

## **Committee Report**

**Item 8C**

**Reference:** DC/21/04099  
**Case Officer:** Bradly Heffer

**Ward:** Eye.

**Ward Member/s:** Cllr Peter Gould.

---

## **RECOMMENDATION – GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION WITH CONDITIONS**

---

### **Description of Development**

Planning Application. Erection of a storage and distribution warehouse

### **Location**

Land At Eye Airfield, Eye, Suffolk, IP23 7HU

**Expiry Date:** 21/10/2021

**Application Type:** FUL - Full Planning Application

**Development Type:** Major Large Scale - Manu/Ind/Storg/Wareh

**Applicant:** Bartrums Group Ltd

**Agent:** Mr Oliver Jones

**Parish:** Eye

**Site Area:** 1.47 Hectares

**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:

It is a 'Major' application for the erection industrial buildings with a gross floor area exceeding 3 750 square metres, therefore requiring determination at Committee in accordance with the adopted scheme of delegation.

---

## **PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY**

---

### **Summary of Policies**

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

FC01 - Presumption In Favour Of Sustainable Development

FC01\_1 - Mid Suffolk Approach To Delivering Sustainable Development

FC03 - Supply Of Employment Land  
CS05 - Mid Suffolk's Environment  
CS06 - Services and Infrastructure

GP01 - Design and layout of development  
E02 - Industrial uses on allocated sites  
E03 - Warehousing, storage, distribution and haulage depots  
E12 - General principles for location, design and layout  
T09 - Parking Standards  
T10 - Highway Considerations in Development  
RT12 - Footpaths and Bridleways

Eye Neighbourhood Plan

In addition to the above adopted policy documents, regard has also been given to the Eye Airfield Position Statement (Nov 2013) and the Eye Airfield Development Framework (Feb 2013).

### **Neighbourhood Plan Status**

This application site is within a Neighbourhood Plan Area.

The Eye Neighbourhood Plan is adopted and is part of the relevant development plan for this application site. Accordingly, the relevant policies of the Neighbourhood Plan have full weight in the determination of this planning application.

### **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)**

At the time this report was written, comments had not been received from **Eye Town Council, Brome and Oakley Parish Council** or **Thrandeston Parish Council** (the expiry date for comments being 17<sup>th</sup> August 2021). Members will be updated accordingly at the Committee meeting if any comments are received.

**Yaxley Parish Council** has no comment to make.

##### **National Consultee (Appendix 4)**

**Natural England** has advised that it has no comments to make. The LPA's attention is drawn to standing advice in relation to protected species etc.

**Highways England** has no objection to the development proposal.

##### **County Council Responses (Appendix 5)**

**Suffolk Highway Authority** has recommended the inclusion of conditions on a grant of planning permission.

**Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service** has advised that a condition will need to be added to an approval that secures fire hydrants. It is also identified that access to buildings for fire appliances and firefighters must accord with current Building Regulations. It is also requested that consideration be given to the installation of an automatic fire sprinkler system.

**Suffolk Archaeological Service** has advised that there would be no significant impact on known archaeological sites or areas with archaeological potential.

The **Lead Local Flood Authority** originally advised of a holding objection, pending the submission of additional information, including a sequential test. Members are advised further information has been received from the applicant in this regard, and a sequential and exceptions test has been undertaken by Officers. An update on the LLFA's position will be presented at the meeting.

**SCC Travel Plan Officer** has no comment to make.

**Suffolk Wildlife Trust** has no comment to make.

#### **Internal Consultee Responses (Appendix 6)**

**Environmental Control (Noise/Odour/Light/Smoke)** has recommended the inclusion of conditions on a grant of planning permission.

**Environmental Control (Land Contamination)** has no objection to the proposal. It is requested that the LPA is contacted in the event that unexpected ground conditions being encountered during construction, and that responsibility for the safe development of the site lies with the developer.

*Officer comment: an Informative to this effect would be added to a grant of planning permission.*

**Environmental Control (Sustainability)** has recommended a condition be imposed on a grant of planning permission.

**Environmental Control (Air Quality)** has identified that the number of HGV movements associated with the proposal would not meet the criteria in the EPUK Guidance for requiring an air quality assessment and therefore no objection is raised.

#### **B: Representations**

The expiry date for receipt of third party representations fell on 19<sup>th</sup> August. At the time of writing this report no representations had been received. Members will be updated accordingly at the Committee meeting if any are subsequently received.

#### **PLANNING HISTORY**

<b>REF:</b> DC/21/04099	Planning Application. Erection of a storage and distribution warehouse	<b>DECISION:</b> PCO
<b>REF:</b> 2845/13	Erection of extension to existing warehouse and distribution building	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 10.12.2013
<b>REF:</b> 0196/11	Erection of loading canopy extension to existing warehouse	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 25.02.2011

<b>REF:</b> 0273/87	Layout of roads and sewers and other offside infrastructural works for industrial development.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 14.07.1987
<b>REF:</b> 0086/79	Erection of buildings for the manufacture of semi-trailers, rigid commercial vehicle bodies and ancillary purposes including open storage of trailer and construction of private sewage treatment plant.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 19.09.1979
<b>REF:</b> 0156/78/OL	Erection of buildings for manufacture of semi-trailers, rigid commercial vehicle bodies and ancillary purposes including open storage of trailer units and construction of private sewage treatment plant.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 13.10.1978
<b>REF:</b> 0798/92/	LAYOUT OF ROADS AND SEWERS USING EXISTING VEHICULAR ACCESS WITH OFF SITE INFRASTRUCTURE (FOR FUTURE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT).	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 25.11.1992
<b>REF:</b> DC/21/04099	Planning Application. Erection of a storage and distribution warehouse	<b>DECISION:</b> PCO
<b>REF:</b> 1999/16	Resurfacing of existing yard with concrete	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 19.07.2016
<b>REF:</b> 2374/07	Erection of distribution and storage building.	<b>DECISION:</b> DIS 31.12.2008
<b>REF:</b> 0370/90/	CHANGE OF USE TO HAULAGE DEPOT.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 20.06.1990
<b>REF:</b> 1436/02/	REMOVE EXISTING SETTLEMENT TANK. REPLACE WITH FILTER PRESS.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 30.12.2002
<b>REF:</b> 0715/90/	USE OF FORMER COUNCIL DEPOT BUILDING FOR LIGHT VEHICLE BODY REPAIRS AND PAINT SPRAYING.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 08.10.1990

---

## **PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION**

---

### **1. The Site and Surroundings**

- 1.1 The site for this proposal is located within the Eye Airfield Industrial Estate; it has an overall given area of approximately 1.5 hectares. It is a relatively level piece of land that is currently overgrown. Its boundary with the service road is defined by post and chain link fencing. In the immediate surroundings are established commercial buildings comprising the Industrial Estate, including other premises that are owned/controlled by the applicant.

## 2. The Proposal

- 2.1. The proposed development seeks full planning permission for the erection of a warehouse building on the identified site, together with an associated office facility. Information submitted with the application advises that that warehouse would have dimensions of 84 metres length and 78 metres width, with a height to eaves of 11.6 metres and height to ridge of 15.7 metres. The warehouse would also contain a canopy feature to enable weather protection for loading/unloading. In terms of the office element, this would be 19 metres length and 12 metres wide (containing two floors), with an eaves height of 6.9 metres and 7.9 metres to the ridge. In regard to proposed finishes, the warehouse would be constructed using cladding coloured Goosewing Grey (with Merlin Grey detailing), with the office building's main colour being Merlin Grey, with Goosewing Grey detailing.
- 2.2. The submitted plans show the warehouse and attached office building occupying the northern half of the identified site, with the remaining southern portion providing space for vehicular parking. Access to the site would take place via a gateway off the service road located adjacent to the southern boundary. This space is shown to contain 13no. lorry parking spaces, together with 12no. car parking spaces. The submitted plans show a further row of 12no. car parking spaces located immediately to the north of the warehouse building.
- 2.3. The following information, from the Design and Access Statement, is provided as further context for Members:

*'...The Applicant currently operates from 3no. parcels of land off the B1077 Eye Airfield...In additional (sic) to their operations at Eye Airfield, the Applicant also currently utilises warehousing space at 4no. other locations due to business expansion, some of which are quite dated and inefficient; **the approval of this planning permission will allow them to relocate 2no. of these off-site storage facilities to their main base Eye Airfield and achieve a greater level of efficiency than is currently possible** [Officer emphasis]. The applicant has always favoured supplying services (storage and haulage) to local business and the business plan which supports this proposal has been constructed along those lines. These plans will create more employment for the local area and help secure a business which has been successfully trading since 1929...The warehouse will primarily be used for the storage and distribution of goods from local Suffolk based businesses...'*

- 2.4. Lastly, the submission advises that the development would generate the need for 22 no. new employees.

## 3. The Principle Of Development

- 3.1. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that *'If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.'*
- 3.2. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states inter alia at paragraph 81:

*'Planning policies and decisions should help to create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development...'*
- 3.3. The site for this application is located within the defined Eye Airfield Industrial Estate, as allocated in the adopted Local Plan. In this regard, Local Plan policy E2 – Industrial Uses on Allocated Sites states that 'Favourable consideration will be given to applications for Industrial and Commercial

development, as defined by Classes B1 and B8 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended), on the allocated sites, in accordance with the provisions of Table 4...’ In addition, policy E3 – Warehousing, Distribution and Haulage Depots inter alia states that ‘Favourable consideration will be given to applications for warehousing, storage and distribution on the sites allocated for such purposes in the Local Plan and identified in Table 4...’ Members are advised that the identified Table does include Eye Airfield, listing B1, B2 and B8 uses within the Use Classes Order as being suitable.

- 3.4 Leading on from this, the Eye Airfield Planning Position Statement, which has the status of Non-Statutory Planning Guidance, was adopted by the Council in November 2013. This document was intended to confirm the Council’s decision that the Eye Airfield Development Framework (February 2013) should guide future development of the site. Within these documents, the application site is located in area 7 – Existing Business, described as ‘Sites given planning permission, some scope for extensions, B1, B2, B8, logistics and data centre type use, retain and upgrade accesses.’ Again, in your officers’ view the proposal for a warehouse and distribution centre, with associated office accommodation, conforms with the Framework and Position Statement’s identified acceptable land uses – being a mixed B8 and B1 use.
- 3.5 Members are advised that the most up to date adopted policy document is the Eye Neighbourhood Plan (2018 – 2036). In this document, the application site is located within the defined Eye Business Area, and in this regard policy Eye 27 – Eye Business Area states:

*‘Eye Business Area shall be developed in accordance with the national and strategic policies.*

*Any development should include Electric Vehicle Charging points consistent with Eye Policy 25 and Cycle Parking consistent with County Council Parking Guidance.*

*Rights of Way should be maintained and enhanced within the area to allow access to and from the Town and to encourage wartime heritage visiting.’*

The proposed development is not considered to conflict with the terms of the identified policy, on the basis that the intended use is considered to accord with the development plan policies and supporting documents identified in this section. In addition, requirements for charging points and cycle parking facilities are controllable under condition.

- 3.6 In summary, the principle of the proposed development taking place on the identified site is considered to be acceptable against the relevant policy base as described above.

#### **4. Nearby Services and Connections Assessment Of Proposal**

- 4.1. The location of the Industrial Estate is such that it has convenient access to the wider road network via the A140 which runs adjacent to the western boundary of the overall site. In addition, recent improvements have taken place to the road junction adjacent to the northern boundary of the site.
- 4.2 It is also noted that the application advises that the proposal would enable rationalisation of operations as the applicant company has other premises on the Industrial Estate.

#### **5. Site Access, Parking And Highway Safety Considerations**

- 5.1. By way of background, for Members’ information, the following extract is taken from the Transport Statement submitted with the application:

*‘...The Applicant’s main operational base is at Eye Airfield, however, they currently utilise warehousing space at 4No. other locations; the approval of this planning permission will allow them to relocate 2No. of these off-storage facilities to their main base. At present, unnecessary traffic*

*movements are generated by the Applicant at Eye Airfield due to additional trips needed to deposit and retrieve goods at their off-site storage locations. By consolidating more of their operations to Eye Airfield, the Applicant will be able to reduce these unnecessary movements...the access [to the site] will be 20 metres wide which will allow for the safe simultaneous passing of 2No. HGVs accessing and egressing the site. 2No. gates are proposed for the safety and security of the site. The site will have ample parking provisions with a minimum of 24No. carparking spaces and 13No. HGV spaces. The Applicant anticipates that 10No. HGV driving employment opportunities to result from the warehouse construction and subsequently 10-15 HGVs accessing and egressing the site per day. The site will be operational 24 hours a day, however, traffic movements are expected to be concentrated during daylight hours on Monday to Saturday, approximately 0500 – 2000. The site is proposed to remain open on Sundays for warehousing operations, however, the Applicant does not anticipate any incoming or outgoing deliveries...'*

Members are advised that the applicant counts one movement as consisting of a vehicle accessing and egressing the site.

- 5.2 The overall Eye airfield site is served by a number of vehicular accesses – one from the A140 trunk road, which enables access to the series of buildings on the western side of the site, and several taken via the B1077, which enable access to the eastern side. Members will also be aware that relatively recent junction improvements have taken place adjacent to the northern boundary of the former airfield site – with the provision of a new roundabout junction.
- 5.3 The proposed development would look to utilise one of the existing accesses from the B1077. This leads to an established service road that serves this central portion of the overall industrial estate. The service road runs adjacent to the southern boundary of the application site and a gated access (suitably proportioned to serve both cars and HGVs) would be taken off this road.
- 5.4 In this regard, it is noted that the Highway Authority does not raise an objection to the proposal; requesting the imposition of a condition requiring the provision of the service/parking area shown on the plans before the proposed use commences. This conditional requirement is considered to be wholly appropriate in the circumstances and its inclusion as part of a planning approval is supported by officers.
- 5.5 In terms of parking provision, it is considered pertinent to the determination of this application that the applicant company operates from other nearby sites within the overall Industrial estate, and this scheme seeks to further rationalise the company's operation. In this regard, the overall floorspace currently occupied comprises 16 998 sq metres of warehousing, and 2 044 sq metres of office space. Notwithstanding that this floorspace is already established, under the adopted parking standards this would generate a need for 181no. car parking spaces. Information provided by the applicant's agent identifies that there are 239no. spaces currently available on the established sites, an over-provision of 58no. spaces.
- 5.6 The submission identifies that the floorspace of the proposed warehousing is 6 455 sq metres, whilst the proposed office floorspace is 336 sq metres. The adopted standard requires an overall provision of 54no. spaces to serve the proposed development. Members are advised that the site plan submitted with the application shows the provision of 24no. spaces on site, a shortfall of 30no. spaces. However, the fact that the existing operation carried out by the applicant company has an over-provision of 58no. spaces means that, overall, the amount of parking spaces available is in excess of the Council's adopted standards. It is also noteworthy that the operation of the company and shift patterns means that not all spaces would be occupied at the same time.
- 5.7 The submitted proposals (and existing parking arrangements) also include provision for HGV parking. In this regard, the Council's adopted parking standards do not include a requirement for HGV parking to serve a warehouse use per se, advising that HGV parking provision should be based on operational requirements.

- 5.8 In summary, it is considered that the proposal would not give rise to unacceptable impacts on the local highway network. Indeed the provision of additional on-site facilities would reduce the need for inter-site trips that are currently necessary. In this regard it is noted that the Highway Authority does not object to the proposals. In addition, it is considered that the parking arrangements for the proposed use are satisfactorily addressed, in accordance with adopted standards.

## **6. Design And Layout**

- 6.1. Adopted Local Plan policy GP1 – Design and Layout of Development requires inter alia that ‘...proposals should maintain or enhance the character and appearance of their surroundings, and respect the scale and density of surrounding development...’ Leading on from this, Local Plan policy E12 – General principles for Location, Design and Layout of Industrial and Commercial development includes a series of criteria that such proposals would be expected to comply with. As may be expected with a development of the type proposed, the submitted scheme is primarily driven by the functional needs arising from a warehousing and distribution type use. This requires the provision of a large single volume building that may be easily serviced. In this regard vehicular access to the site is via the service road adjacent to the southern boundary. The access leads to a service and parking area – behind which would be the proposed built form.
- 6.2 The main building on the site would take the form of a rectangular plan structure with a single span roof. This area of the overall development would be utilised for storage facilities. On the front (southern) elevation would be located the two storey office element, loading area and associated canopy – which would face across the parking and servicing area serving the site. The inclusion of these elements within the overall design would mean that the ‘public’ elevation of the development i.e. that part that faces the service road, had sufficient visual interest. In addition, the office element would enable passive surveillance of the service and parking area.
- 6.3 The built form would be constructed using metal sheeting that would be finished in two shades of grey. In terms of the material proposed, again this reflects the primarily functional nature of the development. Nevertheless, it is considered that the use of this type of material would not appear incongruous or out of keeping in the context of the site’s surroundings. Site inspection reveals that this type of material is found on other commercial buildings on site.
- 6.4 In conclusion, it is considered that the proposed layout of the development, and the built form proposed, would achieve a standard commensurate with, and appropriate to, the character of the site and its environs.

## **7. Landscape Impact, Trees, Ecology, Biodiversity And Protected Species**

- 7.1. The nature of the site at present is that it is unkempt and overgrown, and appears as neglected land within the overall industrial estate setting. Spatially, the site is considered to be well-contained by existing built form and therefore while the proposed built form is of significant size, its overall impact within the landscape would be limited. Other existing elements on the site, such as the wind turbines and other single volume buildings, have greater prominence on the basis that they are significantly taller and/or are located closer to the boundaries of the overall site. The main visual ‘experiences’ of the site are obtained from the A.140 and the B.1077 and, in this regard, the proposed building would have limited prominence.
- 7.2 In relation to potential impacts on ecology, it is noted that Natural England and Suffolk Wildlife Trust have no comment to make on the proposals. The site is not located in an area that is designated for recognised ecological value. That said, it is considered appropriate to add a note to a grant of planning permission that reminds the applicant company of their responsibilities in the event that any protected species are encountered.

## **8. Land Contamination, Flood Risk and Drainage**

- 8.1. Members will note that, in terms of land contamination issues, the proposal has not given rise to concerns from the relevant Environmental Control officer; an informative being requested in the event that unexpected contamination is found during the development process. This would be included on a grant of planning permission as requested.
- 8.2. As regards flood risk, the site is located in flood zone 1 and therefore is not in an area that is adversely impacted by fluvial (river flooding). That said, the site is impacted by potential surface water flooding issues, in an unusual pluvial (rainfall) event.  
In this regard, the following comments are made by the applicant's agent:

*'...As discussed in the FRA & SWDS, the site is at risk of pluvial flooding. Whilst the building and hardstanding area is partially located within the area shown to be at risk of flooding from surface water flows, the drainage scheme for the site will capture the surface water runoff generated from these areas, therefore it is considered that the impact of the occupation will be negligible...It should also be noted that the proposal is within an existing industrial development served by an existing drainage system. This system is not accounted for within the RoFfSW [Risk of Flooding from Surface Water], it is therefore considered that the extent of flooding shown within the RoFfSW mapping will be less than shown. The site layout was designed so that the building was located in the north-western area of the site, to minimise the occupation of the area shown to be any risk of pluvial flooding...'*

The submission advises that the finished floor level of the proposed building would be raised or, alternatively, flood resistant and/or resilient construction be utilised. In this regard it is noted that the nature of the built form, being steel frame on a concrete base, would mean that resilience would be 'built-in' to the proposed structure. In addition, warnings of severe weather warnings may be obtained from the Met Office through a registration scheme.

- 8.3. Officers have undertaken the sequential and exceptions tests and it is determined that this site is the most suitable, available location for the proposed development. In addition, it is considered that the development of the site can take place safely, bearing in mind the impacts that could arise from the pluvial flood events.
- 8.4. The proposal has not given rise to issues in relation to waste disposal.

## **9. Heritage Issues**

- 9.1. In regard to the potential impacts arising from the proposed development on identified heritage assets, it is considered that a deleterious effect would not result. The nearest listed building to the site is Chestnut Farmhouse (Grade II) which is located some 450 metres to the south east – measured as a straight line distance. However, there is no clear line of sight between the application site and this building as various other buildings on the industrial estate are located in between. Therefore any wider spatial relationship or contribution to setting that may have previously been afforded by the site is now lost. The site reads now as a contained area of land within the industrial estate, having a spatial relationship with its immediate surroundings.
- 9.2. Similarly, potential impact of the proposed built form on listed buildings in the wider setting is considered to be mitigated by remoteness, combined with the visual impacts that already result from the industrial estate. Eye does include a conservation area allocation, that covers a significant portion of the settlement. However, the location of the settlement, remote from the industrial estate, means that an impact on the character of the conservation area would be avoided.

## **10. Impact On Residential Amenity**

- 10.1. The impact of development proposals on the amenity of adjacent or nearby residential development is a key material consideration in the determination of planning applications. In this regard, the position of the site is relatively remote from established dwellings; these being located to the east and south-east of the industrial estate, on the opposite side of the B.1077. Again, the fact that there are established industrial and commercial buildings between the site and the nearest dwellings would mean that visual impacts would be mitigated. Therefore the main tangible impact arising from the proposed development would be the increased traffic (both cars and HGVs) that would be generated by the use. Again, in this regard the proposed use has not given rise to consultee objection; the Environmental Control officer responsible for noise etc. being content to recommend the inclusion of conditions on a grant of planning permission (these relating to the construction phase) and the officer responsible for air quality not raising objection to the proposal.

## **11. Planning Obligations / CIL**

- 11.1. There are no obligations to be secured through section 106 agreement or CIL payments resulting from the proposal that have been identified.

## **12. Parish Council Comments**

- 12.1 At the time this report was produced, the proposal had not given rise to comments from the various Parish Councils that were consulted. If comments are received, these will be reported to the Committee meeting.

---

## **PART FOUR – CONCLUSION**

---

### **13. Planning Balance and Conclusion**

- 13.1. The starting point for the determination of this planning application is the relevant policy base, which consists of the adopted development plan i.e. Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (2008), Core Strategy Focused Review (2012), Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998) and Eye Neighbourhood Plan (2018 – 2036). The scheme is for a storage and distribution facility (with ancillary office accommodation) which is considered to comprise a mixed B8/B1 use. When assessed against the relevant policies of the development plan, it is judged that the proposed development is in full accordance with the identified preferred land uses.
- 13.2. Leading on from this, it is considered that the proposed appearance of the built form (albeit functional) on the site would be in accordance with the context of the surrounding form of development on the industrial estate, and as a result visual harm and incongruous impact would be avoided. In this regard, the location of the application site, away from the periphery of the industrial estate, would mean that the impact of built form would be mainly experienced close to the site itself – with wider public views limited to a significant extent by existing development on the industrial estate.
- 13.3. In relation to impacts arising from the use, the storage and office elements in themselves are not considered to be intrusive such as to detrimentally impact on amenity, The primary impact would be from vehicles visiting the site. The level of traffic generation has not given rise to objections from consultees and the nature of the traffic would be similar to that generated by other established uses on the site. Also, the application submission advises that proposal would enable the applicant company to rationalise the overall business operation and hence reduce the number of inter-site trips that are currently necessary. It is also pertinent to the consideration of this proposal that job creation would result from the proposed development.

13.4 Notwithstanding that Officers are satisfied that the proposed development can take place on the site while recognising the pluvial flooding possibility, the final view of the LLFA was not available at the time this report was produced. Therefore, the recommendation to Members reflects this situation.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That Members delegate authority to the Chief Planning Officer to grant planning permission subject to

[a] the resolution of the outstanding surface water drainage issues, in consultation with the LLFA, to the satisfaction of the Chief Planning Officer and

[b] that such permission be subject to the following conditions, and to any additional or amended conditions that are deemed necessary by the LLFA and the Chief Planning Officer:-

Standard time limit

Approved Plans (Plans submitted that form this application)

Construction Hours

Prohibition on burning

Dust Control

Construction Management Plan

Provision of loading/unloading manoeuvring and parking spaces prior to the commencement of use

Agreement/implementation of water, energy and resource efficiency measures for the lifetime of the development

Provision of fire hydrants

Details of maximum heights of storage

And [c] the following informative notes as summarised and those as may be deemed necessary:

Proactive working statement

Support for sustainable development principles

Note regarding unexpected ecological presence.

Note regarding unexpected land contamination

Consideration of sprinkler system