RECOMMENDATION – GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION WITH CONDITIONS

Description of Development
Planning Application. Retention of construction of extensions and elevational alterations to production facility

Location
Land Eye Airfield, Castleton Way, Eye in the Parish of Yaxley Suffolk

Expiry Date: 18/11/2019
Application Type: FUL - Full Planning Application
Development Type: Major Small Scale - Manu/Ind/Storg/Wareh
Applicant: Crown Chicken Ltd
Agent: Trundley Design Services

Parish: Yaxley
Site Area: 19,447sqm

Details of Previous Committee / Resolutions and any member site visit: None
Has a Committee Call In request been received from a Council Member (Appendix 1): No
Has the application been subject to Pre-Application Advice: No

PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

The application is referred to committee for the following reason/s:

The application is for the retention of external works and alterations to a building (granted under DC/17/05666 for 17,453 sqm), which in total results in ground floor area of 18,905 sqm, in excess of the 3,750 sqm detailed under the scheme of delegation.

The floorspace actually applied for under this application extends to 1452sq m, but having regards to the cumulative impact, relatively recent grant of planning permission and retrospective nature of the proposal this application is referred to committee, as it would have been if this had formed the original proposal.
PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Summary of Policies

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

Core Strategy Focused Review 2012:
FC01 - Presumption In Favour Of Sustainable Development
FC01_1 - Mid Suffolk approach to delivering sustainable development
FC3 - Employment

Core Strategy 2008:
CS02 - Development in the Countryside & Countryside Villages
CS03 - Reduce Contributions to Climate Change
CS05 - Mid Suffolk's Environment

Mid Suffolk Local Plan 1998:
GP01 - Design and layout of development
E8 – Extensions to industrial and commercial premises
E12 - General principles for location, design and layout
T9 - Parking standards
T10 - Highway considerations in development

Neighbourhood Plan Status

This application site is within a Neighbourhood Plan Area.

The Eye Neighbourhood Plan is currently at the latter end of the Stage 5: Independent Examination (Summer 2019) process.

Accordingly, the Neighbourhood Plan has increasing statutory weight. Full-weight can be applied following Adoption which first requires a positive referendum outcome.

The application site is also situated within the Eye Airfield Development Framework 2013 and Eye Airfield Planning Position Statement 2013, both of which have been adopted by the Council.

Consultations and Representations

During the course of the application consultation and representations from third parties have been received. These are summarised below.

A: Summary of Consultations
Town/Parish Council (Appendix 3)

Yaxley Parish Council
The Parish Council objects to this application because the appropriate size of the building should have been planned at an earlier stage and have been in the original plan.

Eye Town Council
No comments

County Council Responses (Appendix 5)

SCC Flood and Water
We note that there is sufficient capacity within the existing surface water drainage system, any future development on this site will have to be evaluated and it may require its own surface water drainage system.

We would like to make the applicant aware of the following informatives.

- Any works to a watercourse may require consent under section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991
- Any discharge to a watercourse or groundwater needs to comply with the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017
- Any discharge of surface water to a watercourse that drains into an Internal Drainage Board catchment is subject to payment of a surface water developer contribution
- Any works to lay new surface water drainage pipes underneath the public highway will need a section 50 license under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991
- Any works to a main river may require an environmental permit

Fire and Rescue
If the Planning Authority is minded to grant approval, the Fire Authority require adequate provision is made for fire hydrants, by the imposition of a suitable planning condition.

SCC Highways
In a letter dated 17 October 2019 the local highway authority confirms that it has 'no observations to make'

Internal Consultee Responses (Appendix 6)

BMSDC Public Realm
No comments.

BMSDC Enforcement
Current enforcement case relates to the site.

B: Representations
At the time of writing this report one objection has been received.

A verbal update will be provided as necessary.

Views are summarised below:

- Hours of operation now proposed 24/7/365
- No conditions controlling truck routes

**Planning History**

DC/17/05666 – Planning Application - Erection of a new processing facility, waste water treatment plant and gatehouse with associated car park and service yards, two vehicle access points, drainage swale and landscaping – granted April 2018 by Development Control Committee (in accordance with the officer’s recommendation).

Application DC/17/05666 included various conditions, some which required agreement prior to commencement and some of which required agreement prior to commencement of the use. Conditions 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 18 and 20 have been discharged as required.

Prior to commencement condition 16 is outstanding, requiring fire hydrants scheme to be agreed, this is waiting on an agreed water plan. (DC/19/03107)

Prior to commencement above slab level condition 23 is outstanding, requiring a scheme of renewable energy technology. Details of a CHP scheme have recently been re-submitted (DC/19/04495).

Conditions 15 and 22 require agreement prior to first use/occupation, and no details have been submitted in this respect, however the site is currently under construction. Other conditions require works to be undertaken in accordance with the previously agreed details, and do not require further discharge from the Council.

DC/19/03907 - Application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act - Variation of Condition 2 (Approved Plans and Documents) on planning permission DC/17/05666 Erection of a new processing facility, waste water treatment plant and gatehouse with associated car park and service yards, two vehicle access points, drainage swale and landscaping – pending consideration.

DC/19/03812 - Planning Application - Retention of construction of security gatehouse, realignment of road and new car park to serve production facility – pending consideration.

DC/19/03771 - Planning Application - Construction of an LV Compound to include LV Switch room, LV Transformer and hot water vessel and transformer compound to serve production facility (Retention of) – pending consideration.

DC/19/03747 - Planning Application - Construction of a fresh water tank, permeate tank, fuel tanks, water pumps and a water softener plant (Retention of) – pending consideration.
PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1. **The Site and Surroundings**

1.1 The application site forms land at the south of the former Eye airfield and is situated between Castleton Way to the south, the A140 to the west and Potash Lane (old runway) to the east. To the north and east of the site is the wider Eye Airfield with existing commercial and industrial development and gas compressor station.

1.2 Construction of a poultry production plant is nearing completion at the site.

1.3 The nearest dwellings to the site are located within Yaxley, which lies west and south west of the application site, and Eye which lies east and south east of the site.

1.4 The site is not in a Conservation Area. Listed buildings are located west of the A140. The site is not in or near the Eye Special Landscape Area. The site is in Flood Zone 1.

2. **The Proposal**

2.1 The application seeks retrospective approval for additions and alterations to the factory building approved pursuant to planning permission DC/17/05666. During construction of the consented proposal various additional elements were erected over and above the approved development. This application is retrospective, seeking planning permission for the retention of these elements.

2.2 The additional floor area sought for approval measures 1452sqm and comprises seven separate extensions, the bulk of which are located to the southern side of the approved building.

2.3 Extensions 1, 2, 3 and 4 are situated to the southern elevation of the approved building and result in the following additional floorspace:

- Extension 1: 132.5 sqm Additional production area
- Extension 2: 39.8 sqm Additional stairwell area
- Extension 3: 493.1 sqm Workshop area
- Extension 4: 428.0 sqm Production and Office area

2.4 Extension 5 is to the frontage of the building, facing west towards the A140, this extends to 172.8 sqm and is a new reception area. This also includes a canopy to the front of the building.

2.5 Extensions 6 and 7 are situated to the northern elevation of the approved building:
Extension 6: 50.4 sqm production area
Extension 7: 135.4 production area

2.6 Cosmetic alterations relate to changes to window and door positions and material changes in certain areas. The style, type and colour of doors and windows remain as approved, with only a reduction of glazing panels within the personnel doors undertaken. The ‘Saffron Yellow’ to the industrial doors and entrance canopy has been amended to ‘Dahlia Yellow’ consistent with the operator’s branding.

2.7 The proposal states that the addition of floorspace was “essential to ensure that the required processing needs of the factory could operate without any compromise”. Furthermore “internal alterations to the layout of the processing area and office/amenity area during the technical drawing stage have resulted in the position of doors and window to be altered.”

2.8 Further details sought on this from the applicant set out the reasons for this:

“Extension 1:
This extension is required for the loading of clean trays onto the washed lairage vehicles. Floor plan had to be increased from approved plan due to the vehicle size from the client being larger than original assumed length. This all ensures the vehicles are contained within the building thus avoiding any potential issues with odour/ noise break out from the area.

Extension 2:
Extension to stairwells – through design development the staircase design needed to be changed to a straight access/ egress staircase from the first floor hygiene area including a hygiene point to comply with food processing regulations. The ground floor space also incudes a wash room located under the staircase.

Extension 3:
Originally the site engineering requirements were under-estimated after conformation of the maintenance requirements by the equipment supplier. The original intention was to utilise the existing farm building for engineering and associated storage but through design development these were found to be in the incorrect location and buildings not fit for purpose. Therefore to house the engineering maintenance function including storage of critical spares associated to the processing equipment the connected facility was developed. The unit provides dedicated maintenance bays/ welding bays/ engineers office/ stores office/ staff amenity/ staff hygiene and fully compliant factory entrance points to the process facility access corridors. The building is two storey is form and designed to match the approved facility. The building ensures all the activities are under one roof and there is minimal need to use external areas, access to the area will be via the security gatehouse to ensure a fully secure controlled access is maintained to the area.

Extension 4:
Since the original approval the applicant has secured a major retailer to utilise the site for supply of chicken based products. As part of the product mix required to supply there is a
need for marinaded products such as barbecue/ cooked in a bag type. In order to be able to process these products an additional area of building was required to install the processing equipment. The products range and quantity require the extension along with the provision of a dedicated hygiene facility connected to the main staff amenity/ office area to ensure full compliance with food processing regulations in respect of allergens etc. The first floor areas are utilised for a dedicated site development kitchen and taste panel room as required by the applicants client.

Extension 5:
Due to the client securing the major retailer the site office area required additional meeting rooms/ offices to enable the requirements of the contract to be maintained. The utilisation of the projecting structure with infilling between appeared to be the most suitable area due to impact of the approved design and the main feature of the building. A slight location adjustment has also been incorporated within this design change.

Extension 6:
No loading bay has been omitted due to the change in dry goods deliveries and an extension has been added internally to provide a lift to enable the dry goods to be taken to the first floor processing area. Area also incorporates a drivers rest room/ wc to provide facilities for third party drivers accessing the site. The design of the extension is in keeping fully with the main building.

Extension 7:
The Cat 2 and Cat 3 waste areas have been extended due to the client confirming the final length of the waste trailers which required a small increase to the width of the building in this area. This ensured that the trailers were fully enclosed within the odour abated room and thus providing minimal risk of odour break out from the area.”

2.9 Members are advised that whilst condition 3 of the original full planning permission restricts the use of the building to ‘a food processing facility and for no other purpose except pursuant to planning permission in that regard’ there is no restriction on permitted development expansion, nor would it have been reasonable to have removed such rights at that time.

2.10 In the particular circumstances here officers consider that availability of permitted development rights is relevant and note that these would have allowed modest alterations of a building of this nature by 1000sq.m. once occupied and in use. The proposal can be reasonably balanced with this permitted development consideration
3. **The Principle of Development**

3.1 Local Plan Policies E8 and E12 focus on extensions to industrial buildings. The policies express a presumption in favour of industrial extensions provided they perform appropriately in respect of character, traffic, residential amenity, parking provision, loading, unloading, manoeuvring and landscaping.

3.2 The NPPF at paragraph 80 states that “Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both the local business needs and wider opportunities for development”. Paragraph 83 also considers that “decisions should enable the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of businesses in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings”.

3.3 Local Plan Policies are considered to be largely consistent with the policies of the NPPF, and therefore should be given weight in the determination of this application accordingly.

3.4 In light of the above the proposal is considered acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with the detailed requirements of Local Plan Policies E8 and E12 and Core Strategy Focused Review Policy FC3.

3.5 It is noted that the site is also allocated within the emerging Babergh Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan at LA099 for the provision of employment uses and associated infrastructure. However, the plan has only recently finished Regulation 18 consultation and as such does not have weight to be a determinative factor in considering this proposal.

4.0 **Character and Appearance**

4.1 The additions to the building are acceptable in character terms. The approved building is overtly utilitarian owing to its industrial function. The additional built form has been incorporated as part of the overall design evolution and therefore does not appear as additions so as to affect the overall character of the building or locality. The additions do not increase the previously approved building height. The additional floor area equates to approximately 8% of the approved building footprint, a modest increase having regards to the size of the site, building and surroundings. [and significantly less than this if equivalent permitted development allowances are taken into account in terms of visual impact that could be controlled]

4.2 Overall as a result of this design, layout and scale the proposal effects minimal changes to the character and appearance of the building, and does not have a significant impact on either the site or its surroundings. As such the proposal is not considered to have a significant impact on the character or appearance of the development or locality.

4.2 The most visible alteration forming part of this application is the front reception extension, facing west towards the A140. As originally approved this extended 5m from the façade of
the main building, and was only yellow in colour to the front (west) elevation, the sides being grey to match the remainder of the building. The projection was a canopy only.

4.3 The proposal for this extension increases the projection of this element to 8m, plus the canopy projection at just under 5m. The whole of this front extension building, and canopy, are coloured yellow to both the front and side elevations.

4.4 The increase in size in itself is not considered to be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the existing building, having regards to the size and scale of both the site and development. However, the scale of the area now proposed to be coloured yellow is more significant and will have more of an impact on the character and appearance of the building and locality. However, views of this are limited in the landscape and transient in nature, primarily being experienced from either the A140 or Castleton Way, with wider views being screened by landscaping. As such, taken in the round, and having regards to the character and appearance of the building, the development in the locality, and landscape screening previously secured, it is not considered that this would be unduly prominent or obtrusive as to result in unacceptable harm to consider refusal in this respect.

4.5 The Eye Airfield site is one where the Council has been keen to encourage new business to locate in order to stimulate jobs growth and business investment. More of the wider site awaits development. It is reasonable to expect industrial and warehouse businesses to require large modern industrial sheds but this should not preclude the use of contemporary design elements to accentuate certain features. The yellow coloured main entrance facade is just such a feature. It provides an easy reference to the main entrance, particularly for visitors who may be unfamiliar with the building. Such features are now common place within business/science parks, university campuses, hospitals and public buildings. It provides a flash of relief from the uniform visual monochrome character of the overall building.

4.6 As the Airfield site becomes more popular with new businesses there is likely to be growing pressure for contemporary designs and features because these tend to reflect a dynamism that helps to market and promote exciting new business spaces and locations.

5.0 Access, Parking and Highway Safety

5.1 The proposal relates solely to the small-scale changes to the building previously approved (DC/17/05666), no changes are proposed to the access, egress or parking area.

5.2 The proposal results in approximately an 8% increase to the existing floorspace, extending to 1,452 sqm. The application states that

"During the technical drawing stage, it became apparent that the building layout as approved under the current application would not be sufficient to carry out the operational needs of the new processing facility as required by Cranswick Convenience Foods PLC. Therefore, the addition of floor space was essential to ensure that the required processing needs of the facility could operate without any compromise."

5.3 No proposed changes are made to the access or parking arrangements as part of this proposal, indeed they are outside of the red line of the application site. However, with an
increase in floorspace the impact of this should be considered with regards to any additional impacts this might have on the highway network and parking requirements.

5.4 Perhaps the most important aspect of the proposal to establish is that the new floorspace is not being provided to increase chicken processing capacity. Now that Cranswick has established a primary retail customer the requirements of that customer include demand not just for plain processed chicken but also for a marinaded product. Members will be familiar with convenient fresh meat product packs that can be purchased in supermarkets where all the flavouring preparation has already been completed for the customer. [eg: flavoured barbeque lines and international cuisine packs] The ability to offer a wider product line and greater consumer choice from the single plant provides Cranswick with a business advantage that reinforces the benefits for the company that arise from its £75m investment in Mid Suffolk

5.5 The inclusion of on-site engineering/maintenance space makes operational sense and will mean that plant can be kept in good working order more easily and that repairs can be effected quickly which is clearly beneficial from a cost and production perspective.

5.6 That said Members will want to understand how the demand for parking spaces may be impacted by the extensions.

5.7 The proposal as previously approved provided 450 parking spaces [including 6 disabled parking spaces]. The proposal currently before Members as detailed on drawing reference 17-L07-PL029B includes provision for 457 spaces including 6 disabled spaces.

5.8 It is therefore confirmed that the proposal now before Members does not result in a significant reduction in parking numbers but actually results in a slight increase.

5.9 It is considered necessary and prudent to condition delivery of all of the parking spaces shown on that drawing in view of the concerns expressed in different quarters about a ‘potential’ reduction in parking spaces. Clearly Members will not wish to encourage any under-provision of such spaces compared with those previously approved.

5.10 Members are advised that the current application needs to be assessed within the context that:

- The proposal will result in the creation of an additional 300 jobs, as well as the relocation of 450 jobs from the existing factory site.

- The staffing/shift patterns will be as follows:
  Approx 52 employees will work from 3:30am till 3:30pm; then,
  13 employees will take over working from 3:30pm-3:30am; then,
  Approx 350 – 400 employees will work from 6:40am-6:40pm; then,
13 employees will take over working from 6:40pm-6:40am

Approx 65 office employees will start work from 7:30am-9:00am working normal office hours therefore finishing at 4:30pm-6:00pm

5.11 Using these figures it is clear that there are

- 4 staff sub-shifts across 2 main shifts
  3.30am – 3.30am shift; [65 staff in shifts of 52 and 13] and,
  6.40am – 6.40am shift [365 – 413 staff in shifts of 350-400 and 13]

- and one office worker shift during normal office hours [7.30am – 9.00am and 4.30pm – 6.00pm] comprising approximately 65 employees.

5.12 Within this shift pattern arrangement employees will be coming and going in various shifts throughout the day and less so during the evening and early morning. On this basis there will be a churn of available parking parking spaces. Leavers will make way for arrivers and at certain times spaces will wait available for arrivers. The greatest pressure for spaces will be in the morning where a shift of 52 factory employees [3.30am – 3.30pm, a shift of 350-400 factory employees [6.40am-6.40pm and a shift of 65 office employees will overlap [467 – 517 employees].

5.13 It is considered that the change over of shifts will manage optimum use of the car parking area without compromising business efficiency.

5.14 What the assessment does not take into account is the expected modal shift away from the private car and the impact of the travel plan whereby employees can be picked up by company transport.

5.15 On this basis it is considered that there would be no adverse traffic impact from the proposed arrangements.

6.0 Landscape Setting

6.1 Application DC/17/05666 landscape comments confirmed that “The scenic quality is already influenced by large industrial units, signage, commercial vehicles and wind turbines, and so the proposed development would only be in keeping with the existing
scenic quality. Nevertheless the proposed development has made substantial efforts to screen the site at all boundaries. This concludes that there has been an identified need in the area, which will be met within an appropriate like setting. The development has recognised opportunities to screen the eastern, southern and western boundaries of the site through the strategic planting of a 15m belt of wooded area along with low level hedging, and so there is suitable mitigation in place to minimise the impact of the proposed development. This further enhances mature hedgerow or tree planting currently in place around the site.

6.2 The Eye Airfield Planning Position Statement (November 2013) states that “The southern part of the study area, in particular, formed an important element of distant views towards, from and across the town.” This area includes the site subject of this application.

6.3 As such whilst the site is within an area of distant views the original proposal provided a suitable level of mitigation by means of landscaping. The proposal is for extension to the originally approved building, and which sit against that building and within the originally approved industrial curtilage. The enlarged building does not compromise the approved landscaping scheme nor does it demand a change to the approved landscaping scheme. The extensive hedgerow and shelterbelt planting that has been approved will continue to enhance local landscape character. The approved swale at the southern boundary is unaffected by the enlarged building footprint. The open grassed area immediately south of the building is maintained.

6.4 As detailed above the proposals as extensions sit as part of the consented building, following its design and appearance, with the main impact resulting from extension 5 to the frontage (western elevation). Originally this was significantly smaller, with just a canopy projection, and only coloured yellow to the frontage, the side elevations being grey to match the remainder of the building, rather than the whole being yellow as proposed.

6.4 The proposal does not compromise the approved landscaping scheme, designed to mitigate the impact of the site development as a whole, and this will continue to provide the enhancement to the landscape. The visibility of the proposal will be somewhat greater, due to the increased use of yellow to the A140 frontage, and in particular to the side elevations of the front projection, which will be more visually prominent. However, given the views of these are somewhat screened, to the north by existing buildings, and to the south by the landscaping and views of the industrial site are predominantly from access roads with a transient view of the site, this is not considered to have a significant impact.

7.0 Residential Amenity

7.1 There is no change in the residential amenity implications arising from the works that are the subject of this application, owing to the considerable separation distance between the site and the nearest dwellings. As with the original permission it is considered that there
would be no unacceptable harm to residential amenity, subject to conditions originally proposed.

8.0 Heritage

8.1 The nearest designated heritage asset that is located some distance from the site and separated from the site by the intervening A140. Having regards to the distance between the site and the heritage assets, existing development on site and intervening landscaping the proposal is not considered to risk harm to heritage assets.

9.0 Flood Surface Water Drainage

9.1 SCC Flood and Water has confirmed in writing [received 11 October 2019] that it has no objection stating:

“The following submitted documents have been reviewed and we recommend approval at this time:

Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Strategy Ref A/FRAIRFIELD2.23 Issue 1

We note that there is sufficient capacity within the existing surface water drainage system, any future development on this site will have to be evaluated and it may require its own surface water drainage system.

We would like to make the applicant aware of the following informatives.
• Any works to a watercourse may require consent under section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991
• Any discharge to a watercourse or groundwater needs to comply with the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017
• Any discharge of surface water to a watercourse that drains into an Internal Drainage Board catchment is subject to payment of a surface water developer contribution
• Any works to lay new surface water drainage pipes underneath the public highway will need a section 50 license under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991
• Any works to a main river may require an environmental permit”

9.2 On this precautionary basis it must be concluded that the modifications undertaken and included within this application raise no new material and adverse drainage impacts. It is thereby inappropriate to raise any objection to the amended design on drainage grounds. The response provided by SCC SuDS in respect of drainage will be a comfort to members of the Committee and local residents.

9.3 The point in respect of capacity being made by SCC SuDS in their commentary relates to potential [and as yet unknown] future development and not that presently undertaken and included within this the current application.
10.0 Eye Neighbourhood Plan, Airfield Position Statement and Development Framework

10.1 The site is located within the designated Eye Business Area as defined in the Eye Neighbourhood Plan (ENP). Policy Eye 33 provides policy direction in the Eye Business Area however its direct relevance in respect to the subject proposal, being an extension of an already approved business use, is limited. The policy identifies the uses appropriate to the business area, including manufacturing. The retrospective application does not conflict with the ENP.

10.2 The Eye Airfield Development Framework (February 2013) masterplan shows the site in part within an area allocated for business use and in part for landscaping. The proposal to extend the previously permitted building is not considered to be contrary to any of the requirements set out.

10.3 The Eye Airfield Planning Position Statement (November 2013) includes the site within the same masterplan plan, but excludes it from the policy area detailed on Map 2. It continues to include the site in maps 6 and 7 for business and landscaping. Again, the proposal to extend the previously permitted building is not considered to be contrary to any of the requirements detailed.

11.0 Renewable Energy

11.1 Policy CS3 requires all non-residential development over 1,000 sqm to integrate renewable energy technology, such that details of this would be required for this proposal.

11.2 Application DC/17/05666 included a requirement to agree a scheme for the integration of renewable energy technology to provide 10% of the predicted energy requirement of the development, prior to development above slab level, in order to accord with the requirements of Core Strategy Policy CS3.

11.3 This aspect of the development remains outstanding, although a current application to discharge this condition DC/19/04495 is pending at the time of writing which proposes a combined heat and power (CHP) system, such as detailed at paragraph 3.6 of CS3. A planning application is also pending for DC/19/03837 for a CHP. A verbal update will be given.

11.3 In light of the requirements of CS3 a condition would again be appropriate to manage this aspect of the development.

12.0 Cumulative Impacts

12.1 The application site of DC/17/05666 has been the subject of several planning applications in respect of various amendments/alterations to the consented scheme, the extensions the subject of this application, alterations to the gatehouse, an LV compound, water tank, substation, CHP compound and alterations to the water treatment plant.
12.2 Each of these applications forms part of the wider site development, and each is for the retention of works having already been completed without forming part of the planning permission for the development of the site. Individually each application is relatively small, but consideration is given to the wider and cumulative impacts of these applications when taken together.

12.3 The applications submitted to address the differences between the consented and ‘as built’ scheme are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Additional Floorspace</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DC/19/03841</td>
<td>Retention of construction of extensions and elevational alterations to production facility</td>
<td>1452 sqm</td>
<td>Amendments to main production building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC/19/03907</td>
<td>S73 Application for amendments</td>
<td>52.5 sqm in respect of treatment plant building, not including pits, or basins</td>
<td>Proposal relates to alterations to the water treatment plant only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC/19/03812</td>
<td>Retention of construction of security gatehouse</td>
<td>46.9 sqm</td>
<td>Changes to gatehouse at site entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC/19/03771</td>
<td>Construction of an LV Compound to include LV Switch room, LV Transformer and hot water vessel and transformer compound to serve production facility (retention of)</td>
<td>166.5 sqm</td>
<td>Not part of application DC/17/05666. Does not provide additional production facility floorspace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC/19/03747</td>
<td>Construction of a fresh water tank, permeate tank, fuel tanks, water pumps and a water softener plant (Retention of)</td>
<td>No floorspace created</td>
<td>Not part of application DC/17/05666. Does not provide additional production facility floorspace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC/19/03908</td>
<td>Erection of electrical substation and gas meter housing</td>
<td>No floorspace created</td>
<td>Not included in DC/17/05666, provides for technical requirements of the production building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC/19/03837</td>
<td>Erection of a CHP compound and oxygen and CO2 tank compound to serve production facility</td>
<td>554 sqm</td>
<td>Not included in DC/17/05666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12.4 The proposals other than that the subject of this application, primarily relate to technical production requirements of the site, rather than production floorspace in itself. Although the extent of development on site would be greater than as consented this is in the context of the main posing building and remain overall small additions to provide for the operation of the facility, rather than offering further capacity.

13.0 Other Matters

13.1 SCC Fire and Rescue require a plan for fire hydrant provision. It is noted that fire hydrant condition 16 (of permission DC/17/05666) has not been discharged, and is currently awaiting a water plan agreed with the water company. It is recommended that a fire hydrant condition is included in accordance with Fire and Rescue’s referral response, or if the details have been agreed prior to the issue of this decision that the agreed scheme is implemented accordingly.

13.2 The objector’s concerns regarding hours of operation and controlling truck routes are noted, however these are beyond the scope of this assessment. The hours of operation have been approved pursuant to permission DC/19/03103. HGV routes were a matter for the principal application for the use of the site for poultry production, which has also already been determined as acceptable by the planning authority.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

14. Planning Balance and Conclusion

14.1 The site and existing building are within an existing setting of commercial/industrial development, with the further development of the airfield consented in respect of the gas fired power station to the north, and further development planned for within the Position Statement and Development Framework. The factory building has been constructed larger than originally approved pursuant to planning permission DC/17/05666. The floor area is approximately 8% larger than that originally granted planning permission and is not considered to adversely affect the established industrial character of the locality. Residential amenity is not unacceptably impacted and there are no unacceptable traffic or parking implications. The enlarged footprint is readily accommodated within the site, set well in from the site perimeter. The approved landscaping is sufficient and does not require amending to take account of the larger operation.

14.2 Having regard to the economic considerations and significant weight brought to bear by the NPPF paragraph 80 it is concluded that the retention of the works as constructed are acceptable and the application is recommended for approval.
RECOMMENDATION

That the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to GRANT Planning Permission subject those conditions attached to the original permission that he considers relevant and reasonable

1. Implementation time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Restrictions on use and change of use
4. Surface water disposal strategy
5. SuDS
6. Surface Water Management Plan
7. Construction Management
8. Hours of construction
9. Operation times
10. Landscaping scheme
11. Timescale for planting
12. Materials
13. Ecology
14. Archaeology: works
15. Archaeology: post investigation
16. Fire Hydrants
17. Highway access
18. Highway surface water
19. Provision of parking and turning
20. Cycle parking
21. Travel Plan
22. Lighting
23. Renewable energy
24. Upon completion of the nearby strategic A140 roundabout works the vehicular access to the chicken processing plant shall be modified to a permanent left in left out arrangement as required by Suffolk County Council under a S278 Agreement.

Informatives: as required by SCC SuDS and as included on original permission