

## **Committee Report**

**Item 8D**

**Reference:** DC/21/04697

**Case Officer:** Daniel Cameron

**Ward:** Palgrave. Eye.

**Ward Member/s:** Cllr Peter Gould & Cllr David Burn

---

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

---

### **Description of Development**

Planning Application. Erection of new storage building No.10 for B8 use

### **Location**

Land On Eye Airfield, Ipswich Road, Eye, Suffolk

**Expiry Date:** 24/11/2021

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

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

**Applicant:** R H Developments (East Anglia) Ltd

**Agent:** Hollins Architects, Surveyors & Planning Consultants

**Parish:** Thrandeston and Eye

**Site Area:** 1.51ha

**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:

It would involve the erection of an industrial building with a gross floor space exceeding 3,750sqm. and as such requires determination by Planning Committee in accordance with the adopted scheme of delegation.

---

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

---

### **Summary of Policies**

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

## NPPG-National Planning Policy Guidance

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

E02 - Industrial uses on allocated sites  
E03 - Warehousing, storage, distribution and haulage depots  
E08 - Extensions to industrial and commercial premises  
E12 - General principles for location, design and layout  
T09 - Parking Standards  
T10 - Highway Considerations in Development  
RT12 - Footpaths and Bridleways

Eye Neighbourhood Plan

### **Neighbourhood Plan Status**

This application site is within the Eye Neighbourhood Plan Area.

The Neighbourhood Plan is currently an adopted part of the Development Plan. Therefore, it carries significant weight in decision making:

### **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 Council (Appendix 3)**

##### **Eye Town Council Comments Received 16<sup>th</sup> September:**

No comment.

**N.B** – Brome and Oakley Parish Council, Yaxley Parish Council and Thrandeston Parish Council were consulted on the application. At the time of writing, no response from the Parish Councils has been received. A verbal update will be provided at the meeting should comments be received.

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

##### **Anglian Water Comments Received 4<sup>th</sup> September:**

Having reviewed the development, there is no connection to Anglian Water sewers, we therefore have no comments.

##### **East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board Comments Received 16<sup>th</sup> September:**

No objection. It is recommended that discharge of surface water is made into appropriate SuDS features.

**Historic England Comments Received 17<sup>th</sup> September:**

On the basis of the information available to date, we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.

**Natural England Comments Received 8<sup>th</sup> September:**

Natural England have no comments to make on this application.

**County Council Responses (Appendix 5)****Archaeology Comments Received 7<sup>th</sup> September:**

We have looked at this proposal. In our opinion there would be no significant impact on known archaeological site or areas with archaeological potential. We have no objection to the development and do not believe that any archaeological mitigation is required.

**Fire and Rescue Comments Received 3<sup>rd</sup> September:**

A condition is required for fire hydrants.

**Flood and Water Comments Received 7<sup>th</sup> September:**

A holding objection is noted subject to the undertaking of the sequential test as set out at paragraph 161 of the NPPF. Should the sequential test be passed, additional information is required as set out within the holding objection.

**N.B** - 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.

**Flood and Water Comments Received 9<sup>th</sup> November:**

A further holding objection is noted and the findings of the sequential and exception tests are agreed. Further information is requested with regards to the design of the attenuation basin on site and to demonstrate that the building will be flood compatible and resilient.

**N.B** - Members are advised that the application both expands the attenuation basin serving the site and is intended to make use of flood compatible and resilient building techniques. It is the view of Officers that the additional information requested could be delivered through the use of planning conditions. This approach is supported by the Flood and Water Team.

**Highways Comments Received 21<sup>st</sup> September:**

Notice is given that the County Council as Highway Authority recommends that any permission which the Planning Authority may give should include a condition to secure the areas shown for the manoeuvring and parking of vehicles shall be provided prior to the first use of the storage building and retained as such for future use.

**Travel Plan Officer Comments Received 2<sup>nd</sup> September:**

On reviewing the planning documents submitted, I have no comment to make as the development does not meet the thresholds that require a Travel Plan in accordance with the Suffolk Travel Plan Guidance.

**Internal Consultee Responses (Appendix 6)****Environmental Health – Air Quality Comments Received 9<sup>th</sup> September:**

The number of vehicle movements in association with this proposal are low and do not require assessing for their air quality impact. No objection.

**Environmental Health – Noise/Odour/Light Comments Received 10<sup>th</sup> September:**

No objection and has recommended the inclusion of conditions on a grant of planning permission.

**Environmental Health – Sustainability Comments Received 21<sup>st</sup> September:**

No objection and has recommended the inclusion of conditions on a grant of planning permission.

**Environmental Health – Land Contamination Comments Received 23<sup>rd</sup> September:**

No objection.

**Place Services (Ecology) Comments Received 22<sup>nd</sup> September:**

No objection.

**Waste Services Comments Received 7<sup>th</sup> September:**

No objection

**B: Representations**

At the time of writing this report no letters/emails/online comments have been received in response to this application. A verbal update shall be provided as necessary.

(Note: All individual representations are counted and considered. Repeated and/or additional communication from a single individual will be counted as one representation.)

**PLANNING HISTORY**

<b>REF:</b> DC/17/05674	Application for Discharge of Condition for Requirement 9 (1) (Archeology) pursuant to The Progress Power (Gas Fired Power Station) Order 2015	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 06.12.2017
<b>REF:</b> DC/21/03894	Application for the Modification of a Section 106 Planning Obligation relating to Progress Power (Gas Fired Power Station) dated 13/01/2015 - Modification of Education and Employment Scheme	<b>DECISION:</b> PCO
<b>REF:</b> 0247/90/	CONTINUED USE OF REDUNDANT BUILDINGS AS TAXI OFFICE AND THE PARKING OF 4 TAXIS	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 20.06.1990
<b>REF:</b> DC/18/02715	Notification of SCC Scoping Opinion (EIA) - The construction of two roundabouts along the A140 and a road linking the northern roundabout with the B1077.	<b>DECISION:</b> DEC 10.07.2018
<b>REF:</b> DC/20/03957	Application for Advertisement Consent - Erection of 2No signs each consisting of 14 plate signs advertising Roy Humphrey Group businesses within the Eye airfield industrial complex.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 12.11.2020

<b>REF:</b> DC/21/04697	Planning Application. Erection of new storage building No.10 for B8 use	<b>DECISION:</b> PDE
<b>REF:</b> 1102/13	Use of land for the display of motor vehicles for sale, erection of vehicle retail showroom, construction of raised display platforms and parking areas (revised scheme to that previously approved under reference 2059/12).	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 05.07.2013
<b>REF:</b> 0993/13	Use of land for the display of motor vehicles for sale, erection of vehicle retail showroom, construction of raised display platforms and parking areas.	<b>DECISION:</b> REC
<b>REF:</b> 2059/12	Use of land for the display of motor vehicles for sale, erection of vehicle retail showroom, construction of raised display platforms and parking areas.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 11.09.2012
<b>REF:</b> 3856/11	Use of land for siting storage container	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 16.12.2011
<b>REF:</b> 0810/11	Erection of 1 electricity substation, 2 electrical enclosures and temporary construction compound. Construction of access track.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 27.05.2011
<b>REF:</b> 1480/09	Scoping Opinion request under part 4 of the EIA regulations 1999 (proposed wind turbines).	<b>DECISION:</b> EIA 26.06.2009
<b>REF:</b> 0858/09	Screening Opinion - for a wind energy scheme consisting of a maximum of two wind turbines	<b>DECISION:</b> EIA 15.04.2009
<b>REF:</b> 2464/07	See Actions	<b>DECISION:</b> REC
<b>REF:</b> 2533/05	Erection of a car showroom.	<b>DECISION:</b> REF 13.06.2006
<b>REF:</b> 0247/90/	CONTINUED USE OF REDUNDANT BUILDINGS AS TAXI OFFICE AND THE PARKING OF 4 TAXIS	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 20.06.1990
<b>REF:</b> 0724/10	Erection of 2no. 130m wind turbines, electricity transformer and temporary works compound, construction of access tracks, hard standings and temporary access alterations.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 20.07.2010

<b>REF:</b> 3449/10	Erection of 1 electricity substation, 2 electrical enclosures and temporary construction compound. Construction of access track.	<b>DECISION:</b> WDN 25.01.2011
<b>REF:</b> 0852/10	Use of land for the display of motor vehicles for sale, erection of vehicle retail showroom, construction of raised display platforms and parking areas.	<b>DECISION:</b> REF 02.07.2010
<b>REF:</b> 0881/09	Erection of 70m high anemometry mast for temporary period of 2 years.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 08.05.2009
<b>REF:</b> 0677/09	1. Erection of met mast 2. Erection of 2 no. 2/3MW wind turbines	<b>DECISION:</b> REC
<b>REF:</b> 1061/08	Post enforcement appeal PD Rights Query.	<b>DECISION:</b> REC
<b>REF:</b> 0247/90/	CONTINUED USE OF REDUNDANT BUILDINGS AS TAXI OFFICE AND THE PARKING OF 4 TAXIS	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 20.06.1990
<b>REF:</b> DC/19/00657	Full Planning Application - Erection of 2no. B8 storage buildings and link extension between buildings 6 and 7.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 01.05.2019
<b>REF:</b> DC/19/02711	Discharge of Conditions Application for DC/19/00657 - Condition 8 (Surface Water Drainage), Condition 9 (Implementation, Maintenance and Management of Surface Water Drainage), Condition 11 (Construction Surface Water Management Plan), Condition 12 (Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation), Condition 14 (Sustainable Efficiency Measures) and Condition 16 (Construction Management Plan).	<b>DECISION:</b> PGR 29.07.2019
<b>REF:</b> DC/19/03950	Discharge of Conditions Application for DC/19/00657 - Condition 8 (Surface Water Drainage) and Condition 11 (Construction Surface Water Management Plan)	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 09.09.2019
<b>REF:</b> 0407/16	Proposed business park (poss. to be developed in 2 or more phases) See plans in IDOX from pre-meeting 28/01/16.	<b>DECISION:</b> REC
<b>REF:</b> 2644/13	Creation of new enclosed substation	<b>DECISION:</b> PDV

25.09.2013

<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> 3269/13		<b>DECISION:</b> REC
<b>REF:</b> 1697/14	Eye Master planning Work -	<b>DECISION:</b> REC
<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> 0055/81/OL	Redevelopment of site including the erection of 3 blocks containing 24 units	<b>DECISION:</b> WDN 15.12.1983
<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> 2484/05	New building to provide vehicle storage and warehousing.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 27.04.2006
<b>REF:</b> 0370/90/	CHANGE OF USE TO HAULAGE DEPOT.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 20.06.1990
<b>REF:</b> 0051/99/	ERECTION OF 2 NO. SINGLE STOREY EXTENSIONS TO EXISTING UNIT; ERECTION OF DETACHED TIMBER STORE AND NEW OFFICE BLOCK.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 03.03.1999
<b>REF:</b> 0404/98/	ERECTION OF TOILET BLOCK TO SERVE UNITS 8A-E AND UNITS 9A-D.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 18.06.1998
<b>REF:</b> 0062/00/	ERECTION OF UNLOADING CANOPY OVER PART OF PAVED FORECOURT.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 29.02.2000
<b>REF:</b> 0341/00/	ERECTION OF WORKSHOP AND SHOWROOM BUILDING.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 07.06.2000

<b>REF:</b> 0026/89/	ERECTION OF TRAFFIC OFFICE EXTENSION	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 22.03.1989
<b>REF:</b> 0002/99/A	INFORMATION PANEL AND DIRECTION SIGN.	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 19.02.1999
<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
<b>REF:</b> 0371/96/	USE OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AS OFFICES AND GENERAL INDUSTRIAL USE	<b>DECISION:</b> GTD 11.06.1996

---

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

---

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

- 1.1 The site is a level, irregularly shaped area of land that is located at the southern end of the defined Eye Airfield Business Park, with a given area of 1.51 hectares. It is currently located adjacent to two recently constructed B8 storage buildings, approved under planning application reference DC/19/00657.
- 1.2 A notable feature adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site is a substantial wind turbine, whereas adjacent to the north are a number large, single volume, commercial buildings. The site itself is currently given over to grass.
- 1.3 The overall Eye Airfield site is readily accessible by road from the A140 trunk road that connects Ipswich with Norwich. The A140 is noted as a strategic lorry route within the Suffolk Lorry Route Network.

### **2. The Proposal**

- 2.1 Under this full application submission, permission is sought for the erection of 1 no. B8 storage unit (identified in the application submission as building 10). The proposed location of building 10 would continue the row of established buildings on the Business Park.
- 2.2 In the case of building 10, this would have external dimensions of 96.9 metres length and 45.6 metres width (and hence an overall floor area of 3,888 sqm) with a maximum height of 11.4 metres approx., to roof ridge.
- 2.3 In terms of materials, all buildings would be constructed in profiled steel sheet cladding walls and roofs – this being the prevalent material utilised on other large, single volume buildings already located on the site with the colour of materials to match those existing on the site.

### **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. Site Access, Parking and Highway Safety Considerations**

- 4.1 The application development would be served by the existing access that serves the overall site. It is noted that SCC Highway Authority does not object to the proposals on grounds of the inadequacy of the access to serve the resultant amount of traffic.
- 4.2 In terms of parking provision, it is noted that the Council's adopted parking standards for B8 (Storage and Distribution) use are expressed as a *maximum* – therefore there is no minimum provision that would be applicable in this case. In terms of vehicle parking the adopted maximum standard is 1 space per 150 sqm. In total, the amount of new floorspace proposed under this application would be approximately 3,888 sqm and therefore the maximum number of spaces that would need to be proposed to meet the adopted standard is 25 spaces. The submitted proposal advises that 5 new car parking spaces would be provided with this building in addition the existing car and HGV parking already provided on the site.
- 4.3 Clearly the number of parking spaces proposed is below the maximum level required by the Council's adopted guidance in this matter. However, the number of spaces proposed would, it is felt, be an appropriate provision bearing in mind the nature (storage) of the development and the fact that the Council's adopted standard doesn't require a minimum provision as such.

#### **5. Design and Layout**

- 5.1 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.
- 5.2 The overall site is viewable from extensive publicly-accessible locations – not least from the A140 trunk road and also the public footpath that is adjacent to the southern boundary of the application site. To this end, it is considered that the existing built form to the north of the application site sets a strong development context. In this regard it is noted that the proposed layout and form of the development follows the established pattern – the new warehouse buildings continuing the row buildings already located on site. It is considered that such an approach would be logical in terms of the arrangement of development and would not appear incongruous in the wider landscape setting.
- 5.3 The design of the buildings reflects the appearance of other buildings already on site. The commercial nature of the overall site has resulted in built form having a strong functional appearance. The design approach taken is considered to be wholly appropriate in the context of the surrounding form of development. Lastly it is noted that the submitted scheme does not include any external storage proposals.

#### **6. Landscape Impact, Trees, Ecology, Biodiversity and Protected Species**

- 6.1 The character of the site is such that it does not contain any trees or hedging. The nearest hedging that would potentially be impacted by the development proposed is located adjacent to

the southern boundary, but it is considered that the distance between built form and this feature would mean that its structural integrity is not likely to be adversely impacted.

- 6.2 With regard to impacts on ecology, this aspect has been considered by the Council's retained ecological consultants. Their findings based on a review of the Suffolk Biodiversity Information Services and DEFRA records are as follows:

*'...The desk study confirms that there are no designated sites within the vicinity of the site, as well as no notable records of protected and Priority species and habitats. The habitat on site also appears to be well managed improved grassland/bare ground, which may be a result of disturbance from the erection of Storage building No.9. We also note a number of ponds present within the local vicinity, but these have been recently created as surface water storage basins following a landscaping scheme associated with the delivery of Storage building No.7. As a result, we are satisfied it is highly unlikely that protected or Priority species will be impacted by the proposals.'*

- 6.3 Their response also notes the need to consider a condition to secure good practice mitigation to avoid ecological impacts.

## **7. Land Contamination, Flood Risk, Drainage and Waste**

- 7.1 This application proposal has not given rise to concerns regarding land contamination – as is noted from the consultation response received from the Council's Environmental Health Officer. In any event, it is recommended that an informative be added to a grant of planning permission that identifies the developer's responsibility in the event that unexpected land contamination is found during the construction process.

- 7.2 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 submission advises that surface water run-off from the building will be accommodated within the existing drainage system on the site which discharges into an above ground SuDS system. This was expanded to accommodate the neighbouring buildings and is proposed to be further expanded to accommodate this building. Further, site users will be signed up to receive advance flood warning information and the building is proposed to be built in accordance with water resistant building methods.

- 7.3 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.

7.4 The proposal has not given rise to issues in relation to waste disposal.

## **9. Heritage Issues**

- 8.1 The location of the application site is such that there are no listed buildings within immediate proximity. In addition, the site is not located within or close to a defined conservation area. The nearest listed buildings are Boswold Hall, located to the west, on the opposite side of the A 140, and White House Farm and a pair of cottages located at the northern end of Yaxley. It is considered that the wider setting of these buildings would not be adversely impacted by the proposed development. Similarly, the nearest conservation areas enclose the settlement cores of Eye and Thrandeston which are relatively remote. Therefore, the proposal does not raise issues of 'above ground' heritage impacts as such.
- 8.2 The Council's retained archaeological advisers have advised that no conditions are required in relation to below ground heritage assets on this site. Conditions attached to the development of the adjacent buildings resulted in no archaeological finds and as such, it is considered that no finds would be present on this site.

## **9. Impact on Residential Amenity**

- 9.1 The location of the site is relatively remote from existing residential development. The nearest dwelling in relation to the application site is located to the southwest, on Old Norwich Road. Its location in relation to the site is such that the amenity of this dwelling is not considered to be adversely impacted – particularly bearing in mind that the use of the proposed buildings would be for storage and distribution and also that the route of the A140 runs between the site and the nearest dwelling.
- 9.2 Notwithstanding the relative remoteness of the site from residential development, it is case that recommended conditions from the Environmental Health Officer (including controls over hours of operation, noise emission, lighting, construction times and disposal of construction materials) would be included to further safeguard residential amenity in the wider area.

## **10. Planning Obligations / CIL**

- 10.1 The provision of a planning obligation and CIL payments is not applicable to this application.

---

## **PART FOUR – CONCLUSION**

---

### **11. Planning Balance and Conclusion**

- 11.1 The submitted proposal seeks to augment and add to existing commercial development on the former Eye airfield. The site forms part of an area that is recognised as being an appropriate location for industrial and commercial development in the Council's adopted plan and other supplementary documents as identified in this report. Furthermore, the form of development proposed would reflect the context of development that is established on the site. The scheme would result in the creation of job opportunities which is welcomed, and it is considered that

impacts arising from the development could be properly mitigated through the imposition of conditions.

11.2 In conclusion it is recommended that the Council grants a conditional planning permission for this development proposal.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**That Members approve of the application, subject to the following conditions:**

- Standard time limit
- Approved plans
- Materials to be as stated within application
- Control of hours of work for building
- No installation of plant/machinery/equipment within the building without appropriate noise assessment
- No external storage to be permitted within the red line site
- External lighting to be as shown
- Limit to construction hours of work
- No burning of materials on site
- Sewage plant to be installed prior to first use
- Submission of scheme of water, energy and resource efficiency measures for both construction and operational phase
- Details of provision for electric vehicle charging points
- Provision of parking area prior to first use
- Ecological good practice measures during construction
- Final flood measures to be agreed and implemented in full

**Along with the following informative and any additional or amended informatives that are deemed necessary by the LLFA and the Chief Planning Officer:**

- Proactive working statement
- Support for sustainable development principles
- Note regarding unexpected ecological presence
- Note regarding unexpected land contamination