

Public Document Pack



MSDC PLANNING	
DATE:	WEDNESDAY, 10 APRIL 2024 9.30 AM
VENUE:	KING EDMUND CHAMBER, ENDEAVOUR HOUSE, 8 RUSSELL ROAD, IPSWICH

For consideration at the meeting on Wednesday, 10 APRIL 2024, the following additional or updated papers that were unavailable when the Agenda was printed.

TABLED PAPERS

		<u>Page(s)</u>
5	MPL/23/28 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 27 MARCH 2024	3 - 8
a	DC/23/01506 RED HOUSE FARM, RECTORY ROAD, BACTON, STOWMARKET, SUFFOLK, IP14 4LE	9 - 24
b	DC/22/02458 ANGLIA BUSINESS PARK, WATTISHAM ROAD, RINGSHALL, IP14 2HX	25 - 26

For more information about this meeting, including access arrangements and facilities for people with disabilities, please contact the Committee Officer, Claire Philpot on: 01473 296376 or Email: Committees@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 5

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **MSDC PLANNING** held in the King Edmund Chamber, Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich on Wednesday, 27 March 2024 at 5:30pm.

PRESENT:

Councillor: Sarah Mansel (Chair)
Lavinia Hadingham (Vice-Chair)

Councillors: Lucy Elkin Nicholas Hardingham
Terry Lawrence Jen Overett
David Penny Rowland Warboys

In attendance:

Officers: Chief Planning Officer (PI)
Planning Lawyer (IDP)
Case Officer (VP)
Governance Officer (CP)

122 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/SUBSTITUTIONS

122.1 Apologies were received from Councillor Austin Davies and Councillor John Matthissen. Councillor David Penny substituted for Councillor Davies and Councillor Jen Overett substituted for Councillor Matthissen.

123 TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND OTHER REGISTRABLE OR NON REGISTRABLE INTERESTS BY MEMBERS

123.1 There were no declarations of interest declared.

124 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

124.1 There were no declarations of lobbying.

125 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS

125.1 Councillor Elkin declared a personal site visit in respect of application number DC/23/05641.

126 MPL/23/26 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 14 FEBRUARY 2024

By a vote of 7 votes For and 1 Abstention

It was RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 February 2024 be confirmed and signed as a true record.

127 TO RECEIVE NOTIFICATION OF PETITIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COUNCIL'S PETITION SCHEME

127.1 None received.

128 MPL/23/27 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

128.1 In accordance with the Councils procedures for public speaking on planning applications, representations were made as follows:

Application Number	Representations From
DC/23/05641	Nicol Perryman (Agent) Councillor Lucy Elkin (Ward Member)

129 DC/23/02535 GATEWAY 14 (2000), LAND BETWEEN THE A1120 AND A14, CREEETING ST PETER, STOWMARKET, SUFFOLK

129.1 Application number DC/23/02535 was deferred in accordance with pre-election rules following the notice of a by-election in the Chilton (Stowmarket) Ward.

130 DC/23/05641 FORMER PADDOCK HOUSE CARE HOME, WELLINGTON ROAD, EYE, IP23 7BE

130.1 Item 7B

Application Proposal	DC/23/05641 Application under S73a for Variation of a Condition following grant of DC/20/01537 dated 30/07/2020 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) – “Erection of 16 no. affordable dwellings including vehicular accesses, footpaths, car parking, car port, bin and bike store buildings, open space and landscaping (following demolition of existing buildings)”
Site Location	Former Paddock House Care Home, Wellington Road, Eye, IP23 7BE
Applicant	Mid Suffolk District Council

130.2 The Case Officer introduced the application to the Committee outlining the proposal before Members including: the amendments which had been made to the proposal and agreed by the Applicant, the planning issues to be considered, the location of the site, the heritage assets in the area, the existing layout and housing mix at the site, the impact of the roof panels on

the street scene, the existing roof materials and proposals for how the solar panels would be integrated, the potential heritage harm and any public benefit from the proposal, and the officer recommendation as detailed in the tabled papers.

- 130.3 The Chief Planning Officer provided clarification to Members that weight should be given to the preservation and conservation of heritage assets.
- 130.4 The Case Officer responded to question from Members on issues including: the location of the panels across the plots, the efficiency of the solar tiles in comparison to solar panels, the view of the proposed materials from various points across the site, whether any pre application advice had been requested, the scope for amalgamating tiles to provide collective energy on other roofs as an alternative to panels on plots 1, 2, and 3, and the lifetime costs of the tiles in comparison to solar panels.
- 130.5 Members considered the representation from Nicol Perryman who spoke as the Agent.
- 130.6 The Agent and the Applicant, Holly Brett, responded to questions from Members on issues including: consideration given to installing panels on the garage roofs at the rear of the site, whether a community energy scheme had been considered, the viability of the scheme and the costs of the tiles, the expected energy output for each dwelling, and the funding of the properties from Mid Suffolk District Council.
- 130.7 The Chief Planning Officer, the Agent, and the Applicant commented on the feasibility of moving the panels to alternative plots on the site, and sharing the energy across the plots.
- 130.8 The Agent and the Applicant responded to further questions from Members regarding the costs of the various panel types.
- 130.9 Members considered the representation from Councillor Lucy Ekin who spoke as the Ward Member.
- 130.10 Members debated the application on issues including: the potential level and nature of heritage harm compared to potential public benefits, the environmental benefits of each property having access to solar energy, the potential loss of heritage assets and the impact on the character of the Eye Conservation Area, the heritage benefits of using roof tiles rather than solar panels, the impact of the panels on the view of the heritage properties, the Council's policy for new developments to have PV panels installed, and the lack of consideration given to all options by the applicant.
- 130.11 The Chief Planning Officer suggested an amendment to the recommendation to read as follows:

'That Members resolve to DELEGATE authority to the Chief Planning Officer to GRANT planning permission SUBJECT FIRST TO the following

amendment (a) (b) or (b2) being made to the application to the satisfaction of the Chief Planning Officer'

With the following being added

'or (b2) the amendment of the proposed PV panels to incorporate, as far as reasonably practicable, additional roof panels on the rear roof slopes to Plots 4, 5 and 6 and other plots in lieu of those on Plots 1, 2 and 3'.

130.12 Councillor Hadingham proposed the recommendation contained in the tabled papers with the amendment as read out by the Chief Planning Officer.

130.13 Councillor Lawrence seconded the proposal.

130.14 Members continued to debate the application on issues including: the future visual appearance of the solar tiles, the viability of the project including the costs involved in acquiring and installing the tiles, and the lack of objections from the Town Council.

By a vote of 4 votes For, 1 Against and 2 Abstentions

It was RESOLVED:

That Members resolve to DELEGATE authority to the Chief Planning Officer to GRANT planning permission SUBJECT FIRST TO the following amendment (a), (b), or (b2) being made to the application to the satisfaction of the Chief Planning Officer

(a) The removal of the PV panels from the dwellings facing Church Street from Plots 1, 2 and 3

Or

(b) the substitution of the proposed PV panels from Plots 1, 2 and 3 with solar tiles of a type, design and arrangement

Or

(b2) the amendment of the proposed PV panels to incorporate, as far as reasonably practicable, additional roof panels on the rear roof slopes to Plots 4, 5 and 6 and other plots in lieu of those on Plots 1, 2 and 3'

And subject to the receipt of amended plans providing the modified detail described below to the satisfaction of the Chief Planning Officer as agreed in principle by the applicant in their Clarification Note dated 21st March 2024. Namely:

(c) amended drawings showing the relocated bin store to Plot 7 as having a fully pitched roof

(d) amended drawings showing a recessed blank window to Plot 1 (west end elevation at first floor)

(e) amended drawings showing the relocation of PV panels on Plots 15 and 16 from the west roof slope (rear) to the east roof slope (front)

And that such permission as may be granted be subject to appropriate conditions at the discretion of the Chief Planning Officer

(f) In the event that the above amendments are not received within 2 months of the resolution or such detail as shall have been submitted is not considered satisfactory the Chief Planning Officer then he be authorised to REFUSE the application under delegated powers for the following reason and such other reasons as he thinks fit:

“The proposed pv panels on the dwellings occupying plots 1, 2, 3, 15 and 16 will result in ‘Less Than Substantial Harm’ to designated heritage assets, namely the Eye Conservation Area and the setting of numerous listed buildings adjoining the site. This harm will arise from the intrusive nature an alien non-traditional appearance of pv panels installed on the street facing (front) roof slope to the dwellings on plots 1, 2 and 3 within what is a key art of the historic core of Eye. The introduction of pv panels facing Church Street will result in significant harm to the character of the conservation area hereabouts such that the proposal cannot be said to neither preserve nor enhance that character. The existing buildings hereabouts have very distinctive vernacular roofscapes that retain a strong historic significance as they reflect the Towns long history in a largely unaltered form. This redevelopment was approved in the form it was in order to harmonise with that strong character. The approval of pv panels in such a prominent location is likely to encourage other property owners to seek approval for pv panels on front facing roof slopes on the basis of a consistent application of policy in the conservation area and within the setting of listed buildings. This would quickly erode the charm character and historic significance of heritage assets hereabouts. In refusing this application the Council as local planning authority suggested a variety of alternatives including the use of solar tiles rather than panels to mitigate the identified harm but the applicant decided not to pursue these. The proposal is contrary to ALP Policy LP - The Historic Environment and this policy is considered to be the most important within the basket of relevant policies for the determination of this application. The Proposal is contrary to Neighbourhood Plan policy Eye 16 in that the position of pv panels on the front facing roof slopes of the dwellings on plots 1, 2 and 3 will not contribute positively to the conservation area. They will therefore neither preserve and enhance its intrinsic character and its distinct historic significance. The proposal is also contrary to the NPPG at paragraphs 203, 205, 206 and most importantly 208 as the identified public benefits that arise from the proposal do not outweigh the identified ‘less than substantial’ heritage harm to the character of the designated Eye Conservation Area and the setting of adjacent statutorily listed buildings”.

131 SITE INSPECTION

131.1 There were no site inspection requests.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 7.20 pm.

.....
Chair

Agenda Item 7a

10th April Mid Suffolk Development Control Tabled Papers

Agenda Item 7a - DC/23/01506 RED HOUSE FARM, RECTORY ROAD, BACTON, STOWMARKET, SUFFOLK, IP14 4LE

1) Statement received from the Applicants Agent in response to the committee report, covering the following matters (See Appendix 1):

- Proposed yard construction timeframe
- Wetherden road visibility
- Updated traffic figures
- Planning policy

Officer Comments

Corrections to the Committee Report

- Class B8 use (storage and distribution) also takes place on site (paragraph 1.1).
- Paragraph 3.6 “paragraph 85 goes not to state that”, ‘not’ to be replaced with ‘on’.
- Tables 1 and 2 ‘Summary of Portable Space’s HGV movements between August 2022 and January 2023’ and ‘Summary of Portable Space’s HGV movements combined from August 2022 and June 2023’ to be replaced with the following table:

Table 1: Summary of Portable Space’s HGV movements from August 2022 to January 2024

	All Accesses	Access A – Rectory Road	Access B – Great Ashfield	Access C – Earls Green
Average Daily Trips	12.3	9.3	2.4	0.6

To note, these updated figures were provided to the Local Planning Authority previously, and the superseded figures were included in the Committee Report in error. The Agent states that the difference in figures is due to a reporting error regarding the recorded movements, which affected the number of movements using the main entrance onto Rectory Road in particular. The figures found in amended Table 3 above do not alter the assessment and conclusions within the Committee Report.

Wetherden Road Visibility

As noted in the Committee Report (at paragraph 6.11), there is some dispute regarding the achievable visibility from the access points, most notably with regards to the Great Ashfield entrance (onto Wetherden Road). Contrary to the Highway Authority’s comments, the Agent has rebutted these conclusions stating: “we would like to reiterate that visibility is good from this junction and the applicant has control over the land to provide adequate visibility splay to the southeast” (Section 2 of their Statement).

This matter is somewhat inconsequential to the determination of this application. From the outset the Highways Authority have recognised that the access routes are not suitable for HGV use. To reiterate, the use of these routes by traffic from Portable Space, as well as

agricultural vehicles, is an existing issue, and the Councils ability to remove or reduce this is to some degree beyond what can be reasonably achieved in association with this application. The considerations here are whether the proposed development would result in an unacceptable intensification of HGV movements detrimental to local amenity, and if so, whether it would have a significant or severe impact on highway safety.

2) Additional third-party comments (see Appendix 2):

3no. neighbour representations received representing 1no. support comment and 2no. objection comments.

The support comment is summarised as follows:

- Support for local businesses
- Benefit of management and fostering good relationships with local residents
- Investment in rural communities

The objection comments are summarised as follows:

“To confirm

- Highways Dept have stated that local roads are not suitable for HGV traffic.
- Police Commercial Vehicle Unit has confirmed Wetherden Road is less than ideal to accommodate abnormal loads.
- The Applicant has made a false and misleading statement re visibility splays at junction School Road with Elmswell Road, grossly over stating visibility as 200m whereas is more like 25m.
- The applicant has provided false and misleading figures regarding HGV usage of Wetherden Road/School Road, stating 1.4 HGVs/weekday whereas actual average figure is 4No/weekday.
- The applicant has on more than one occasion routed up to 12HGVs along Wetherden Road/School Road in a single day.
- The applicant frequently routes convoys of up to 4HGVs along Wetherden Road/School Road.

When considering the above points of fact, it becomes clear that routing of HGVs, often with abnormal loads, on inappropriate routes, presents a very real road safety issue.

Left unchecked, there is a very high likelihood that the irresponsible and antisocial behaviour exhibited by the applicant will result in a road traffic accident with a life changing or fatal outcome.”

AND

- Concern at industrialisation of Suffolk countryside and amenity impacts of activity at Red House Farm
- Risk to other highway users including pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders leading to an unsafe highway environment
- Business should be located on a proper industrial estate in the interests of countryside amenity and highway safety

**Statement on Construction Period, Visibility,
Traffic Figures and Planning Policy for
Application DC/23/01506/FUL
Bacton Business Park, Bacton**

April 2024



Opus House
Elm Farm Park
Thurston
Bury St Edmunds
Suffolk
IP31 3SH

T 01359 233663
E enquiries@evolution-planning.co.uk
W evolution-planning.co.uk

Statement on Construction Period, Visibility, Traffic Figures and Planning Policy for Application DC/23/01506/FUL

Bacton Business Park, Bacton

Client: David Black and Son

Content Amendment Record

This report has been issued and amended as follows:

Issue	Revision	Description	Date	Signed
1	0	Draft	02/04/2024	SST
1	0	Reviewed	05/04/2024	KL

Reference: E350.C1.Rep17

Disclaimer

The copyright in this report prepared by Evolution Town Planning Ltd is owned by them and no such report, plan or document may be reproduced, published or adapted without their written consent. Complete copies of this report may however be made and distributed by the Client in dealing with matters related to the brief.

The information given in this report is solely for the use of the Client noted above. Evolution Town Planning Ltd can accept no responsibility or liability to any third party. The benefit of this report is not transferable to any third party except with the written agreement of the original Client and Evolution Town Planning Ltd. An extra fee will be payable for such a transfer.

Contents

1.0	Proposed Yard Construction Timeframe	4
2.0	Wetherden Road Visibility	6
3.0	Updated Traffic Figures	7
4.0	Planning Policy.....	8
5.0	Summary	9

1.0 Proposed Yard Construction Timeframe

- 1.1 This report has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for consideration by members of the Planning Committee regarding the timing of removing the containers currently stored at Jacksons Farm, to the storage yard proposed in this application.
- 1.2 The applicant intends to begin works on the development of the storage yard as soon as planning permission has been granted to move the containers currently located at Jacksons Farm to the new storage area.
- 1.3 When the new storage yard had first been designed, this was a relatively simple proposal constructed from permeable hardstanding, which sought to connect to the existing land drainage which serves the rest of Red House Farm and Bacton Business Park. The applicant was capable of undertaking much of this excavation and construction work using equipment owned by the farm and existing employees.
- 1.4 However, during consultation on the application, this was not found to be acceptable by drainage consultees which required a more thorough drainage system to be implemented across the site. This consists of;
 - 1.4.1 Varying depths of specialist type 3 surfacing;
 - 1.4.2 Interspersed layers of permeable and impermeable membranes;
 - 1.4.3 The yard is divided into 4 drainage tank areas, separated by check dams which run the length of the yard;
 - 1.4.4 4 orifice flow control devices;
 - 1.4.5 An attenuation ditch;
 - 1.4.6 A Hydrobrake.
- 1.5 The applicants have accepted the need for the yard to meet these drainage requirements. This is, however, beyond the capability of the applicant to construct themselves and therefore specialist contractors will need to be hired.
- 1.6 The Local Planning Authority has suggested that the containers at Jacksons Farm should be moved within a period of 6 months from the grant of planning permission.
- 1.7 The applicant cannot instruct contractors or order the materials or equipment for the construction before planning permission is granted.
- 1.8 No contractors can begin work on sites immediately and will have a lead in time for

new projects. If there is any adverse weather, delay in obtaining materials or contractor delay, then a six-month window could easily be exceeded. While trying to commence construction quickly, we do not want to put the applicant in a situation where they would breach an agreement which they have signed.

- 1.9 We request instead that a period of 9 months be allowed for the construction of the new storage yard and the relocation of the containers from Jacksons Farm to the new storage yard. We also request that a provision be included to allow an extension to the 9-month time period, with the agreement of both parties, due to an unforeseen issue which has arisen outside of the applicant's control for which evidence would be provided.
- 1.10 We are currently working on projects in Mid Suffolk where unforeseen problems have occurred which have caused significant delays to developments. These delays include a building contractors' businesses folding mid-way through a project, and on other sites, there have been significant delays due to materials not being available for several months.
- 1.11 Should the containers need to be moved from Jacksons Farm before the new storage yard is ready, this would mean offsite storage would have to be temporarily utilised, which would result in more local traffic as all the containers are transported off-site and then returned a few months later. This would also have an additional cost implication and would take up Portable Space's lorry fleet to undertake this transfer. As such we would seek to avoid this.
- 1.12 Should permission be granted, the applicant will try to construct the new storage yard as quickly as possible. However, we feel it is necessary to provide a realistic time limit for this to be completed and provision to accommodate an extension should an unforeseen delay occur.

2.0 Wetherden Road Visibility

- 2.1 Comments are reported in the Committee Report from the Highway Authority that from the access onto Wetherden Road towards Great Ashfield; *“visibility to the south-east is restricted to a level that is below what we would accept for a new junction or access”*.
- 2.2 We would like to highlight that the land to the southeast of the access is fully within the applicant's control. Recently the plants and hedges have flowered which has reduced the visibility from the junction. In particular, some domestic, non-native plants have quickly grown in the recent wet and warm weather. These plants will be trimmed back as well as the hedges to enable vehicles leaving this access to have clear visibility along the road to the southeast.
- 2.3 As such, we would like to reiterate that visibility is good from this junction and the applicant has control over the land to provide adequate visibility splay to the southeast.

3.0 Updated Traffic Figures

- 3.1 Updated Traffic Figures have been provided to the Local Planning Authority concerning Portable Space movement from Red House Farm.
- 3.2 These figures follow up on figures previously provided to the Local Planning Authority. Previously, a reporting error was identified regarding the recorded vehicle movements in the early figures provided by Portable Space, which, in particular affected, the number of movements using the main entrance onto Rectory Road.
- 3.3 Updated figures have therefore been provided which rectify these issues. These figures have also been increased to reflect contractor lorry usage for deliveries by Portable Space. Portable Space has confirmed that contractors are used during busy periods and when they are suffering from driver shortages or mechanical breakdowns. These account for up to 15% additional lorry movements which are included in the most recent figures. A summary of these figures is as follows:

	All Accesses	Access A – Rectory Road	Access B – Great Ashfield	Access C – Earls Green
Average Daily Trips	12.3	9.3	2.4	0.6

- 3.4 The increase in movements to and from the Rectory Road entrance further emphasises that the route through Great Ashfield is not the primary route used by Portable Space.

4.0 Planning Policy

- 4.1 In Paragraph 1.1 of the Committee Report it states that Bacton Business Park has a number of units used for Class B2, B1 (now Class E). There are also B8 uses approved and taking place on the site.
- 4.2 In respect of paragraphs 3.5 and 3.6 of the Committee Report on the principle of development, we would like to highlight that the Joint Local Plan (JLP) sets out in Policy SP03 that, outside settlement boundaries, SP03 states that “development will normally only be permitted where;
- a) the site is allocated for development, or
 - b) it is in accordance with a made Neighbourhood Plan, or
 - c) it is in accordance with one of the policies of this Plan listed in Table 5; or
 - d) it is in accordance with paragraph 80 of the NPPF (2021).
- 4.3 “It was confirmed in the Inspector’s report into the JLP dated 19th September 2023 that the word “normally” in Policy SP03 “provides the flexibility to take into account the circumstances outlined in Paragraph 85 of the NPPF, where appropriate”. Paragraph 85 of the NPPF states that “Planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business, and community needs in rural areas may be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements and in locations that are not well served by public transport.”
- 4.4 This is specific and clear support for local businesses. It would be helpful if the committee was made aware of this point given these comments from the Planning Inspectorate were made so recently.

5.0 Summary

- 5.1 This application seeks to consolidate Portable Spaces container storage needs and seeks to prevent additional lorry movements which would be required should containers be stored off-site.
- 5.2 The proposed storage site is a good location, it is seen in the context of the large buildings at the business park. The new bund will screen existing and proposed development.
- 5.3 As a result of this application, a Traffic Working Group will be set up which will work with the local community to resolve any traffic-related queries.
- 5.4 The principle of development has the support of local and national planning policy.
- 5.5 This application supports 75 local jobs, improves traffic management, improves the screening of the business park, and provides a biodiversity net gain.

Ref Planning Application DC/23/01506



Having seen many residents comments in relation to this application and the concerns expressed I felt that it was appropriate to look at the positive's that have not been expressed up to this point.

As a resident of sixty seven years in Bacton I have seen many changes none more so than in the last decade.

There are well over seventy businesses in Bacton from very small, to companies such as this applicant which has continued to grow and now has well over seventy employees. I guess at some time or other they visit our village stores, dine and drink at our public house and buy their petrol from the local Garage, and this is but just a few to mention.

The comments that have been made are very much around the movement of vehicles and as such this applies to every road within the Parish as a result of the building of over four hundred homes.

At the heart of the application is the location of containers and bringing them all to one site where they can be moved within the existing grounds rather than having to locate them elsewhere which in real terms would create even more traffic movements.

The question that really has to be asked does Bacton wish to support local businesses grow, or would we rather see them move out and relocate along the A14, taking their workforce with them.

Commercial enterprise has to be encouraged and yes I agree it has to be managed and that is where times of traffic movements are important and should be enforced, any responsible business would make sure this is adhered to, thus fostering good relationships with the local residents.

The message that is being sent to this applicant by all the comments that have been made is NO we do not wish to see growth, employment creators, and entrepreneurs, the very people that help to sustain and support our rural economy, whilst none of us like change it is important we embrace and work with those that seek to invest in our rural communities.

I support this application on the grounds of keeping rural businesses within our community, large and small. Without them the future looks very bleak.



April 3rd 2024

Ref Planning Application DC/23/01506

Objection to application without conditions to control HGV traffic.


Should permission be granted for the above application it would seem reasonable to do so with restrictions on HGV traffic, in particular the routes and frequency of such traffic.

To confirm

- Highways Dept have stated that local roads are not suitable for HGV traffic.
- Police Commercial Vehicle Unit has confirmed Wetherden Road is less than ideal to accommodate abnormal loads.
- The Applicant has made a false and misleading statement re visibility splays at junction School Road with Elmswell Road, grossly over stating visibility as 200m whereas is more like 25m.
- The applicant has provided false and misleading figures regarding HGV usage of Wetherden Road/School Road, stating 1.4 HGVs/weekday whereas actual average figure is 4No/weekday.
- The applicant has on more than one occasion routed up to 12HGVs along Wetherden Road/School Road in a single day.
- The applicant frequently routes convoys of up to 4HGVs along Wetherden Road/School Road.

When considering the above points of fact, it becomes clear that routing of HGVs, often with abnormal loads, on inappropriate routes, presents a very real road safety issue.

Left unchecked, there is a very high likelihood that the irresponsible and antisocial behaviour exhibited by the applicant will result in a road traffic accident with a life changing or fatal outcome.



My Statement [REDACTED] Wetherden Road.

I have lived on Wetherden Road for 29 years and for 26 of those, opposite the main exit point that Portable Space Limited have been using for the last four years or so. As time progressed I noticed more and more container lorries using this road. I had previously asked those working for the Blacks family farm what was going on as I had absolutely no idea that an industrial estate was being built at Red House Farm. I was told that "It's nothing to worry about, we just need more storage space at the farm". Clearly, that was not at all true.

I have worked for the NFU for 28 years and I am well aware of farmers needs to diversify their business. However, this is not diversification but creating industrialisation of pristine Suffolk farmland and countryside. When I realised what had actually been going on at Red House Farm, I was horrified. It seemed to me that suddenly we had a situation where a new custom made office building had already been constructed (Modular House) and that more and more containers were travelling up and down Wetherden Road.

To then find out from another neighbour the truth of what was going on at Red House Farm came as a shock. I could not understand how a planning authority would have approved of his type of industrialisation in what is a fairly rural area. But I then realised after looking into matters further that containers were piling up at Red House Farm and traffic movements were getting very frequent along Wetherden Road. These containers were not for farm storage use but for renovation and resale elsewhere. I object strongly.

When I was diagnosed with [REDACTED] I bought myself an electric/manual trike as I have no balance and wanted to continue to cycle along Wetherden Road. That trike is sitting in my barn, getting rusty as I no longer have the confidence to use that fearing that I will face an oncoming Container lorry. I would have to dismount to lift the trike into the verge, provided there was room and there often isn't. Some Portable Space drivers are very aggressive and do not take into consideration my needs nor the needs of pedestrians walking dogs nor other cyclists, horse riders and certainly not local car users either. My daughter had been travelling to nursery in Elmswell to collect her two young children in the semi dark when she came face to face with such a driver. He was swearing at her and gesticulating wildly forcing her to reverse back along Wetherden Road so that he could pass. You will or should all know by now that there is one passing place only on Wetherden Road and this was a long way from where [REDACTED] my daughter came across this aggressive driver.

This type of business given its ambitious future plans should be located on a proper industrial park off the main A14 or similar where access routes are easy and there is no impact on others. Portable Space are making my life and the lives of others a misery. Our so called Quiet Lanes are a joke. Where else in the UK do we see Quiet Lanes being invaded by juggernauts? Only here in Mid Suffolk. !! When I have stopped and spoken to lorry drivers some have told me that they do not like using these roads as they are dangerous. During a recent publicity campaign in local newspapers one lorry drivers wife said that Portable Space had outgrown their current facility at Red House Farm. I am totally dismayed that they have been allowed to continue and to expand their business without the necessary planning and view this application as Planning by Stealth. As far as transportation to and from their site, their unabated use of Wetherden Road and School Road continues to pose a real danger, especially on that junction leading from School Road to Elmswell Road. There is an accident waiting to happen here.

Photographs below show the exact positions of Portable Space container lorries when using Wetherden Road and School Road. I am perfectly aware that a site visit was carried out recently as I live on Wetherden Road. On that day no container lorry travelled either of these roads until after the site visit had long ended. I know that to be a fact, as have cctv as do other residents who are affected by these juggernauts

Bottom of School Road junction turning left into the main Elmswell Road. Clearly you can see that the container lorry is splaying over the white dividing lines heading directly into oncoming traffic on a very busy road.



Portable Space lorry on Wetherden Road – a Quiet Lane signposted Unsuitable for HGV's

Not enough room for me to pass on my bike nor walk safely past with my dog !

Highway Code rules below

- ❑ leave at least 1.5 metres when overtaking cyclists at speeds of up to 30mph, and give them more space when overtaking at higher speeds
- ❑ pass horse riders and horse-drawn vehicles at speeds under 10 mph and allow at least 2 metres of space
- ❑ allow at least 2 metres of space and keep to a low speed when passing a pedestrian who is walking in the road (for example, where there is no pavement)



See how far the container hangs over either side of the lorry and in many cases overhangs the verges. Resulting in a neighbours hedgerow being partly destroyed.



Night time lorry on a Quiet Lane outside a residents house.



Thank you.

Agenda Item 7b

DC/22/02458 Anglia Business Park, Wattisham Road, Ringshall, IP14 2HX

Tabled Papers

- 1) Officer Note: With the submission of a drawing showing the proposed acoustic fence to the rear of the existing landscaping, subject to no objections from the Environmental Protection Officer in relation to the new location for the acoustic fence, reason for refusal 2: *The proposed acoustic fences, due to their height and length would be detrimental to the character of the countryside and to the users of the public right of way and occupiers of the neighbouring properties Mead Cottage and Tye Cottage due to loss of outlook and overbearing nature contrary to Policies LP17 and LP24 of the Joint Local Plan and the NPPF is considered to have fallen away and no longer forms part of the recommendation.*


- 2) Officer Note: Paragraph 3.1 of the Committee Report should state *Policy SP03 of the Joint Local Plan*

NO DIMENSIONS TO BE SCALED FROM THIS DRAWING

This document references the following file:-


Reference Name	Status	Revision
PC-XX-XX-M3-Designer-0001_5442		P01.1

Revisions	Date	Drawn / Chk'd
P01 Fence Details	22/11/23	LM / BM
P02 Fence location amendment	02/04/24	LM



Solid Fence Detail
1:50

Page 26



Fence Section
1:100

Client
Anglia Business Park

Project
Commerical Development, Anglia Business Park, Wattisham Road, Ringshall

Title
Proposed Solid Fence

Project N° Drawing N° Revision
5442 - 0104 P02

Scale - unless otherwise stated Issued For
As indicated @ A3 PRELIMINARY

BS 1192 Ref. Status
PC-Designer-0104



The Old Steelyard
Poplar Lane
Sproughton
Ipswich
IP8 3HL
t: 01473 689 532
www.klharchitects.com