

**Brian V Cockbill - Written Statement Session 1**

Subject: Canal Proposal (*Paras. 1&2*) The Canal Policy 4 Page 50  
Introduction Page 2

**Introduction**

1 This Written Statement will outline the arguments in support of my views that the Canal proposals contained in the Swindon Central Area Action Plan (CAAP) are unsound that I intend to develop at the Hearing Session 1.

1.1 The Action Plan is "unsound" on the following grounds:-

**Reasons**

2 The CAAP contains no alternative, other than the vague statement regarding "an early review" in Policy 4 on Page 50, should the canal plans be:-

- i) rejected at the Examination in Public;
- ii) abandoned by reason of reconsideration in the light of the full Council's decision on 29 April 2008 (Appendix A1) of:-
  - a) the additional information acquired;
  - and/or b) the result of the Poll then to be undertaken.

3 (*Para. 5*) If the Canal route is adopted, the Authority is at risk of being served with Blight Orders at an early stage without having indicated that they have the finance or from where such costs be met.

4 (*Para. 2*) The Plan whilst acknowledging there are a number of practical difficulties has failed to show how these can be overcome. (Appendix A2)

5 (*Para. 1*) The CAAP has failed to provide any evidence to support its view that its canal proposals either in full or part would generate any investment that could not be achieved by alternative development.

6 (*Para. 1*) Whilst the plan talks about joint funding there is no indication of:-

- a) the amount required;
- b) the division of costs between the partners;
- c) commitment to by private investors.

7 (*Para. 1*) The Action Plan acknowledges costs involved are high and the project is reliant on external and uncertain funding sources. (Policy 4 last paragraph on Page 51). Given the recent events outlined in (*para. 1*) the whole Canal Proposition can not be considered a "...prudent use of resources..." (5<sup>th</sup> bullet point of The Council's Aim and Objectives for Central Swindon 1 Introduction Page 2).

8 (*Para. 1*) The canal route proposed would require:-

- a) major interruption and re-routing of utilities;
- b) cause unacceptable traffic chaos;

and c) before a full and comprehensive traffic policy is adopted conflicts with the Council's Promise 37. (Appendix A3)

**Changes Necessary**

9 Withdraw of the Canal Proposal and rethink of practical and achievable alternatives.

10 The restoration of a replacement for the Wilts & Berks Canal connecting with other waterways could be achieved by either/and alternative routes using a southern route through the Southern Development Area and/or the River Ray course to the North.

**Key:**

Red - Submission Paper Ref.

Blue - Suggested Changes Ref.

Green - Written Appendix

*(Italics Bold)* - Original Representation Form objection panel paragraph

**Brian V Cockbill - Written Statement Session 1**

**Subject: Canal Proposal (Paras. 1&2) The Canal Policy 4 Page 50  
Introduction Page 2**

**Schedule of Appendices**

**A1 Copies of Emails regarding Council Decision with Shaun Banks (Committee Clerk).....Page 3**

**A2 Extract of Cabinet Feasibility Study - Review submitted to Cabinet on 23 January 2008 .....Pages 4**

**A3 Extract of the adopted "Council's 50 Promises".....Page 5**

**Key:**

**Red - Submission Paper Ref.**

**Blue - Suggested Changes Ref.**

**Green - Written Appendix**

***(Italics Bold) - Original Representation Form objection panel paragraph***

Brian V Cockbill - Written Statement Session 1

Subject: Canal Proposal (Paras. 1&2) The Canal Policy 4 Page 50  
Introduction Page 2

**All Copies of Emails regarding Council Decision with Shaun Banks (Committee Clerk)**

Brian,  
Here is my draft minute. If there are any changes I'll advise you accordingly.  
Regards  
Shaun

**120. Motion - Canal**

Councillor Steve Allsopp moved and Councillor Des Moffatt seconded:

"This Council abandons its support for a canal through central Swindon and agrees that no further officer time or Council finances either from direct Council Tax, Government Grant or Section 106 monies should be spent on the project."

Councillor Stan Pajak moved and Councillor David Wood seconded that the Motion be amended to read:

"That this Council in finalising its support for a canal in central Swindon agrees that further officer time and Council finance should be spent on the project leading to a local poll of residents of Swindon on whether they support a canal."

The amendment was put to the vote and declared carried becoming the Substantive Motion.

The Substantive Motion was put to the vote and declared carried.

A formal division was requested in accordance with Standing Order 14(2).

Members voting for the motion were Councillors Andy Albinson, Rex Barnett, Andrew Bennett, Roderick Bluh, Mick Bray, Mavis Childs, Sinead Darker, Doreen Dart, Michael Dickinson, Melanie Duff, Mark Edwards, Paul Findlow, Ray Fisher, Fionuala Foley, Brian Ford, David Grahm, Peter Greenhalgh, Dale Heenan, Russell Holland, Charles Lister, Colin Lovell, Peter Mallinson, Mary Martin, Nick Martin, Brian Mattock, William Morton, Stan Pajak, Anthony Peake, Garry Perkins, David Renard, David Sammels, Philip Sharp, Eric Shaw, John Short, Glenn Smith, Peter Stoddart, Justin Tomlinson, Keith Williams, David Wood, David Wren and Philip Young.

Members voting against the motion were Councillors Steve Allsopp, Paul Baker, John Ballman, Ray Ballman, Michael Barnes, Fay Howard, Des Moffatt, Derique Montaut, Kevin Small and Robert Wright.

-----Original Message-----

From: Brian Cockbill [mailto:brian.v.cockbill@talk21.com]

Sent: 30 April 2008 15:41

To: Shaun Banks

Subject:

Hi Shaun

I understand that at last Thursday's meeting a motion was carried regarding the proposed canal project. Can you please tell me the precise wording of motion and the result of the vote?

And, if it was by a 'recorded vote', how each member voted?

Regards Brian V Cockbill

**Key:**

Red - Submission Paper Ref.

Blue - Suggested Changes Ref.

Green - Written Appendix

*(Italics Bold)* - Original Representation Form objection panel paragraph

**A2 Extracts of Cabinet Feasibility Study - Review submitted to Cabinet on 23 January 2008**

**Section 2.11** Costings have only been for the prescribed works for the Swindon Central Route and those works immediately associated with it. Costs for further off-site works which emanate from the proposals, such as water storage lagoons or junction improvements on the towns traffic network at distant locations, are not included. It is important to be aware that these could represent significant additional costs.

**Section 2.13** A cost for the project is provided and suggestions about how funding might be raised is discussed but this report cannot provide the definitive answer on how this section could be paid for. The base cost is calculated at £52m (at 2007 prices).

**Section 3.15** However there are not any large development sites where the Council could accrue Section 106 monies. .... Acquisition may need to be supported through an extension of the existing public private partnership that is currently regenerating the town centre.

**Section 8.3** The report is very clear about what costs that have not been included. This includes compulsory purchase and acquisition costs. ....

**Section 8.6** Availability of Lottery funding is becoming harder, particularly with the increasing demands arising from the Olympics. However, business sponsorship and other types of grant aid will need to be fully explored.

**Section 7.9** ..... Key questions for future investigation are;

- \* Is the town centre link viable in its own right as a free standing stretch of waterway?
- \* Is it viable with a link to wichelstowe and not beyond?
- \* Is it only viable if linked to the wider network through an M4 tunnel?
- \* Does the link have a value as a water feature if not a canal?

**Section 10.2** In order to take this work forward to the next stage we recommend that a task group be set up by the Director of Planning and Transport strategy in conjunction with the Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Regeneration and Development to;

- i. Assess the value of the canal with or without a link to the wider network, addressing the questions at para 7.9
- ii. Produce an implementation plan, including resource needs
- iii. Report back with an evidence base to support the proposed route or minor variations on this where this overcomes objections or enhances the value or viability of the route.

**Key:**

Red - Submission Paper Ref.

Blue - Suggested Changes Ref.

Green - Written Appendix

*(Italics Bold) - Original Representation Form objection panel paragraph*

**A3 Extract of the adopted "Council's 50 Promises"**

**Promise 37** No significant new developments will be approved before the full transport implications are fully evaluated and plans for funding and implementation of any transport schemes are in place.

**Key:**

Red - Submission Paper Ref.

Blue - Suggested Changes Ref.

Green - Written Appendix

*(Italics Bold)* - Original Representation Form objection panel paragraph