



Application by Four Ashes Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the
West Midlands Interchange

Representations for The Inglewood Investment Company Limited

by Bruce Owen

SUMMARY

REFERENCE 20015438

2nd April 2019

1 Summary

Compulsory Purchase of Inglewood Investment Land is not required or justified to deliver the economic benefits of the WMI proposals

- 1.1 The Inglewood Investment Company Limited (Inglewood Investment) are an established commercial property investment and development company.
- 1.2 The development proposed on land owned by Inglewood Investment represents 15.6% of all proposed WMI accommodation.
- 1.3 Development of Inglewood Investment land is proposed 10 – 15 years after commencement of development of the WMI.
- 1.4 FAL do not propose any speculative development of B8 warehousing as part of the WMI. FAL proposes that the development of B8 warehousing will be in *“response to occupier requirement”* and subject *“usual development funding mechanisms utilised in commercial projects of this nature”*.
- 1.5 FAL’s proposals provides no certainty of delivery of commercial accommodation on land owned by Inglewood Investment.
- 1.6 Inglewood Investment are equally commercially motivated, and able, to deliver commercial accommodation on their land *“in response to occupier requirement”*.
- 1.7 Compulsory Purchase of the Inglewood Investment land is not necessary to deliver the economic benefits of the WMI as a whole, or part thereof.

The WMI proposals have substantially grown in the period from 2008 to 2016. FAL have provided no evidence to demonstrate that the proposals at 2008 should now considered to be undeliverable.

- 1.8 In 2008 FAL stated that a site comprising 350,000 sqm of B8 accommodation *“offers the size of site necessary to support a SRFI”*.
- 1.9 FAL’s 2008 assessment of site capacity (350,000 sqm) included 84,000 sqm of B8 with existing planning approval.
- 1.10 In 2015 Kilbride’s published scheme site plan mirrored that of 2008.

- 1.11 FAL have not provided any documents to demonstrate that the site illustrated in 2008, or subsequently in 2015, should now be seen as undeliverable.
- 1.12 On a directly comparable basis (ie. with existing planning approval and proposed accommodation as referenced in 2008 and 2015) the WMI DCO proposals comprise 827,200 sqm of B8 development and extends to 297 hectares.
- 1.13 FAL's Alternative Sites Assessment (ASA) sets a minimum threshold for "*true alternative sites*" at 60 hectares.
- 1.14 FAL have not demonstrated why the WMI is required extend to 297 hectares.
- 1.15 The ASA defines the market area that is relevant to the WMI by direct reference to the Market Assessment prepared by Savills.
- 1.16 The Market Assessment provides no evidence to support the commercial necessity for the total quantum of B8 floor space to be provided in a single location, such as that proposed at the WMI.
- 1.17 The Market Assessment identifies a vital need to bring forward additional well-located sites with capability for larger warehousing units. The Market Assessment does not identify access to rail facilities as a requirement of such sites.
- 1.18 Savills advised the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Planning and Infrastructure Group (HPIG representing Leicestershire County Council and the Leicester and Leicestershire LEP) that commercially attractive rail-linked sites should provide at least 200,000 sqm of floorspace.
- 1.19 Review of existing operational SRFI's, and proposed SRFI's around the UK confirms that the WMI proposals are of an unprecedented size. Including the existing permitted development (84,000 sqm), development contiguous with the WMI will exceed the largest existing UK SRFI schemes (iPort, Doncaster and East Midlands Gateway) by some 267,000 sqm. (c.148% larger).

Development of the WMI proposals are commercially viable without the necessity to include land owned by Inglewood Investment Land

- 1.20 Viability appraisal of the WMI proposals, excluding the land owned by Inglewood Investment, demonstrates that development will generate substantial development profits for the commercial partners in FAL.
- 1.21 The level of developer profits generated by the WMI proposals, excluding the land owned by Inglewood Investment is significantly in excess of that that can be reasonably expected, or required to deliver the SRFI scheme as proposed.
- 1.22 Viability Appraisal demonstrates that development by FAL of Phases 1 to 3 of the proposed WMI will viably support the SRFI.
- 1.23 The compulsory acquisition of the Inglewood Investment land, and its proposed development by FAL, will provide super profits to FAL, at the landowners expense.
- 1.24 There is no compelling viability case in the public interest to compulsorily acquire Inglewood Investment land for the purposes of FAL to develop it.

There is no compelling case in the public interest for the compulsory acquisition of land owned by Inglewood Investment

- 1.25 The WMI proposals fail to satisfy the requirements of Section 122 of the Planning Act 2008.
- 1.26 *The Inglewood Investment land is not required for the development:*
- Viability appraisal demonstrates that development by FAL of the Inglewood Investment land is not required for FAL to deliver the SRFI at Four Ashes.
 - Viability appraisal demonstrates that should FAL compulsorily acquire Inglewood Investment land, and develop it as proposed, it will significantly enhance FAL's development profits over and above that that is reasonably required to deliver the WMI SRFI.

1.27 *The Inglewood Investment land is not required to facilitate the development:*

- No part of the land owned by Inglewood Investment is necessary to deliver the functional rail or road infrastructure of the proposed WMI scheme.
- No part of the land owned by Inglewood Investment is particularly suited to provide open space in environmental mitigation as part of the proposed WMI.

1.28 *There is no compelling case in the public interest for the Inglewood Investment land to be compulsorily acquired:*

- Inglewood Investment are an established commercial property developer. They have equal commercial intent and motivation to develop their land (as included in the DCO/CPO), and deliver economic benefit.
- FAL are not proposing speculative development of B8 warehousing. There is no certainty of FAL's development of B8 development on the land owned by Inglewood Investment.
- Compulsory acquisition of Inglewood Investment land is not necessary to deliver the economic benefits of the proposed SRFI.
- Compulsory acquisition of Inglewood Investment land will unreasonably and unnecessarily interfere with its commercial interests.