

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 01 July 2015

AGENDA ITEM NO	2
APPLICATION NO	3519/13
PROPOSAL	Outline planning application (including access and layout) for the erection of three B8 use storage units with new access arrangements
SITE LOCATION	Land rear of Ceva Logistics, Norwich Road, Mendlesham (Part site in the Parish of Wetheringsett)
SITE AREA (Ha)	7.7
APPLICANT	Henley Property Investments 1063 Ltd
RECEIVED	December 2, 2013
EXPIRY DATE	March 4, 2014

REASONS FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

The application is referred to committee as it is a "Major" application for:-

- the erection of any industrial building/s with a gross floor space exceeding 3,750 square metres

BACKGROUND

This application was presented to Development Control Committee B on the 2nd July 2014 and recommended that Members indicate whether they would be minded to grant planning permission in principle subject to the outcome of negotiation on the following matters :

[a] the principles for landscape impact mitigation measures throughout the site together mitigation of wider landscape / off-site impacts by way of Section 106 planning obligation (which may include contributions towards the establishment of an appropriate fund)

On this matter the applicant has rearranged the layout of the site in order to allow for a significant 12 metre deep landscape buffer along the boundaries. On this basis your officers consider that given the context of the existing industrial area that the landscape impact

[b] the potential re-routeing of the public right of way FP34 to enhance the landscape amenity of countryside users within the locality

Issues of the footpath through the Ceva Logistic site have not be resolved, this is outside of any control of the applicant for this site. Instead the applicant has generously set aside land for a footpath through their site that might serve as an alternative. Essentially this serves as a potential re-routing of the right of way, but the matter of any formal adoption lies in the hands of Suffolk County Council to resolve. In planning terms it is considered that the provision of this new path would serve as a significant community benefit and supported.

and

[c] the amendment of the layout and access arrangements in order to facilitate [a] and [b]

This has been done and has resulted in both landscape and footpath improvements.

[d] That officers explore with the applicant and highway authority concerns regarding the risk of queuing vehicles within the A140 & the new access way and the effective management of that risk and explore sustainable drainage issues with the applicant

While highways do not object to the scheme, members previously were concerned with the shuttle arrangement if the traffic lights were to fail. In the unlikely event there is sufficient capacity to park lorries on the access road without backing out on to the A140. However, despite this capacity already built in the applicant has now provided a further lay by to allow for increased stacking capacity to provide members assurance on this issue. Accordingly it is considered that full exploration within the control of the applicant has been made and sufficient capacity is built in. Drainage issues are proposed to be dealt with further via condition in agreement with Environmental Agency and appropriately in terms of the reserved matters submission.

The following report has been updated in respect of re consultation on the changes made to the application since it was last at Development Control Committee.

PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE

1. MSDC Planning Policy, Economic Strategy and Development Management Officers have been involved in pre-application discussions with the applicants and agent for this proposal. The application has been submitted as recommended.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

2. The application site is a 7.7ha area of agricultural land, part of the former Mendlesham airfield, located within the countryside close to the villages of Mendlesham and Wetheringsett. The site is located adjacent and to the rear of the existing CEVA Logistics industrial complex and extends around this site to the A140 highway. The proposal is a separate business development to CEVA.

HISTORY

3. The planning history relevant to the application site is:

3817/12

Request for screening opinion
for three Class B8 Buildings,
associated hardstanding,

10/01/2013

parking and new access to A140

PROPOSAL

4. This application seeks outline planning permission, with access and layout matters considered, for the erection of three B8 (warehouse and distribution) buildings with a total floor area of 24,293.00 sq metres. There will be some associated offices. Only access and layout form part of this application and final design and heights of the buildings are not known (see assessment), but not envisaged to be taller than the buildings on the adjacent site. It is proposed as a 24hr operation and the application considers that 100 full time workers will be employed.
- The proposal includes the construction of a new vehicular access from the A140 highway, roadway and hard standing parking and turning areas. There are 162 car parking spaces available for employees and 92 HGV spaces positioned to serve the development.

POLICY

5. **Planning Policy Guidance**

See Appendix below.

CONSULTATIONS

6. **Mendlesham Parish Council (FULL)**

Mendlesham Parish Council unanimously agreed to recommend approval of this application subject to consideration of the following:

- a) Concerns that this application will lead to lorries stacking whilst waiting to turn into the site, from both directions of the A140 and also when trying to leave the site to access the A140.
- b) Concerns about the impact of surplus water and how it will affect drainage and flooding of the area.
- c) The new access will affect the amenity of the adjacent War Memorial, with the new junction making it dangerous and difficult for visitors to access the memorial site, but also mean lorries will be waiting/ driving along a second road next to the site with additional noise and fume implications. There is currently a joint project between Mendlesham Parish Council and Wetheringsett Parish Council to move the memorial to Mendlesham. This project is in the early stages, with planning permission and funding to still be obtained. If this application is to be approved, we would ask that financial contributions to facilitate the new project be negotiated with the land owner/developer.

On amended scheme:

Further to the consultation request dated 4 June 2015 regarding further information received with this application, Mendlesham Parish Council has reviewed the application documents and still unanimously recommends that this

application is accepted.

Concerns still remain as per our previous comments with regard to the A140, including access to and from the site and lorries stacking on the A140. We would also agree with Wetheringsett Parish Council in that it would be better to find the means of using the existing access to the Ceva site rather than having two entrances onto the A140.

We are also still concerned about the impact of surplus water and how it will affect drainage and flooding of the area.

Our earlier comments regarding the War Memorial are no longer valid as the Memorial has now been totally relocated to a site within Mendlesham Village.

Wetheringsett-Cum-Brockford Parish Council (FULL)

Wetheringsett Parish Council has now considered this application and recommends refusal on the grounds the access is not satisfactory. The proposed two accesses onto this short stretch of road would be a hazard, the proposed access should be incorporated into the existing access.

We would be grateful if you would take this recommendation into account when deciding this application.

(Note: No response received in respect of amended scheme)

SCC - Rights of Way Department

This proposal does affect Public Footpath No. 34 which passes through the site and comment as follows:

The current alignment of FP34 (not FP37 as stated in the proposal) is obstructed by fencing and the existing CEVA buildings both inside and outside of the proposed development site.

The 'protection' of the 50 metre section at the north west corner of the site is of no benefit if there is no proposal to make the rest of the path available for public use.

We would request the applicant makes provision for a potential diversion of FP34 to follow the boundary of the proposed development around units A, B and C. At the north east corner of the proposed development the public footpath should continue on the same alignment to join FP36, thus resolving the obstruction issue.

Suffolk County Council-Landscape Development Officer, Consultation Sent: 24/12/2013, Reply Received: 24/01/2014

Details concerns in respect of landscape works to the access road proposed. Notes 8 metres or more wide landscaping potential of majority of site. Seeks landscaping to be confirmed prior to consideration of application.

(Case officer note: Landscaping is not part of this application, but in principle there is space for significant landscaping to be achieved and dealt with as a

reserved matter; the exception being a length of access road that has limited potential due to land available in the control of the applicant, but this is the least sensitive area in terms of wider views and an area more associated with the existing industrial use adjacent the proposed site.)

MSDC - Conservation Officer, Consultation Sent: 24/12/2013, Reply Received: 06/01/2014

The application site lies on a disused airfield which is a potential heritage asset in its own right. The runways are now lost, but the proposed access road lies on what appears to be an original airfield road. Certainly the archaeologist at Suffolk CC will need to advise on the need for archaeological investigation or mitigation.

There are several listed buildings in the surrounding area all of whom have views looking out onto the proposed development site. However, even the closest of these buildings (Moat House and Hoods) are over ½ km away. The nearest others, Mickfield Hall, Read Hall, Bloomfields, Park Hall Farmhouse and Town Farmhouse, are all over 1 km away.

The proposed storage units are large buildings and care will need to be taken with the choice of exterior cladding and roofing materials to ensure that their visual impact upon the countryside is minimised. The height at the ridge is restricted to 9m which is probably about as low as is practicable for buildings of this size. In addition it is noted that significant planting is proposed as screening.

I consider that this proposal will have negligible impact upon the setting of the surrounding listed buildings and therefore I have no objection.

MSDC Economic Strategy, Consultation Sent: 24/12/2013, Reply Received: 31/12/2013

Mendlesham Airfield already has a cluster of B8 logistic based businesses, its position adjacent to the A140 and within easy reach of the A14 means that it is a good location for such businesses to operate from. This site is immediately adjacent to the existing employment area and is a natural extension to it. I support the application as it will provide new job opportunities in a rural area and support growth in one of our key business sectors.

Highways Agency, Consultation Sent: 24/12/2013, Reply Received: 06/01/2014

No objection

The Environment Agency

Recommends conditions

MSDC - Tree Officer, Consultation Sent: 24/12/2013, Reply Received: 08/01/2014

There are no arboricultural implications relating to this proposal.

Fire Service Hq - County Fire Officer.

Recommends installation of fire hydrants, the number and position to be agreed to be conditioned.

On amended plans, no further comments made.

Natural England, Consultation Sent: 24/12/2013, Reply Received: 08/01/2014

Based upon the information provided, Natural England advises the Council that the proposal is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes.

NATS Safeguarding Office, Consultation Sent: 24/12/2013, Reply Received: 30/12/2013

The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with our safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company ("NERL") has no safeguarding objection to the proposal.

Suffolk County Council - Archaeological Service

There would be no grounds to consider refusal of permission in order to achieve preservation *in situ* of any important heritage assets. However, in accordance with the *National Planning Policy Framework* (Paragraph 141) we would recommend that any permission granted should be the subject of a planning condition to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed

MSDC - Environmental Health - Land Contamination, Consultation Sent: 24/12/2013, Reply Received: 24/12/2013

I can confirm that I do not have any objections to the proposed outlined development.

Suffolk County Council, Highways (Travel Planner) Development Control Sec, Consultation Sent: , Reply Received: 17/01/2014

There must be a strong emphasis on encouraging staff to car share to the site as it is located in a remote location in regards to using sustainable transport, as there is no local walking infrastructure or bus services that serve the site. Staff policies to ensure staff car share when an opportunity is available must be put in place before the first units on the site are occupied. I have suggested a shuttle bus could be used as a measure to collect staff that may wish to commute via Stowmarket railway station, or other areas where quite a few members of staff are clustered. Also there needs to be more information on how cyclists will be able to travel to the site more safely as the main entrance will involve them crossing busy traffic on the A140.

Suffolk County Council - Highways, Consultation Sent: 24/12/2013, Reply Received: 13/01/2014

The total parking provision is acceptable for the intended use but 5% of the spaces should be allocated for disabled users. The estimated trip generation in the TA is accepted and the site is served directly off the A140 which has adequate capacity to cope with the predicted additional flows, which are approximately an increase of 3-4% in the am and pm peak hour. The new junction with the A140 accords with the appropriate design standards but the traffic signal controlled single lane section of the access road has been of some concern in pre-application discussions because of the possibility of queuing back to the A140. Further details of the operation of these signals are required so that we can be satisfied they will not affect the highway. Can the applicant provide proposed intergreen times for the proposed signals?

The Planning Statement refers to a Stage 1 safety audit of the shuttle system in paragraph 6.4 which I cannot find in the material submitted with the planning application. It would be useful to see this safety audit as part of the consideration of the shuttle system

Update 17/04/2014 (Having seen safety audit and had further discussions with applicant)

Recommends 6 conditions:

- Securing details of access and traffic lights (shuttle system for part of the access road only) have been detailed and is in place prior to further development
- Piped or bridging of ditch
- Surface water drainage to be agreed
- Travel Plan condition
- Securing of parking and turning areas
- Securing of visibility splays

(Case Officer Note: SCC Highways have also sought a 106 Agreement for the traffic shuttle system to be properly maintained. Instead a condition is proposed to ensure proposed operation of the shuttle system at all times. There is no legal requirement or power that can ensure something does not ever break down and a 106 is not recommended on this unenforceable basis).

LOCAL AND THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

7. This is a summary of the representations received.

None

ASSESSMENT

8. There are a number of considerations which will be addressed as follows.
- Principle of Development
 - Highway and Access Issues
 - Design and Layout
 - Listed Building and setting / Heritage Asset
 - Residential Amenity
 - Landscaping
 - Biodiversity
 - Environment and Flood risk
 - Consultee and Representatives Comments

• PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

Local Plan

Members will be aware that the weight to be attached to the 1998 Local Plan must be considered carefully by reference to the NPPF to ensure consistency.

The Mendlesham industrial area is an allocated site for warehousing storage, distribution and haulage and was secured under policy E3 Table 4 of the Local Plan 1998. The proposed development is for the extension of the existing site in terms of similar use and adjacent location, but would be separate in terms of operation and security.

Policy E8 refers to extension of an industrial curtilage and that it would normally receive favourable consideration providing the development is related to the character and appearance of its surroundings, consider environmental, landscape, wildlife and traffic considerations and would not harm residential amenity. Policy E10 for new industrial development in the countryside seek to resist countryside development unless an overriding need can be demonstrated and if this is the case provides similar criteria to Policy E8. In this case, while the proposal is in the countryside, need has been demonstrated by the applicant and at the same time the proposal is an extension of a similar use site and located on a major transport route through the district.

Policy E12 sets out general principles for location, design and layout for industrial and commercial development. This includes seeking high standards of building design, allowance for further expansion, complying with highway standards, avoiding adverse impact on residential amenity and neighbouring land.

In conclusion there are no principle objections in local plan policy terms.

The Core Strategy and Core Strategy Focused Review (CSFR)

Policy CS5 provides that *"All development will maintain and enhance the environment, including the historic environment, and retain the local distinctiveness of the area"*.

The Core Strategy Focused Review (CSFR) was adopted by Full Council on 20 December 2012 and should be read as a supplement to Mid Suffolk's adopted Core Strategy (2008). This document updates some of the policies of the 2008 Core Strategy. The document does introduce new policy considerations, including Policy FC 1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development that refers to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) objectives and Policy FC 1.1 - Mid Suffolk approach to delivering Sustainable Development that provides *"development proposals will be required to demonstrate the principles of sustainable development and will be assessed against the presumption in favour of sustainable development as interpreted and applied locally to the Mid Suffolk context through the policies and proposals of the Mid Suffolk new style Local Plan. Proposals for development must conserve and enhance the local character of the different parts of the district. They should demonstrate how the proposal addresses the context and key issues of the district and contributes to meeting the objectives and the policies of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy and*

other relevant documents."

Policy FC3 of the Core Strategy Focused Review seeks to provide 8000 new jobs by 2026 and the Mendlesham site remains allocated for this purpose. In addition to meet this target the policy has allocated new land with a focus on the Stowmarket area, but the growth of at least 100 jobs on this site would be a value addition.

It is concluded that the site proposed with its access to the A140 and industrial area would not be resisted in principle in respect of the position of the Core Strategy

NPPF

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27th March 2012. It provides that the NPPF *"does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved, and proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise"*.

The NPPF also provides (para 187) that *"Local planning authorities should look for solutions rather than problems, and decision-takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible. Local planning authorities should work proactively with applicants to secure developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area."*

The NPPF encourages support for a prosperous rural economy at para 28 stating: *"Planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development [and]...should support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas..."*

The NPPF is one of a number of key documents promoting the current economic growth agenda subject to development being sustainable growth. There are no principle objections to the proposed development.

● HIGHWAY AND ACCESS ISSUES

On highway matters paragraph 34 of the NPPF states: *Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. However this needs to take account of policies set out elsewhere in this Framework, particularly in rural areas."*

This proposal extends the existing industrial site that is located within the rural countryside, but has direct access to the A140. Significant movements of traffic in direct relation to transport from Felixstowe to Norwich will already need to pass this site making it more sustainable than having a site further from the A140, but the distance from any settlement will cause employees the need to travel. Some of these aspects are being picked up by the recommendation of a travel plan, but it will not deal with the majority of employee travel needs and the use of the car will be relied upon. This aspect has to be balanced with the locations

advantages in terms of avoidance of harm to residential amenity if it were located closer to settlements and potential greater adverse landscape impact of more sensitive areas.

Access and layout are matters submitted as part of this application. The proposal includes the provision of a new vehicular access from the A140 highway serving an access roadway into the main part of the site where areas for the parking and turning of vehicles are arranged. Due to ownership restrictions the access is not wide enough for its entire length for HGVs to pass each other for a small section. Instead a traffic light system has been proposed for the restricted length and concerns that it might lead to queuing of traffic towards the A140 have been resolved with the highways authority.

SCC Highways and Highways Agency do not seek to resist or object to this development.

Footpath 34 is an obstructed path that is already blocked in part by the buildings and security fencing of the adjacent existing site. Part of the footpath would cross the proposed access road that has been identified by the applicant and has been proposed to be protected from development, but essentially this protected section of the path goes nowhere thanks to the adjacent existing industrial site not in the ownership or control of the applicant. The footpath as a whole could be diverted and such diversion would align to the use of the former airfield runway that once existed and this is clearly being used for such use presently in any event. The issue of who should seek the entire diversion and paid for it is a more complex issue as this proposal will affect only a small section of footpath, but no development of it is sought except to clear the trees and over growth currently obstructing it. The majority of the footpath lies within the current neighbouring Ceva site and has been obstructed for years by building and fencing that the applicants for this development are not responsible for. It was previously concluded that treating this application on its own merits, the proposal does not affect the footpath on its site and while it is regretful that the footpath and its current obstructions are not likely to be resolved, unless SCC decides to seek the diversion themselves. Members sought officers to readdress this issue, but progress has not been made. Instead the applicant has examined its layout and provided an alternative footpath that can be created within its site. This proposal is accordingly fully supported on this basis.

• DESIGN AND LAYOUT

Layout is included within this application, but the appearance of the buildings are not. It is envisaged that the buildings proposed would not be dissimilar in functional design and height to the rest of the existing adjacent industrial site and a condition restricting the height is proposed for the avoidance of doubt and with consideration of landscape and conservation assessments. The shape of the available site has a significant bearing on the layout, but successfully the three large buildings enclosed the main central space for the most part. The main turning space and parking areas for HGVs and cars are contained within the site and the development is spacious.

• LISTED BUILDING AND SETTING / HERITAGE ASSET

Under the NPPF Para 17 states development should *“conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for*

their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations". Para 131 goes on to provide that "In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of; the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness." Furthermore Para 132 states "When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification."

The site is not located within a Conservation Area and no nearby designated areas or buildings are considered to be affected by the proposed development. However, the scale of the development and the openness of the landscape is such that your Heritage Enabling Officer requested the submission assess any impacts on Grade II* listed Read Hall, located approximately 830m to the south of the site. The application documents include an assessment that concludes the distance of the site from Read hall and the presence of dense mature screening around the property is such that there will be no material adverse impact the setting of the listed building.

Furthermore, the airfield site has the potential for archaeological assets being close to a Roman road and recorded finds. The nature of the development is such that significant ground works are likely to be involved which have the potential to disturb and damage archaeological deposits. SCC Archaeology have been consulted for their advice and they have raised no objection to the proposed development subject to appropriate archaeological investigation, which can be secured by condition on the grant of permission.

Overall the proposed development is not considered to have any significant unacceptable impact on the historic environment.

• RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Policies within the adopted development plan require, inter alia, that development does not materially or detrimentally affect the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. The proposal is for a B8 storage use and the main impacts on residential amenities are likely to arise from vehicle movements and the lighting of the site. There are no specific activities proposed that would give rise to other potentially harmful noise, smell, pollution or disturbance impacts. There is a degree of existing impact from the CEVA site that operates as a similar use to the proposal.

The site is located in a fairly sparsely populated area of the countryside with no residential properties immediately adjoining the site. The nearest residential dwelling includes Memorial Farm, directly opposite the site on the western side of the A140, Brockford House approx 350m south of the proposed new access, properties on Town Lane, approximately 500m to the north of the site, White Oak Farm, approx 700m to the north-west of the site on the opposite side of the A140.

Your Environmental Health Officer has raised no objection to the proposal. Subject to appropriate conditions to control external lighting there are not considered to be any unacceptable impacts on residential amenity.

• **LANDSCAPING**

Landscaping, scale and appearance are matters reserved from this application to be considered as a subsequent application should Members be minded to grant the principle of development, layout and access arrangements. This assessment is therefore limited to the general landscape impact of the proposal, its layout and access.

The application site is located directly adjacent to the south and east of the existing CEVA complex of buildings with the proposed development laid out predominantly to the east of that site. The proposal includes a new access from the A140, independent from CEVA serving a new access road running along the southern boundary of the CEVA site to the main area of development.

The application documents include a visual impact assessment which concludes the development will be seen in context with the CEVA site, additional landscape impacts are negligible and can be adequately mitigated by new planted screening to be included with the scheme.

The site is generally open to public views from the A140, the footpath network that passes through and around the CEVA site and the wider road network including Town Lane to the north and Station Road to the east. Given the proposed use of the site it is considered reasonable to expect the scale and appearance of the development to be very similar to the CEVA site such that the visual bulk and dominance of the development within the landscape will likely be experienced as an extension of the existing CEVA site.

Impacts arising from materials and colour finishes and external lighting can all be controlled by condition on the grant of permission. Specific details of landscaping are reserved for a subsequent application however, it is clear from the proposed layout that there is sufficient space for an adequate planting belt on the boundaries of the site that will mitigate the landscape impact of the development.

• **BIODIVERSITY**

Regulation 9(5) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (Implemented 1st April 2010) provides that all "competent authorities" (public bodies) to "have regard to the Habitats Directive in the exercise of its functions." In order for a Local Planning Authority to comply with regulation 9(5) it must "engage" with the provisions of the Habitats Directive. Woolley v Morge determined that in order to discharge its regulation 9(5) duty a Local Planning Authority must consider in relation to an application (full, outline or listed building) the following:-

- (i) whether any criminal offence under the 2010 Regulations against any European Protected Species is likely to be committed; and
- (ii) if one or more such offences are likely to be committed, whether the LPA can

be satisfied that the three Habitats Directive "derogation tests" are met. Only if the LPA is satisfied that all three tests are met may planning permission be granted.

These three tests are:

1. the development must be for one of the reasons listed in regulation 53(2) of the 2010 Regulations. As follows

- (a) scientific or educational purposes;
- (b) ringing or marking, or examining any ring or mark on, wild animals;
- (c) conserving wild animals or wild plants or introducing them to particular areas;
- (d) protecting any zoological or botanical collection;
- (e) preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment;
- (f) preventing the spread of disease; or
- (g) preventing serious damage to livestock, foodstuffs for livestock, crops, vegetables, fruit, growing timber or any other form of property or to fisheries.

2. there must be no satisfactory alternative, and

3. favourable conservation status of the European Protected Species in their natural range must be maintained – this is the test that drives the need for the developer to provide replacement habitat.

There are no recordings of protected species or their habitats in the immediate area. It is highly unlikely that any protected species would be found within this site and as such this proposal is not considered to be harmful in terms of biodiversity issues.

• ENVIRONMENT AND FLOOD RISK

The application site is located within an area designated as flood zone 1, having less than 1 in 1000 annual probability of river or sea flooding in any year. However, as the application site exceeds 1 hectare issues of surface water flooding must be assessed.

A flood risk assessment (FRA) is submitted with the application which concludes that the risk of flooding is low and would remain so following development, providing the development. It identifies the only potentially significant risk as surface water flooding and refers to a separate drainage strategy that can demonstrate the existing Greenfield runoff rate of the site can be maintained such that the development can be achieved without significant flood risk to the development or other properties occurring.

• CONSULTEE AND REPRESENTATIVES COMMENTS

There has been no neighbour or other third party representations made except for the parish councils.

Mendlesham Parish Council unanimously agreed to recommend approval, but did include highlighting traffic issues and drainage regarding earlier in this report. Wetheringsett have recommended refusal on the ground of the access

is not shared with the existing Ceva site. It is considered that the additional access would not cause an adverse impact and has not been objected to by relevant highway authorities.

● SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

This proposal represents a significant boost to the economy and is proposed in a location that expands an existing site without the adverse impacts a new site potentially includes.

RECOMMENDATION

That Outline Planning Permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- Standard time limit for outline permission
- Time limit for reserved matters to be submitted including landscaping that would include minimum 12 metre landscape buffer to north east and north west boundaries.
- As approved plans
- Materials and colour finishes to be agreed
- Details of lighting scheme to be agreed and no further floodlighting unless agreed
- 10% renewable energy to be achieved and agreed
- Archaeological investigation conditions
- Provision fire hydrants to be agreed.
- No building shall be higher than 9.5 metres
- No external storage outside of buildings
- Environmental Agency Conditions on Drainage.
- Highways Conditions
- Removal of permitted development and restriction to B8 use only.
- Provision of footpath as shown on revised plans within 6 months of first use.

Philip Isbell
Corporate Manager - Development Management

John Pateman-Gee
Senior Planning Officer

APPENDIX A - PLANNING POLICIES

1. Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the Core Strategy Focused Review

Cor2 - CS2 Development in the Countryside & Countryside Villages

Cor5 - CS5 Mid Suffolks Environment

CSFR-FC1 - PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

CSFR-FC1.1 - MID SUFFOLK APPROACH TO DELIVERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

CSFR-FC3 - SUPPLY OF EMPLOYMENT LAND

2. Mid Suffolk Local Plan

H17 - KEEPING RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AWAY FROM POLLUTION

GP1 - DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF DEVELOPMENT

T10 - HIGHWAY CONSIDERATIONS IN DEVELOPMENT
E10 - NEW INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE
E12 - GENERAL PRINCIPLES FOR LOCATION, DESIGN AND LAYOUT
E3 - WAREHOUSING, STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTION, AND HAULAGE DEPOTS
E4 - PROTECTING EXISTING INDUSTRIAL/BUSINESS AREAS
E8 - EXTENSIONS TO INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL PREMISES
E9 - LOCATION OF NEW BUSINESSES
H16 - PROTECTING EXISTING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY
HB1 - PROTECTION OF HISTORIC BUILDINGS

3. **Planning Policy Statements, Circulars & Other policy**

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

APPENDIX B - NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS

No Letters of representation have been received.