

REPRESENTATION AGAINST APPLICATION: 19/02979/OUTMAJ

Given there was **no pre-public consultation**, residents invited Walkers' consultants, Pegasus, in June 2019 to outline their plans to us. They admitted these would bring **no local benefits**.

Our community fiercely objected and 167 signed a petition against this enormous warehouse proposal by all effected in:

- Shefford Woodlands
- Poughley
- Goodings
- Inholmes
- Woodlands St. Mary
- Rook's Nest
- Lambourn Woodlands
- Membury

After formal application in December 2019, **55 residents objected vs 4 genuine locals supporting**. It is not the 20 vs. 17 story the Planning Recommendation states. Check its website!

Our community then raised £000's to fund external planning and transport consultants who raised key issues with Planning, **all of which went unanswered**.

The Recommendation promises 45 new jobs as the **EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCE** to develop on AONB land. Residents support new employment and enterprise to boost the local rural economy, as many small businesses already do at Membury.

Yet the applicant's employment history shows **just 18% staff are really local which would equate to just 8 new local jobs**, likely minimum wage warehouse workers. This is far from an "exceptional reason" given many compelling arguments against this non-designated industrial land development, including:

1. Destroying breathing space between PEA zones that protects the delicate balance between business and rural environment, **AONB vehemently protests at a permanent land loss of considerable size**.
2. The **scale** of this warehouse is massive which will **dominate the landscape** with a footprint of 2.5 acres, and at 40 foot high it **will take many decades for new trees to screen**.
3. Using Walkers' selective lower traffic forecasts, the Officer ignores TRICS, the standard database for planning similar developments. This forecasts **776 additional vehicles a day** from this 9 HGV loading bay warehouse on a 14km round trip to access jct14 M4, along narrow unclassified and B roads.
4. Environment states extra traffic would adversely impact **rural quality and tranquility**.
5. Highways state the Membury site is **unsustainable today**.
6. Beyond constant noise, vibrations and risks to those who already live alongside this route, carbon emissions will rise unnecessarily **severely impacting WBC's Climate Emergency declaration**.

7. Residents are already anxious about **HGV traffic, now much increased at night**, not least with Royal Mail, UPS, and DPD, all of whom are Clients of Walkers who are not a 9-6 business, despite their claims. Their **publicity boasts 24/7 service**, and local weekend shift worker advertisements confirm.
8. This applicant's personal limitation must be vulnerable to future ownership change. While the Officer disregards this, **how could Planning ever enforce capacity growth from new owners?**

Recognising Logistics are growing national businesses, having already doubled their site, if Walkers need further dramatic expansion, **alternatives to this already saturated Membury site** exist elsewhere, as the Applicant admits.

The alternative of **8 new jobs does not justify permanent damage to Membury** and its rural surrounds.

On behalf of Woodlanders Action Group, we urge you to reject this application.

Piers Yeld

Tony King