be within 15 minutes of a town centre or a major road network as claimed.</i> ● <i>Similarly the insistence that it must be operational by 2021 is absurd. As Dr Parry has demonstrated it can take 30 years to establish a Science Park and even with critical mass conditions in place the minimum is 5 years.</i> ● <i>Claim 2: Moving Wasdell to a single site will deliver huge economic benefits, including job creation.</i> ● <i>SSPG: We urge that you take into account a full economic benefit analysis on a relocation of Wasdell’s Swindon operation</i>

Consultee	Comments
	<p><i>before considering this application further.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Turley and the applicant they represent avoid direct claims on employment gains in Phase 1 and major more on benefits from a Science Park in Phase 2, which are tougher to quantify beyond mere speculation.</i> <i>However full planning application is being sought for Phase 1, whilst the 'Science Park' is an outline application and is "subject to demand". So any decision to override planning policy using the "balance" of economic gain needs to be proven for "phase 1".</i> <i>Published accounts confirm that the majority of the workforce (83%) are classified "Labour" and the remainder "Admin", with an average salary of £22,500: i.e. the majority of their workforce is unskilled.</i> <i>Taken together it is clear that this relocation to one site would be used as an opportunity for Wasdell to consolidate their operation and lead to a net loss of jobs.</i> <i>This would be worsened by the impact on local employment close to the proposed development. The Ridgeway villages support jobs in the equestrian, hospitality and leisure industries. Many have indicated that the siting of this development so close to these rural communities will force some of the businesses to close, potentially causing the loss of 100 further jobs.</i> <i>Claim 3: The planned use of this development is designated as B8 class.</i> <i>SSPG: We urge you to consider rejecting this application on that mis-definition of class usage or insist the applicant reconsiders its design.</i> <i>Claim 4: The applicant maintains there are no other suitable sites for its operation.</i> <i>SSPG: The 2036 Local Plan includes provision of 77.5 hectares of employment land, which makes ample provision for the commercial/industrial needs of the Swindon area, and already includes several other suitable sites.</i> <i>This proposal makes a lengthy list of requirements tailored to the applicant's own needs, even though the applicant has not put itself forward as the likely lead occupier of this development, which renders their specific requirements irrelevant.</i> <i>Claim 5: The applicant maintains this location is the only one to meet their requirements.</i> <i>SSPG: As established in the foregoing, the applicant's requirement is for a single Warehousing and Distribution centre. The application should be considered on planning merits for Phase 1 alone.</i> <i>In summary: The changes made to this revamped application are merely cosmetic; it remains a deeply flawed case for development:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>this industrial development would bring a steady stream of traffic in and out of the village, to add to the already busy A419 and J15 M4, affecting the flow of traffic to and from Swindon and the GWH;</i> <i>it would undermine the successful delivery of the NEV, firstly by diverting utility provision away from the NEV and reducing the desirability of properties in the NEV being accessed via a congested connector road that would attract heavy traffic flows that have not been built into the modelling of the Southern Connector Road;</i> <i>it would also have huge ramifications for rights of way, footpaths, flooding, noise and light pollution, visual impact,</i>

Inlands Farm, The Marsh, Swindon (S/OUT/18/1943)

Consultee	Comments
	<p><i>wildlife, biodiversity, canal, ancient heritage as well as the non-viability of utilities for the development;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>it contravenes national as well as local planning guidelines, as conceded by Turley;</i> <i>there is no credible basis for the claims made for economic benefits that would be delivered;</i> <i>it would deprive Swindon of a leisure destination, spoiling the landscape and rural feel of the Ridgeway villages as natural leisure destinations, in the process destroying local jobs;</i> <i>The applicants' game plan is clearly to follow the lead of Badbury Science Park, where there was minimal take-up of commercial/industrial space and the proposal was converted to domestic housing. That would yield the applicant 30 times the return of their investment than this one: a cynical speculative, unsupported application.</i>
Swindon Stargazers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From an astronomy viewpoint there has been a dramatic increase in 'light pollution' in the environment which means dark skies have disappeared from large portions of the country. Developments like this only extend the light pollution meaning that people have to travel even further. Developments like this must be stopped not only for their large impact on light pollution but also on the wider impact on the rural buffer zone around Swindon. It encroaches on the separate individual identity of the surrounding villages, on both people and wildlife.
Thrings (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Support the proposed development.</i> <i>Been a supplier to Wasdell and it's group of companies for a number of years.</i> <i>Understand that the company's success has resulted in it needing to find a new home for expansion and further collaboration with other scientific industries.</i> <i>The loss of Wasdell to Swindon would be a blow to the economy.</i>
Wanborough Anti-Flood Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the proposed development on the following grounds: Concerned that the proposed development would not actually from a Science Park and would become a warehouse. Concerned that the existing properties around Moorleaze Farm could be flooded more frequently. The Wanborough Anti-Flood Group are very concerned that plans to flatten and then elevate the site by 1.5-2m could create a dam in the natural drainage of the land forcing water outside of it's boundaries and onto other peoples properties and houses which are at a lower level in the area. The proposed underground storage tanks for surface water will be a problem at this site. The site gateway will cause a problem with vehicles coming down Packhill, and site traffic will add to the problem by backing up the traffic for emergency vehicles trying to access the hospital or the M4 motorway. The projected amount of traffic travelling from the proposed NEV will make it almost impossible to access and exit the factory/warehouse site at times.
Wanborough Anti-Flood Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Object to the proposed development on the following grounds:</i> <i>It is understood from Thames Water that the area will not have access to fresh drinking water for at least 5 years.</i>

Inlands Farm, The Marsh, Swindon (S/OUT/18/1943)

Consultee	Comments
(Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The application site is greenfield, there are other more appropriate sites available.</i> <i>This site is the lowest lying land in the area which takes both flood water from Upper Wanborough and Liddington, the flood water from here travels two ways, west to the homes at Moorleaze (a listed building) and to the Road at the bottom of Packhill where it collects and floods quite dramatically.</i> <i>Insufficient information has been given in relation to the proposed canal alignment.</i> <i>Plans to have Suds and move flood water to the culvert at Culdervale will not be viable as when in flood conditions the River Liden is well over capacity.</i> <i>The application site is located within close proximity to the AONB and would result in additional pollution to residents.</i>
Wasdell Employees (Revised)	<p><i>A number of letters have been received from Wasdell employees. These outline the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>State that the company has run out of space at the Swindon sites, and that the relocation and expansion would strengthen Wasdell's future.</i> <i>If the Science Park goes ahead it will secure jobs for many residents in Swindon and nearby suppliers.</i> <i>Proud to work in an industry that saves lives and the recent pandemic has shown how important the pharmaceutical industry is. Wasdell plays an important part in this chain.</i> <i>If Martin Tedham had been able to find a suitable alternative site he would have, but there are no other sites which suit the company's needs and timescales.</i> <i>Understand that nearby residents have concerns, however the design of the building and landscaping is considered to blend the development in well. The scheme would also involve the delivery of a section of the Southern Connector Road.</i>
Wilts & Berks Canal Trust	<p>Objects to the proposed development on the grounds that it does not provide an adequate alternative alignment for the Wilts & Berks Canal, in accordance with Local Plan Policy EN11.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The protected line for the restoration of the canal is shown by an indicative route on the Local Plan 2026 of which approximately 270 metres lies within the boundary of the proposed development. Policy EN11 requires that any development protects the integrity of the canal alignment and its associated structures and, further, where the canal is affected by development an alternative alignment is provided. The attached plans show the indicative route taken forward in the NEV GI SPD (2016). Due to the discovery of archaeological features, this route was realigned. The canal should be designed to accommodate two 22m long narrow boats. The width needs to be wider to accommodate this on the bends. The alignment proposed by the developer is therefore too narrow. The potential alternative to this is to go directly under the roundabout, however this would require two bridges. To the south, a route has been protected through a woodland area and across the Thames Water pipeline, it is therefore restricted with where it can link in. It is clear that the new road, the canal and any proposed new development in this sensitive area must be carefully integrated in order to mitigate the environmental impact.

Consultee	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The canal provides an opportunity to use the canal to help alleviate flood problems in the area. • The waterway will be accompanied by a towpath and cycleway providing safe, enjoyable links to the surrounding areas and eventually to Coate Water and more distant locations. • The scheduling of construction should also be considered at this stage and, sensibly, the structures to convey the canal under the new roads should be built as part of those roads as it will be very disruptive to do the work later. • Until further work has been completed on aligning closely with the SCR, which requires co-operation with the road designers and sponsors, and the archaeological question has been resolved it is not possible to say whether Line C or Line D could be adopted and thus avoid penetrating further into the proposed development area. The developer's proposed route, even if accepted, cannot be shown to connect satisfactorily to the north until the route through The Marsh has been confirmed. The green Line D is also dependent on a good connection northward. • The trust is ready to enter into discussion with all parties to in order to provide the best solution for the community.
Wilts & Berks Canal Trust (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Object to the proposed development on the grounds that it does not provide an adequate alignment for the Wilts and Berks Canal, in accordance with Policy EN11.</i> • <i>Since the initial submission the Canal Trust have undergone consultation on alternative alignments for the proposed canal, with the preferred route running through the application site. A number of constraints such as topography archaeology and where the canal can connect to the north and south have impacted the preferred alignment.</i> • <i>The route proposed through the submitted application is beneath the proposed roundabout, which would form an access to the Science Park. This alignment would run through an area of significant archaeology, and would therefore be difficult to achieve. The proposed alignment would also present a number of technical challenges to the construction of the canal, and would result in the costs to deliver the project rising significantly.</i> • <i>In summary, the developer's proposal fails to meet the requirements of Policy EN11 because the alignment proposed is inadequate, technically unsuitable for the purpose and raises conflict with important archaeological remains.</i>