

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

I'm Brian Riley. I'm a District Councillor for Hadleigh North and the County Councillor for Hadleigh.

It's my pleasure and honour to address the Committee on behalf of the people of Hadleigh who are poorly served by this document.

With respect to you Mr. Richards, this application reads like a poor first novel.

A robust start, a soggy middle and then an unrelenting drive for a conclusion that fits the prejudices of the authors.

Let me give a brief example of poor draughtsmanship. Page four gives a list of abbreviations used in this document. On page 25 we see the acronym FRA which is not on the list but which I deduce means a Flood Risk Assessment. I use the FRA as an example – there are others – all of which makes the document more of a chore to read than is necessary.

Mr Richards, when you are giving your clarifications can you enlighten us on the use of the word “insult” in paragraph 409 on page 80.

As I say, this document is poorly written and badly presented.

I'll deal with matters on a more sequential basis but let me take you to page 81 where it states and I quote. “There are no grounds, therefore to English Heritage's comments in respect of the impact of the proposed development on a grade I listed heritage asset. **The only explanation** is that the assessment was based on a desk study, without inspecting the application site and its environs.

What presumptive rubbish of an expert view!

Is it the **only** explanation? Who has made this judgement? Did they ask English Heritage how the assessment was made? Apparently not – yet here you take it upon yourself to make this outrageous statement.

Who do I believe, outside disinterested parties or a document designed to obtain a decision in favour of the applicant?

On the other hand, what steps were taken to validate Tesco's claim that the development will produce 100-120 new jobs (page 77). It sounds so cosy and nice. But are these full time equivalent jobs? This is unclear from the document and from the presentations. These new jobs include every part time shelf stacker and trolley collector!

Nor are these **net** new jobs. As we know from Prof. Hallsworth and our own common sense and observations that Tesco destroys more jobs than it creates. But the authors of this paper blithely accept Tesco's own assessments.

Who do I believe, outside disinterested parties or a document designed to obtain a decision in favour of the applicant?

Let's jump to Page 55.- **Planning Considerations.**

Because this is what it's all about – Planning and how it might enhance, develop and improve our Town.

It is not about, as one Committee Member said in 2011 the need to clear up the mess on the Brett Works site – and while we are at it – whose fault is that?

The principle of development given the changed retail landscape in Hadleigh, is whether saved policy HD01 remains relevant.

Well it doesn't because as I understand it HD01 is currently superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework – which is why the Framework appears so often in this document.

Does the proposal conform the provisions of the Framework.?

Well it doesn't meet the sustainability criteria. As we all know when the elephants fight the grass gets trampled.

Will the proposed development have a significant adverse impact upon the vitality of Hadleigh Town Centre? Even the Council's own officers and consultants say it will.

We are looking at £1.5 million going from the Co-op to Tesco (Page 58). And for those people who only come to Hadleigh to work in Corks Lane and attend meetings there, the Co-op is a key anchor store in our High Street.

The Design Considerations, Bridge House and Heritage Asset aspects have all been criticised by more knowledgeable and better informed persons than myself. These include English Heritage, The Town Council, The Hadleigh Society and the Hands Off Hadleigh pressure group.

Highway Safety – the Highways Agency accepts that heavy lorry traffic from Lady Lane into Angel Street might have to be controlled by a legal regulation order. Now that speaks volumes (see page 22 paragraph 109).

Incidentally, did you notice that Tesco classifies all non personal vehicles including white vans as Commercial Vehicles to justify its claim of only a *modest* increase in heavy goods traffic. Where was the planners' challenge to that?

Is the development sustainable? It isn't because, even by Tesco's own figures, For this store to succeed then both Morrison's and the Coop have to seriously suffer and the independent shops which make Hadleigh the fourteenth least clone town in Great Britain will also suffer – and there is no fat there to be trimmed!

Landscape, ecology and biodiversity have been dealt with and I would turn the Committee's attention to the representations made by the Hadleigh and District Angling Society on page 48 As to flood risk – I haven't seen any references to what happens downstream to Benton End and Layham. We know that in the last fourteen years the Brett has burst its banks downstream. Heaven help us if you say that the proposal is acceptable with regard to the risk of flooding.

There will be an adverse impact upon the amenities enjoyed by local residents (existing and future). How can there be otherwise when so much money is sucked out by the supermarkets. Look at other towns.

Did you notice that last time Tesco had to bring someone down from Rutland to tell us how wonderful it would all be and that we could reinvent ourselves as an Antiques Town a sort of Long Melford of East Babergh.

So Mr. Chairman and members of the committee – let's conclude by reminding you that you have the future, sustainability and the viability of this town in your hands.

There are overwhelming arguments for turning this application down.

There is an overwhelming democratic feeling against this proposal.

Tell Tesco that we neither need or want them.

Their plans have no place in our future – because that is the substance of the expert opinions you have heard today.

Thank you Mr. Chairman