

Committee Report

Item No: 6B

Reference: DC/22/00682

Case Officer: Elizabeth Flood

Ward: Sproughton & Pinewood.

Ward Member/s: Cllr Richard Hardacre. Cllr Zachary Norman.

RECOMMENDATION – GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION WITH CONDITIONS

Description of Development

Application for Approval of Reserved Matters following Outline Approval DC/17/05687 - Submission of details for Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for an Industrial development with ancillary office space (B2/B8 & E(g)ii)/E(g)iii), including related servicing arrangements, car parking, landscaping, and associated works.

Location

Parcels 12, 13 & 15 Of The Land Off Sproughton Road, Former British Sugar Factory, Sproughton, Ipswich Suffolk IP1 5FF

Expiry Date: 13/05/2022

Application Type: RES - Reserved Matters

Development Type: Major Large Scale - All Other

Applicant: HE2 UK Enterprises 16 GP Ltd

Agent: UMC Architects

Parish: Sproughton

Site area: 3.95 ha

Details of Previous Committee / Resolutions and any member site visit: None

Has a Committee Call In request been received from a Council Member: 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 provides for the erection of industrial buildings with a gross floor space exceeding 3,750 sqm.

PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Summary of Policies

CS01 - Applying the presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development in Babergh

CLASSIFICATION: Official

CS02 - Settlement Pattern Policy
CS03 - Strategy for Growth and Development
CS08 - Sproughton Strategic Employment Land Allocation
CS12 - Design and Construction Standards
CS13 - Renewable / Low Carbon Energy
CS14 - Green Infrastructure
CS15 - Implementing Sustainable Development
CS16 - Town, Village and Local Centres
CS21 - Infrastructure Provision
CN01 - Design Standards
CN04 - Design & Crime Prevention
CN06 - Listed Buildings - Alteration/Ext/COU
CN14 - Historic Parks and Gardens - National
CN15 - Historic Parks and Gardens - Local
CR04 - Special Landscape Areas
EM02 - General Employment Areas - Existing and New Allocations
EM04 - Former British Sugar Sproughton
EM08 - Warehousing & Distribution
EN22 - Light Pollution - Outdoor Lighting
SP03 - Retail Development Outside Town Centres
TP05 - New cycle Link - Sproughton
TP15 - Parking Standards - New Development
TP16 - Green Travel Plans

Neighbourhood Plan Status

This application site is within a Neighbourhood Plan Area.

The Neighbourhood Plan is currently at:-

Stage 3: Pre-submission publicity and consultation
Accordingly, the Neighbourhood Plan has little weight.

Consultations and Representations

During the course of the application, Consultations and Representations from third parties have been received. These are summarised below.

A: Summary of Consultations

Town/Parish Council

Sproughton Parish Council

Initial response (8th March 2022)

Sproughton Parish Council objects to planning application DC/22/00682 in relation to the following issues. However, if these can be resolved and appropriate conditions imposed to address these issues, we would likely retract these objections.

Our first Issue: The Tetra Tech Noise Assessment report submitted with this application for units 4, 5, 7 & 8 on the SEP undermines the principles & policies against which the original outline application

(DC/17/05687) was approved. The original outline planning application for the site DC/17/05687 as considered and approved by the BDC Planning Committee in 2018 was supported by an Acoustic Technical Report that set the limits of the cumulative noise generated by the whole Sproughton Enterprise Park (DC/17/05687 development) such that the total should not exceed the local background noise at the surrounding residential receptors.

This is in line with the requirements of Policy CS8 (iv) no material adverse impacts on residential amenity; the proposition being that provided the noise level from the SEP measured at the residential receptors did not exceed the background noise at the residential receptors this would not create a noticeable increase in the noise impact on the residential amenity receptors. This principle was acceptable as it ensured there would be no increase in noise impact on the residential amenity from the whole cumulative noise impact of the S.E.P. /Eastern Gateway Site.

However, the Tetra Tech Noise Assessment report follows the principles normally applied to individual developments calculating the potential noise impact of the individual development on residential receptors and comparing that with a noise level the report considers acceptable. SPC object to this because it is not the process that was submitted in the outline planning application and would set a precedent to adopt this process for the rest of the development that would allow cumulative noise impact from the whole site to exceed the background noise which is not what was proposed and accepted in the original outline planning application.

We also object to this because this method of noise impact assessment allows for assumptions and generalisations to be adopted that do not recognise the true nature of the noise impact on individual residential homes. The Tetra Tech Noise Assessment adopts typical noise assessment assumptions about residential receptors using a modern standard of 30db noise reduction for double glazed windows and a 15db noise reduction for partially open double-glazed windows. However, the homes to the south of the site sitting on the valley side facing the development are not modern homes, they are predominantly older properties, at least 30 years old, many much older and some pre-1900. As such their windows vary enormously including single glazed, older double glazed, various frames, glass thicknesses and various frequency resonances that are factors not considered in the report. Even compared to the partially opened double glazed window considered a single glazed windows in an older house offers virtually no sound insulation fully opened on a hot summer's night. Indeed, it would be an impractical task to consider the sound insulating properties of all these windows. However, the principle submitted in the Outline Planning Application sets a fairer and simpler method of assessment that prevents any increase in noise levels at the residential receptors regardless of what windows may be installed

However, we hope that the survey data already obtained may be adequate to recalculate the noise impact of the proposed application in conformity with the standards originally agreed. It is important, as the development is built out, that new and different methods of noise assessment are not introduced and that the cumulative noise impact of new units on the site are not incorporated in the local background noise criteria otherwise there is the risk that the accepted threshold for noise impact on the residential amenity will increase.

We would also point out that this is not just important for the residential amenity but to limit the adverse impact noise will have on the Chantry Cut Island Nature Reserve that sits immediately to the South between the SEP/Eastern Gateway development and the residential areas. Noise, particularly high frequency noise, is a recognised deterrent used in pest control to move wildlife away from an area and any increased noise impact on the Nature Reserve is likely to have a detrimental impact on the value of this wildlife area.

Our second issue: concerns the building plant noise assessment. This assumed that the plant might be placed on the north side of the buildings as this was considered the 'worst case scenario' closer to the nearest residential receptors RO1 and RO2. In relation to RO1 this is not correct, Elton Park is closer. In relation to RO2 this is only marginally correct and dependent on how it is measured. For instance, RO2 is

further away from the position the plant is shown installed in Fig. 5.1 than RO4 would be from plant placed on the opposite (south) side of the same building. RO4, RO5 and RO6 receptors are closer on average than RO1 and RO2. RO1 and RO2 are also screened by the railway embankment as can be seen in Fig 5.1 whilst exposed to railway noise and a busy roundabout for an industrial park and 24hour supermarket. Whereas Elton Park sits exposed with just an open car park and the apparently completely overlooked wildlife in the Sproughton nature reserve between. This is a relatively quieter area and therefore like the nature reserve vulnerable to a greater adverse impact from noise

The Noise contour plots on figure 5.1 clearly show how the railway line shields RO1 and RO2 from any noise from the building plant and how if the plant is installed on the North side of the buildings the buildings shield the Elton Park area from any noise. But this report caveats that these are assumed plant positions that might be installed anywhere around the building. Clearly if this plant was installed in different positions both the nature reserve and the Elton park area could be exposed to unshielded direct exposure to this plant noise which we object to

From the drawing it can be seen that the plant for units 4 and 5 are positioned further South, unit 8 is slightly further east and unit 7 has plant installed near the South East corner that appears to have been unconsidered and is in a position that would potentially 'funnel' noise towards the Elton Park and nature Reserve areas.

If the assessment of noise impact from the true positions for this plant is reassessed and it does not exceed the local back ground noise at the residential receptors South of the development (conforming with the originally accepted limits set for DC/17/05687) this would be acceptable.

However, we understand that the end user is not confirmed and it is not known if additional plant may become a requirement so we would ask that a condition is set that any change to plant or additional plant is subjected to the same standard of noise assessment. (that it does not exceed the local back ground noise at the residential receptors)

Our third issue: is with regards to the Halligan Lighting Report. This lighting report has been assessed against environmental zone E3 (suburban) described as 'Medium district Brightness'; and typified as 'Well inhabited rural and urban settlements, small town centres of suburban locations' and whereas that may be appropriate looking North it is not appropriate looking South for which reason we object to this report.

The Chantry Cut Island Nature Reserve and River Valley Greenway sits immediately South of the Sproughton Enterprise Park and lighting impact on that area could have a significant detrimental effect on the nocturnal biodiversity which includes Owls, Bats and their prey and many twilight feeders like Otters, Deer etc.

It is also inappropriate to consider the residential area South of the site on the opposing river valley side as E3 suburban for lighting assessment. Elton Park estate is unlit and the lights in the adjacent housing areas all go out after 11pm. This unlit area is then backed by unlit parkland and woodland creating a vast predominantly dark and unlit environment overnight. So, all stray lighting from the S.E.P. to the south is very distinct and detrimental particularly to the wildlife area. As the purpose of planning application reports are to identify and protect the most sensitive assets of an area surely it is this area that should define the environmental zone and at the very least this should be described as a 'relatively dark outer suburban location' defining it as E2, 'Low District brightness' We believe that this lighting scheme may still be acceptable when assessed against an E2 environmental zone. However, we cannot agree with this report unless that is undertaken and proven, and cannot accept a precedent being set in relation to environmental assessments where the sensitivity of a Nature Reserve is ignored.

We would also ask that clear conditions are set to limit both light and noise disturbance on the residential amenity and Wildlife areas during the construction of this application to the generally accepted hours for noisy work of Monday to Friday 8.00am-6.00pm, Saturdays 8.30am-1.00pm. The construction of the adjacent Amazon Distribution unit raised many complaints when loud work and floodlights continued late into the evening and frequently from early in the morning impacting on the sleep of residents. This appeared to be the result of contractors being ignorant or ignoring any conditions and it took months before this was properly controlled. We do not want our residents to have to endure that again.

Our fourth issue; centres around the landscaping surrounding the proposed buildings. We believe the SEP should have as much planting as possible. Developments should be more creative and incorporate sections of green wall for example. It is laudable that Trebor have specified areas of planting including well-being areas. There is a reference to the hedgerows being indigenous which we believe is what is commonly referred to (& should be) native mix i.e. hawthorn, blackthorn, hazel, dog rose amongst others. Mixed hedgerows play a vitally important role as wildlife 'highways', nesting cover, and as a diverse source of food for many animals. They can support up to 80% of our native woodland bird population, 50% of our mammals, 30% of our butterflies and many species of insect. The grassy verge at the base of the hedge can also be home to reptiles and ground nesting birds. This may be slightly ambitious for a hedgerow in the middle of an industrial park but given SEP sits between the Gipping River, Sproughton Nature Reserve, and countryside it will contribute to maintaining a degree of biodiversity in the area.

We also feel that the trees planted next to the Well-Being areas should be fruit trees – this could be regarded as a 'scattered orchard' something our Neighbourhood Plan team are including in the new plan. In general, all planting should be pollinator friendly. It is also hoped that a small strip of planting around the edge of the new units (not shown on the plans) could be incorporated as grass but including wildflowers, again pollinator friendly providing cover for smaller animals. We understand that a minimum number of parking spaces must be included however we feel that it would be beneficial if the parking spaces could be separated at regular intervals by additional grass verges.

Our final issue is with regards to sustainability and the nationwide move towards net-zero carbon. We note that one plan includes a reference to photovoltaic panels. However, we feel that more is required. Photovoltaic and solar panels should be standard as should grey water recycling and the collection of rainwater to irrigate the green areas. It is hoped that heating will be via heat pumps be they ground or air source.

Subsequent comments (18th April 2022)

The changes on the planning portal for the application are two plans that show some additional acoustic screening fencing on the East Side of the development.

This however does not address our concerns about noise radiating to the South towards Elton Park and the Nature Reserve, neither does it address our concerns that the noise survey is making comparisons against the wrong criteria.

The criteria submitted in the outline planning application, which is what the BDC Planning Committee approved, was that the total noise of the Enterprise Park should not exceed the existing background noise. That means that as the enterprise park develops consideration must be made against the noise generated by the applicant cumulatively with any other noise generated by other units already in place and that total cumulative noise should not exceed the same level at residential receptors as the other surrounding background noise at that same receptor.

What this application is doing is conducting a unilateral noise survey only considering noise generated by their own units and judging that against an adopted noise guidance format as being within the limits of that format's recommended noise impact on residential receptors.

This completely ignores the issue of cumulative noise impact from all the projected units on top of background noise. Basically, if this is condoned and not challenged every new application can add a layer of noise potentially higher than the last application as the noise cumulatively increases. Whereas the agreed outline planning noise strategy sets a limit on the whole enterprise park not to exceed the measured background noise.

There was also an issue that the applicants noise survey based the noise impact on bedrooms protected with good quality double glazing and some homes impacted do not have that standard of sound proofing. Again, under the outline planning noise strategy at least any new units must pin back their noise impacts to an existing level regardless of what type of windows are in a house.

Final comments (16th May 2022)

With regards to our issue 5, We welcome the applicant's comments and proposed heat pump systems but consider that few businesses will actually install PV cells themselves on an existing warehouse. This is simply demonstrated by viewing existing warehousing on google earth to see how few actually have done that. Therefore, if PV cells are not included in the planning application/conditions we doubt that the end user will bother to install them just because the warehouses are 'wired' for PV cells. In view of the National/International crises developing around global warming and supply of fossil fuels we feel it should now be a condition for new development to have PV cells installed and would recommend that for this application.

With regards to our issue 4 we are grateful for the applicant's consideration for our suggestions. We would propose in relation to hedgerows and in the interests of wildlife, biodiversity and their future protection that planting of all new hedgerows should consist of a minimum of 7 of the woody species from the Schedule 3 list of The Hedgerows Regulations 1997 instead of the 4 proposed in the Biodiversity Management Plan, to be distributed over each 50 metre section of hedgerow or less and that any replacement planting required due to plant failure or damage should be Schedule 3 woody species to maintain that 7 species mix.

With regards to our issue 3 we are pleased for the assurance that the lighting contamination at the areas of concern will be within the E2 environmental zone standard. But would point out that the primary area of concern are the Island site and Gipping River corridor which are designated in the planning policy as nature areas and wildlife assets which by definition must then be E2 or better to protect them. These Nature areas are 180 metres from the site which is closer than the 300metres referenced to nearest residential amenity.

With regards to our issues 1 and 2 relating to noise impacts. We are confused by the documents published because we find Chris Cornish the BMSDC Environmental Officer approves the application based on the additional Acoustic Barrier to be built between Units 7 & 8 along their Southern Boundary. But in all the documents and drawings we can find on the planning portal for this application acoustic fences are only shown on the East sides of the sites. Only a fence described as an existing fence is shown to the South of units 7a/b and 8. Is there a revised drawing that has not been published yet or is the drawing presented wrongly labelled and in fact the Existing Fence is intended to be an Acoustic Fence? We are also concerned that the compressor plant for unit 7b is placed between unit 7b and unit 8 but Figure 5.1 Night-time LAeq Noise Contour plots in the Tetra tech report does not appear to have considered that noise source which would have a direct impact on the Nature Reserve and Elton Park residential area. So in absence of evidence that demonstrates consideration for the unit 7b compressor plant or of the implied Acoustic Fence on the South side of units 7b and 8 we would still have to object on this point.

With regards to the letter from UMC Architects dated 27th April 2022 forwarding the comments of their Noise Assessment Consultant and, with exception to the point raised in paragraph above, we are reassured by their assurance that the noise levels for this application would conform with the cumulative noise limits submitted in the outline planning application against which standard the outline planning application was

agreed by the Planning Committee. But as above the documents presently published on the planning portal appear to fall short of demonstrating that.

What is however very concerning is that this standard was not specified in the Outline Planning application conditions which leaves the potential for a cumulative noise impact on the residential amenity and Nature Area that would exceed the noise impact limits specified when the outline planning application was approved by the planning committee with the potential to cumulatively, along with all other development, create a noise nuisance beyond the WHO recommendations capable of having an adverse impact on social and mental health well-being and even impact on the physical health of residents and as the wildlife areas are closer an equally detrimental effect on the wildlife. We would like to know how this will be dealt with in future to ensure the limitations of noise impact from the SEP site on the residential amenity are restrained to what the planning committee approval was based on

Ipswich Borough Council

Design

The units will have a ridge height of approximately 15.5 metres or less. The height and massing of the buildings means they are likely to be visible in mid-distance views. A bund and retention of existing trees will provide natural screening and maintenance.

The design of the buildings is basic, though efforts have been made to break up the facades through the utilisation of cladding of different colours (greys, blue, anthracite and white). Use of metal cladding could create a reflective surface which would make the buildings appear brighter in the landscape. More natural colour hues or recessive colour grading may help the buildings to appear less visible in the landscape and could be explored with the applicant. Consideration should also be given to how the cladding material will weather following prolonged exposure to UV light.

The height of material stored in the outside service yards should be limited to the height of the boundary treatment to reduce the visual impact.

The application includes plans to minimise light spill from the service yards beyond the plot boundaries. This is supported but should be conditioned to ensure they are incorporated at the construction stage.

Landscaping

The proposal includes greens pace provision as part of landscaping proposals. A green buffer is proposed to screen the buildings from the surrounding areas. The green buffer comprises existing trees and the creation of bunds which will add to their effectiveness. The green buffer will require substantive planting of a sufficient width to ensure effective screening. Boundary landscaping should use native species where appropriate to the location. It is important that new trees are planted in the right places and solutions are found which are compatible with highways standards and the needs of different users. The proposed landscaping scheme appears to meet these requirements.

Amenity

The application is likely to generate noise from the site yard, machinery and workers. The proposed layout of the site yards is designed to reduce noise transfer. The landscaping proposal also includes plans for a green bund, which will help to reduce noise transfer from the site. The green bund/buffer will also provide screening which will reduce the visual impact of the buildings in the mid-distance. A more sympathetic cladding could also help to address the visual impact of the buildings.

Biodiversity

The ecological report submitted alongside this application states that 'the delivery of biodiversity enhancements across the wider site is critical to off-setting the impacts of the development and ensuring

that there is no net loss of biodiversity'. The report makes a number of recommendations for enhancing biodiversity on the site, in line with national planning policy. It is important that these recommendations are taken forward into the design of the development and conditioned where appropriate.

Air Quality

No air quality impact assessment has been submitted with this application. Ipswich Borough Council has recently adopted its Low Emissions SPD (2021) in light of the air quality issues identified in Ipswich and detailed in the Council's Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP). This site is expected to employ a high number of people. The site is located in close proximity to one of the main arterial routes into Ipswich town centre (Sproughton Road/Bramford Road). It is therefore essential that the application maximises the opportunities for sustainable transport modes.

The Council would ask that the submitted details are appropriate in terms of assessment against the Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2019), in particular assessment against the quantum of appropriate secure cycle and PTW storage spaces and EV charging spaces, including future infrastructure provision, as well as shower, changing and locker facilities within the proposed buildings to encourage staff use of bicycles. The current plans do not appear to accord with the SCC Guidance.

Conclusions

Matters of concern raised by the Borough Council in January 2018 appear to have been addressed through this reserve matters application. Structural landscaping plans have been prepared, as has an ecological report which considers matters of biodiversity interest. The design of the buildings and landscaping plans seek to address residential amenity concerns raised in 2018. As such Ipswich Borough Council raise no objection to the proposal, subject to compliance with the Suffolk Guidance for Parking.

National Consultee

Highways England:

No objection

Historic England:

No comments

Natural England:

No objection

MOD:

The MOD has no safeguarding objections to this proposal

County Council Responses

Highway Authority:

Further to the submission of additional information and amended plans, we are generally satisfied with the proposal to a degree where we can recommend planning conditions. However, it should be noted that we do not support the EV charging provision and methodology and subsequently, a planning condition relating to that element of the proposal for each unit is recommended. Recommend Conditions

Archaeology:

No archaeological conditions need to be attached to parcels 12, 13 & 15 of the former British Sugar factory, as these areas have been previously disturbed or have already been fully investigated.

Travel Planning:

On reviewing the Travel Plan submitted there is no evidence of any progress with the Site-Wide Travel Plan which was secured as part of the outline planning permission, as Suffolk County Council (as Highway Authority) have not received any monitoring, or seen any progress of Travel Plan implementation on Modeshift STARS Business system with the existing occupier on the site to date.

An update on the progress of the existing Travel Plan to demonstrate that it is being implemented will need to be submitted to Suffolk County Council prior to the determination of this reserved matters application.

Flood and Water Officer:

Recommend approval

Fire and Rescue:

Request condition for the installation of Fire Hydrants.

Anglian Water:

The impacts on the public foul sewerage network are acceptable to Anglian Water at this stage.

Minerals and Waste:

No comments

Internal Consultee Responses

Heritage:

No comments

Arboricultural Officer:

No objection to this application subject to it being undertaken in accordance with the measures outlined in the accompanying arboricultural report, an appropriate condition should be used for this purpose.

Place Services: Landscaping

Proposed landscape: The proposed landscaping combines a mix of native species and ornamental planting with tree planting to improve the streetscape throughout the development. Soft landscaping to boundary frontages helps softening the hard landscape created by the industrial units and large parking areas. We feel there is a need to soften the edge between car parking area and footway of Unit 4 with additional planting. If space is a constraint, the double staggered rows can be planted closer together - up to 300mm offset to create a narrower strip or planted as a single row in this instance.

We acknowledge that advance planting has taken place to the western boundary of Unit 4. We would recommend that the maintenance for this planting is carried over and managed by the Landscape Contractor responsible for implementing the works under this application area.

We welcome the proposed ecology mitigation proposals of invertebrate gardens and log/rock piles.

The provision of amenity wellbeing areas is most welcome. When looking at the location of the wellbeing area of Unit 5, we feel that it has been pushed to the far corner and could benefit from being better integrated within the proposed soft landscape area.

We have notice that the planting palette includes Viburnum tinus 'Eve Price'. Viburnum tinus spp. can be severely damaged by Viburnum beetle and often produces an unpleasant smell particularly when the foliage is wet. We recommend that Viburnum tinus 'Eve Price' is removed from the planting palette and replaced with a more suitable alternative.

We welcome the use of native species for the new hedge planting. We found the proposed tree and hedge species appropriate.

Boundary treatment

We found the proposed boundary treatment acceptable. The colour black chosen for the 2.4 high fencing will help to reduce its visual appearance.

Landscape management

A landscape management plan for 5 years has been submitted as per our previous recommendations to support plant establishment.

There is no reference to mulching or mulching operations in the management plan and the subsequent annual top up where necessary. Mulch would assist with moisture retention and weed suppression around establishing planting. We ask that this is considered or justified in case of its omission.

The need for removal of the shelter guards should be assessed regularly and remove where the growth of the planting is sufficiently sturdy, and guards are becoming brittle. Its removal can sometimes be necessary earlier, between 2-3 years.

Environmental Protection - Sustainability:

The information included in the documents details that the applicant has complied with Condition 21 from the decision of the original Outline planning permission through the adoption of fabric first techniques, improved air tightness, the use of Air Source Heat Pumps and Solar Photovoltaics

I have viewed the applicant's new documents and whilst the number of EV charging points appears to have increased they are still insufficient.

OFFICER COMMENT – This issue is discussed in the main body of the report.

Environmental Protection - noise, odours etc:

Original Comments (10th March 2022)

With regards to version 4 of the Noise assessment undertaken by Tetra Tech dated 4th March 2022.

The assessment carries out a BS4142 assessment comparing a noise rating level to existing background noise levels established during a survey in September 2021. The assessment also considers noise

intrusion based on BS8233 and WHO guideline values for internal noise levels; however, these standards are outside of the scope for assessing the impacts of commercial and industrial noise on existing residential dwellings.

However, the BS4142 assessment is sufficient for determining the potential noise impacts of the proposals presented.

With regards to the background noise survey, which covers residential dwellings to the south and east of the site. The selected representative background noise levels in relevant to Elton Park area south of the application site are consistent with levels established by Babergh Mid Suffolk District Councils Environmental protection team in 2019 during the consultation process for the Amazon Fulfilment centre to the south and south west of the area covered by this application with a deviation of +1 for night time levels and – 5 for daytime noise levels. Therefore the background levels reported by Tetra Tech are appropriate

Plant noise

The assessment has modelled sound propagation of typical plant associated with commercial units, located in close boarded enclosures on the northern façade of unit 8 and the eastern facades of units 4, 5 and 7a/b. A +2dB penalty has been added to the noise rating level to allow for the character typical for plant of this nature.

The Noise Rating levels at the nearest receptors East and south of the site ranges from -20 to -10 and is therefore, not considered to have a significant adverse impact.

This is based on the assessment assumptions presented including the acoustic enclosure compound for the plant and locations of plant and as such conditions concerning the locations of plant, the close boarded compound fencing and a report confirming the selected equipment and its sound output compared to this assessment to validate the results prior to first use should be applied to any permission granted.

Operation Noise

The assessment has modelled the sound impact of lorry deliveries arriving at site being unloaded and leaving in consideration of the methodology in BS4142. The assessment without mitigation has identified that location R01 will have a Noise Rating level of +7dB which is between an adverse impact and significant adverse impact. In line with guidance from the NPPG for noise mitigation has been recommended in the form of 2 x 2m high Close Boarded barriers as shown in Figure 6,1.

It is noted that location R06 will experience noise levels at night at least 2dB above background (+3 based on 8hour LA90 surveys in 2019) which leaves very little room for any inherent uncertainties in the modelling. It appears from the models that this is largely due to unloading operations servicing units 7a and b. I would therefore recommend that a close boarded barrier as shown in figure 6.1 is also located between these units and unit 8.

This also ensures that noise levels do not exceed background levels and reduces the potential for noise creep as additional units on the development are added.

I would therefore recommend conditions requiring the submission of detailed plans for the acoustic barriers prior to the commencement of development.

I therefore have no objection to the proposed units subject to conditions relating to the location of plant and validation of the acoustic assessment using the actual plant installed prior to first operation and a prior to

commencement condition concerning the details of the acoustic barriers recommended by the tetra tech report plus an additional barrier between units 7 and 8 along the southern boundary.

Subsequent comments (21st April 2022)

Thank you for the above re-consultation due to additional information concerning additional acoustic barriers between units 7a/b and unit 8 to reduce noise from deliveries propagating south towards Elton Park which addresses comments made by Environmental Protection dated 10th March 2022.

Environmental Protection therefore have no objection to the above application subject to subject to conditions relating to the location of plant and validation of the acoustic assessment using the actual plant installed prior to first operation and a prior to commencement condition concerning the details of the acoustic barriers recommended by the tetra tech report plus an additional barrier between units 7 and 8 along the southern boundary as shown in the drawings submitted for re consultation.

Environmental Protection: Air quality

The operational impact of the development on air quality is predicted to be negligible, based on this assessment using predicted worst case traffic flows for the different land use classes that are involved in the development. Therefore, no mitigation is recommended. In terms of the construction phase, various methods are recommended to reduce emissions and the impact on air quality (Appendix H). I would hope that these measures have been/will be included in the Construction Environmental Management Plan, and that if this condition has not already been discharged that there would be the opportunity to comment on the air quality aspects of this.

Economic Development

The Economy Team are fully supportive of this application, as it will enable the next phase of development at the Eastern Gateway site and facilitate the creation of a further 70 jobs on this key Enterprise Zone site.

This site was purchased by Ipswich Borough Council and designated as an Enterprise Zone in 2016 after many years where the site had stood empty and proved unviable to redevelop without public intervention.

The very successful redevelopment by IBC on this site has already led to the opening of 2 substantial businesses – LaDoria and Amazon which have created in the region of 850 new jobs and this new application will see 160,000sqft of speculative commercial space created by Trebor Developments. This deal shows real confidence in the market and we understand that significant interest has already been shown in these new units.

The units are also proposed to be BREAAAM Excellent which aligns with our wider net zero ambitions.

In total 36 acres of this key site have now been sold or are under contract, out of a total developable area of 63 acres (exclusive of roads and infrastructure) bringing significant new jobs and opportunities for residents and businesses in Babergh.

If the application is approved, we would like an employment & skills condition to be included

B: Representations

At the time of writing this report at least two letters/emails/online comments have been received. It is the officer opinion that this represents two general comments. A verbal update shall be provided as necessary.

Views are summarised below:

- Would like the acoustic modelling to be considered the worse-case scenario for properties on Elton Park.
- Concern that the residents of the properties on Elton Park could be detrimentally affected by noise.
- Previous development in the area (De Lorio) contradicts the previous plans for the area due to building height, noise, light pollution and impact on wildlife.
- Flooding needs to be considered
- The restrictive tonnage, traffic restrictions over the bridge at Sproughton Road are regularly ignored.
- Impact on wildlife on adjacent conservation area
- Development needs to provide for the right kind of jobs.

(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

There are approximately 40 applications on this site. This information is at the foot of this report in the interests of clarity.

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1.0 The Site and Surroundings

- 1.1. Eastern Gateway amounts to 51.2ha and is located immediately to the south of Junction 54 of the A14 as it meets Sproughton Road. The Site wholly falls within the parish of Sproughton, although it abuts the administrative boundary between the district of Babergh and the borough of Ipswich on its eastern edge; Ipswich town centre lies to the south-east. The A14 runs parallel to the western boundary of the site and is a major trunk road.
- 1.2 The site comprises Parcels 12, 13 and 15 of Eastern Gateway. Parcels 12 and 13 are located immediately east of the vehicular access into the wider site from Sproughton Road, while Parcel 15 is diagonally opposite parcels 12 and 13, east of the Amazon warehouse.
- 1.3 The current occupiers of Eastern Gateway are LDH, situated west of Parcels 12 and 13 and Amazon, situated south of Parcels 12 and 13 and west of Parcel 15. On the opposite side of Sproughton Road is Farthing Road industrial estate. The nearest residential properties are located to the south/south-east on Elton Park approximately 300 metres distant, separated by the river Gipping and vegetation of varying degrees of maturity and thickness.
- 1.4 The site is currently undeveloped land surrounded by estate roads, which incorporate verges with trees. The site falls within Flood Zone 1, where there is a very low probability (less than 1 in 1000 annually) of river or sea (fluvial) flooding. The existing nature of the land also means that there is presently considered to be a low risk of surface water (pluvial) flooding.

- 1.5 The site is neither within, nor adjacent to, a Conservation Area. Nor is it within or adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Air Quality Management Area, Local Green Space, or Area of Visual/Recreational Amenity.

2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1. The proposal is for industrial development with ancillary office space (B2/B8 & E(g)ii)/E(g)iii), including related servicing arrangements, car parking, landscaping, and associated works. The proposals involve the construction of five industrial premises (units 4, 5, 7a, 7b and 8). This is a speculative development by Trebor, a specialist commercial developer and the final occupiers are not yet known.
- 2.2. As the development is speculative, the proposed uses for the units are B2 (general industry), B8 (storage and distribution), E(g)ii) research and development and E(g)iii) light industry. The size of the units ranges from 1199 m² to 4863 m². Units 5, 7a&b and 8 are approximately 13 metres in height and unit 4 is 15 m in height.
- 2.3 The units would be clad in composite cladding of various grey shade, generally darker grey walls graduating to light grey roofs. The roofs would consist of shallow pitched roofs with rooflights, concealed by parapets.
- 2.4 The proposed parking is as follows:

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Unit 4: 56 | (38 required by Suffolk Parking Guidance) |
| Unit 5: 54 | (32 required) |
| Unit 7A:14 | (12 required) |
| Unit 7B: 18 | (15 required) |
| Unit 8: 34 | (24 required) |

The parking spaces for units 7A and 7Bs are in accordance with the Suffolk Parking Standards, units 4, 5 and 8 are significantly above the minimum required for B8 but this will give additional flexibility should the units be used for an alternative approved use.

3.0 The Principle Of Development

- 3.1. The site has a long standing employment use and the principle of development was determined with the granting of the outline planning consent under planning application no. DC/17/05687. Following the grant of outline planning permission, the key question for Members has now moved to whether the detailed form of the development proposed is acceptable in respect of access; scale; layout; appearance; and landscaping. Through the grant of planning permission, it is implicit that there must be an acceptable form of reserved matters arising out of that permission and for each development area that has been approved. As noted, the scope/parameters of such an acceptable presentation were set by the outline planning permission to which these reserved matters accord.
- 3.2. This is important because the extent and nature of the planning permission that has been granted has set an “envelope” of assessments and judgements about the development to be carried through to the reserved matters and the implementation of the scheme. This reflects good planning practice and it is commonplace for outline planning proposals/permissions to set very clear parameters for the development to be brought forward under that permission. This gives confidence in the

robustness of assessments already made and a degree of certainty in respect of what is to be brought forward.

- 3.3 There are a number of such parameters affecting the Eastern Gateway, including: scale (28-metre site-wide building height restriction); spatial arrangement (i.e. areas specified for built development); and approved uses. Relevant to the outline planning permission, the Eastern Gateway is restricted to providing no more than 90,000sqm Gross Internal Area⁸ ("GIA") of B2, B8 and E (g) ii & iii floorspace, of which no more than 13,950sqm GIA can comprise B1(a) floorspace.
- 3.4 The proposed development sits within approved developable areas for built development. The maximum height of the facility would be 15 metres. The proposed development would take up approximately 14,886 sqm GIA of B8/B2/ E(g) ii and iii floorspace which, along with the Amazon and LHD sites would still be significantly below the 90,000sqm GIA permitted under planning application DC/17/05687.
- 3.5 Having regard to those parameters, the proposed development fully accords with the outline planning permission for the Eastern Gateway and is acceptable in principle. In light of the above, and acknowledging the background and policy context which underpin the application, the report will now move on to assess the reserved matters for the proposed development.

4.0 Nearby Services and Connections Assessment Of Proposal

- 4.1. This matter was dealt with at Outline.

5.0 Site Access, Parking And Highway Safety Considerations

- 5.1. Site access / egress to land parcels 12, 13 and 15 has been established by the grant of Outline Planning Permission DC/17/05687 and Reserved Matters applications DC/19/04840 and DC/22/00828.
- 5.2 The current parking numbers are based on the use of the units for B8 storage and distribution, as this is considered the most likely use of the units, albeit that units 4, 5 and 8 provide significantly above the minimum required. It is proposed to include a condition on any approval, that prior to any occupation of the building hereby approved for any use within Use Class B2 or E(g), a revised car parking and service yard scheme that shall have been first submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. The submissions of the revised scheme shall include details of the proposed occupier and the associated parking, servicing, and manoeuvring requirements. As a non-B8 use is likely to require smaller areas for lorry loading and servicing yards, this area could be used for additional car parking
- 5.3 Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2019) states that B1, B2 and B8 uses should provide 20% of spaces with EV chargers (7.4kw) and 20% more should be fitted with infrastructure for future connectivity. The developer is concerned that 20% EV chargers is excessive for B8 uses and that EV chargers installed at construction stage will become obsolete before they are required, especially as the units may be built speculatively. They are proposing 5% EV chargers at construction stage with the infrastructure included for an additional 35% EV chargers.
- 5.4 Providing infrastructure rather than including the EV chargers has the disadvantage that the chargers may never be provided (as they may involve an outlay to the business), or that employees of the units are discouraged from buying electric vehicles as there are limited EV chargers. As a

compromise it is proposed to include a condition that, on first use of the individual units, a strategy for providing additional EV chargers is included. This would have an expectation that, for the first 3 years, an additional 5% of parking spaces are provided with EV chargers until 20% is reached, unless evidence is provided (for example staff surveys) to show that an alternative number of EV chargers are required.

6.0 Design And Layout [Impact On Street Scene]

- 6.1 The general layout of the units has been dictated by the estate roads; units 4 and 5 have been set back from Sproughton Road, allowing for the retention of the existing highway trees. Both these units have similar layouts with service yards to the side and parking to the front. Unit 7 is divided into two units, 7a adjacent to the road and 7b behind, with servicing and parking to the front. Unit 8 is set back from the road with servicing and parking to the front.
- 6.2 The layout is relatively dense, with only minimal space for landscaping; however, this is in character with the remaining industrial estate. Units 4 and 5 will be clearly visible from Sproughton Road, while there will be longer distance views of units 7 and 8 before the site to the front is developed. However, the development will be in character with surrounding development within the industrial estate and along Sproughton Road, which comprises industrial/ commercial premises and car showrooms.
- 6.3 The design of the buildings is functional, as rectangular box-type structures. The buildings will be similar in design and materials/colours to the LDH and to a lesser extent the Amazon building, although the scale will be much smaller. The design of the four units will be co-ordinated, giving a sense of cohesiveness. The design of the buildings is considered acceptable within the context of the wider site.

7.0 Landscape Impact, Trees, Ecology, Biodiversity And Protected Species

- 7.1 The current site has little landscape value and, while the development will provide minimal landscaping, all the units will have some landscaping to help break up the sites. Outside the site there are also highway verges which are proposed to have accompanying street trees. Each of the units will have a small outside seating area for staff. The Landscape Officer is broadly supportive of the proposed landscaping.
- 7.2 The development of Unit 4 will involve the removal of a number of trees from the centre of the site. The aboricultural officer has no objection to this.
- 7.3 An ecological survey was undertaken as part of the application, it indicated that the current derelict industrial site provides a habitat for invertebrates and potential nesting opportunities for Little Ringed Plovers. In addition, there is an existing bat roost within one of the trees to be removed. The development will include on-site ecology mitigation proposals comprising invertebrate gardens and log/rock piles, this is in addition to the site-wide ecological measures, including replacement brownfield type habitats along the southern and western boundaries. A licence from Natural England will be required in relation to the removal of the bat roost. Bat boxes are proposed on buildings and retained trees within the wider site.

8.0 Land Contamination, Flood Risk, Drainage and Waste

8.1 Land contamination was considered at outline stage and that permission included conditions to protect future employees within the site from land contamination. The site is within Flood Zone 1 and is at low risk of both river and surface water flooding. Within the Eastern Gateway there are site-wide suds features. The Flood and Water Officer has recommended approval of the development.

9.0 Impact On Residential Amenity

9.1 The key issue in relation to residential amenity is potential noise from the units, especially in conjunction with noise from the existing and additional proposed units. This is a particular concern of Sproughton Parish Council. It should be noted that the nearest residential properties are 300 metres from the proposed units, although sound will carry across the intervening countryside.

9.2 The developer has responded to concerns by providing additional acoustic fencing between units 7 and 8 which should protect the occupiers of Elton Park from detrimental noise from lorries manoeuvring. The Environmental Management Officer now considers that the impact from noise from the proposal will be acceptable. The Parish Council remains concerned particularly due to the cumulative impacts with additional units in the future; however, the cumulative impact of the new units and LHD and Amazon has been considered and any future units will need to be considered on their own merits.

10.0 Parish Council Comments

10.1 The majority of matters raised by Sproughton Parish Council have been considered in the report above. With regards to the concern in relation to the lighting on the Gipping corridor (and subsequent residential dwellings) it is proposed to include a condition to ensure that the proposed lighting is wildlife friendly.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

11.0 Planning Balance and Conclusion

11.1 The principle of development has previously been agreed with the approval of planning application DC/17/05687. The development will provide 5 additional B8/B2/E(g) units of different sizes within the Sproughton Enterprise Park/ Eastern Gateway, these will be smaller than the existing units (LDH and Amazon) and provide provision for a greater range of businesses. The development is fully supported by the Economic Development Team and will support a significant number of jobs. The site is in a sustainable location and is relatively accessible from both North East Ipswich and Sproughton.

12.2 The overall design of the units is acceptable and the design is in character with the other units on the wider site. Access, parking, flooding and noise impact have all been assessed and are considered acceptable. However, the number of EV chargers proposed is less than guidance recommends. The development accords with development plan policies (principally CS08) and will have a positive long term impact for both Babergh District and Ipswich Borough areas.

RECOMMENDATION

That the reserved matters planning application is GRANTED and includes the following conditions:

- Approved Plans (Plans submitted that form this application)
- Construction Plan to be agreed including construction hours, contractors parking, delivery routes and measures to decrease the impact of the development on local air quality.
- Details location of plant and validation of the acoustic assessment using the actual plant installed prior to first operation
- details of location and design of acoustic barriers
- Implementation of noise management and mitigation
- Implementation of ecological mitigation
- Wildlife friendly lighting plan
- Revisions to parking proposals for any non B8 user
- Height limit for outside storage
- EV charger strategy
- As further required by SCC (LHA)
- Local employment and training opportunities plan
- Development in accordance with the arboricultural report

Planning History

REF: DC/17/04873

Screening Opinion-Proposed redevelopment of the site to provide an Enterprise Park comprising up to 90,000sqm GIA of employment floorspace (B1/B2/B8), 9,000sqm GIA of motor vehicle sales (sui generis), a local centre (accommodating with up to 1,250 sqm NIA of retail floorspace including local retail and services (A1 and A2) restaurants, pubs and takeaways (A3, A4, A5), an 80-bed hotel (C1); new and improved access from Sproughton Road, new landscaping, infrastructure, utilities, engineering works and demolition.

DECISION: EAN
17.10.2017

REF: DC/17/06058

Planning Application - Construction of infrastructure to serve the first phase of development at Sproughton Enterprise Park including highways, parking, cycle and pedestrian routes, utilities and sustainable drainage systems, provision of landscaping and removal/management of existing landscaping and engineering works (including demolition of existing structures and buildings, breaking-up and recycling of hardstanding and ground remodelling and enabling works).

DECISION: GTD
20.04.2018

REF: DC/19/03371

Submission of details under Outline Planning Permission DC/17/05687 - Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for a warehouse (Class B8) with ancillary office accommodation (Class B1), associated car parking, van storage, cycle parking, pedestrian access arrangements, landscaping and infrastructure.

DECISION: GTD
07.11.2019

REF: DC/19/04840

Application for approval of reserved matters relating to DC/17/05687 - Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for 214m of new road, attenuation basin number 2 and associated landscaping and utilities (drainage, gas, water, electricity and communications) for Development Areas 11 and 19 and part 4.

DECISION: GTD
07.11.2019

REF: DC/22/00828

Application for approval of Reserved Matters following Outline Planning Permission DC/17/05687 dated: 03/12/2018 - Access,

DECISION: PCO

Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for construction of a further phase of infrastructure (Phase 2B) including 510m of new roads, footway/cycleway, associated landscaping, access bell mouths and utilities (including gas, water, electricity, communications, drainage, sewerage and construction of new pumping station) for Development Areas 7, Part 6b, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15 and 17, 18 and Part 19.

REF: DC/17/04873

Screening Opinion-Proposed redevelopment of the site to provide an Enterprise Park comprising up to 90,000sqm GIA of employment floorspace (B1/B2/B8), 9,000sqm GIA of motor vehicle sales (sui generis), a local centre (accommodating with up to 1,250 sqm NIA of retail floorspace including local retail and services (A1 and A2) restaurants, pubs and takeaways (A3, A4, A5), an 80-bed hotel (C1); new and improved access from Sproughton Road, new landscaping, infrastructure, utilities, engineering works and demolition.

DECISION: EAN
17.10.2017

REF: DC/17/04936

Screening Opinion - Regulation 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 - Proposed redevelopment of the site to provide an Enterprise park 90,000sqm GIA of employment floorspace(B1/B2/B8, 9,000sqm GIA of Motor Vehicle Sales (sui generis), a local centre (accommodating with up to 1,250sqm NIA of retail floorspace including local retail and services (A1 and A2) Restauarants, pubs and takeaways (A3,A4 A5) together with an 80 bed hotel (C1); new and improved access from Sproughton Road; together with the provision of landscaping, infrastructure (inc. movement (highways, parkingcycle and pedestrian routes), utilities(gas, electricity, water, sewage and telecommunications) and sustainable drainage systems), engineering works inc demolition of existing structures and buildings, breaking-up and recycling of hardstanding and group remodelling and enabling works).

DECISION: EAN
17.10.2017

REF: DC/17/06058

Planning Application - Construction of infrastructure to serve the first phase of

DECISION: GTD
20.04.2018

development at Sproughton Enterprise Park including highways, parking, cycle and pedestrian routes, utilities and sustainable drainage systems, provision of landscaping and removal/management of existing landscaping and engineering works (including demolition of existing structures and buildings, breaking-up and recycling of hardstanding and ground remodelling and enabling works).

| | | |
|-------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| REF: DC/19/03371 | Submission of details under Outline Planning Permission DC/17/05687 - Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for a warehouse (Class B8) with ancillary office accommodation (Class B1), associated car parking, van storage, cycle parking, pedestrian access arrangements, landscaping and infrastructure. | DECISION: GTD 07.11.2019 |
| REF: DC/19/04840 | Application for approval of reserved matters relating to DC/17/05687 - Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for 214m of new road, attenuation basin number 2 and associated landscaping and utilities (drainage, gas, water, electricity and communications) for Development Areas 11 and 19 and part 4. | DECISION: GTD 07.11.2019 |
| REF: DC/20/01275 | Non-Material Amendment to DC/19/03371 - Lowering of finished floor level, relocation of bollards in relation to canopies over van loading areas, relocation of some louvres, provision of additional louvres, removal of roof hatches, provision of extract flues at roof level, glazed panels added to door at left hand end of south elevation, change of colour to window surrounds on north elevation and reduction in number of PV panels | DECISION: GTD 03.04.2020 |
| REF: DC/20/03691 | Application for consent to display an advertisement(s) - Installation of 54no. Non-illuminated directional signs | DECISION: GTD 06.10.2020 |
| REF: DC/21/06666 | Non-Material Amendment sought following Outline Planning Permission DC/17/05687 - Amendments to Development Areas Plan and Parameters Plan to allow removal of an | DECISION: GTD 13.01.2022 |

ancillary road on the south eastern corner of the site between Development Areas 20 and 22

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| REF: DC/22/00610 | Application for a Non-Material Admendment relating to DC/17/05687 - Amendment to plan no 619185-MLM-ZZ-XX-DR-C-0650 P02 allowing: 1. The removal of an ancillary road between Development Areas 20 and 22 2. The moving south of the northern boundary of Development Areas 12 and 13 to avoid a conflict with buried services. | DECISION: PCO |
| REF: DC/22/00682 | Application for Approval of Reserved Matters following Outline Approval DC/17/05687 - Submission of details for Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for an Industrial development with ancillary office space (B2/B8 & E(g)ii)/E(giii)), including related servicing arrangements, car parking, landscaping, and associated works. | DECISION: PCO |
| REF: DC/22/00828 | Application for approval of Reserved Matters following Outline Planning Permission DC/17/05687 dated: 03/12/2018 - Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for construction of a further phase of infrastructure (Phase 2B) including 510m of new roads, footway/cycleway, associated landscaping, access bell mouths and utilities (including gas, water, electricity, communications, drainage, sewerage and construction of new pumping station) for Development Areas 7, Part 6b, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15 and 17, 18 and Part 19. | DECISION: PCO |
| REF: DC/17/03406 | Planning Application - Erection of 30m high tower fitted with peregrine falcon nesting box. | DECISION: GTD 21.08.2017 |
| REF: DC/17/04873 | Screening Opinion-Proposed redevelopment of the site to provide an Enterprise Park comprising up to 90,000sqm GIA of employment floorspace (B1/B2/B8), 9,000sqm GIA of motor vehicle sales (sui generis), a local centre (accommodating with up to 1,250 sqm NIA of retail floorspace including local retail and services (A1 and A2) restaurants, pubs and takeaways (A3, A4, A5), an 80-bed hotel (C1); new and improved access from Sroughton Road, new | DECISION: EAN 17.10.2017 |

landscaping, infrastructure, utilities, engineering works and demolition.

REF: DC/17/04936

Screening Opinion - Regulation 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 - Proposed redevelopment of the site to provide an Enterprise park 90,000sqm GIA of employment floorspace(B1/B2/B8, 9,000sqm GIA of Motor Vehicle Sales (sui generis), a local centre (accommodating with up to 1,250sqm NIA of retail floorspace including local retail and services (A1 and A2) Restaurants, pubs and takeaways (A3,A4 A5) together with an 80 bed hotel (C1); new and improved access from Sproughton Road; together with the provision of landscaping, infrastructure (inc. movement (highways, parkingcycle and pedestrian routes), utilities(gas, electricity, water, sewage and telecommunications) and sustainable drainage systems), engineering works inc demolition of existing structures and buildings, breaking-up and recycling of hardstanding and group remodelling and enabling works).

DECISION: EAN
17.10.2017

REF: DC/17/05687

Outline Planning Application - Development of an Enterprise Park comprising up to 90,000sqm GIA of employment floorspace (B1/B2/B8), 9,000sqm GIA of motor vehicle sales (sui generis), a local centre (accommodating with up to 1,250 sqm NIA of retail floorspace including local retail and services (A1 and A2) restaurants, pubs and takeaways (A3, A4, A5) together with an 80-bed hotel (C1); new and improved access from Sproughton Road; together with the provision of landscaping, infrastructure (including movement (highways, parking, cycle and pedestrian routes), utilities (including gas, electricity, water, sewerage, telecommunications) and sustainable drainage systems), and engineering works (including demolition of existing structures and buildings, breaking-up and recycling of hardstanding and ground remodelling and enabling works).

DECISION: GTD
03.12.2018

REF: DC/19/03371

Submission of details under Outline Planning Permission DC/17/05687 - Access,

DECISION: GTD
07.11.2019

Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for a warehouse (Class B8) with ancillary office accommodation (Class B1), associated car parking, van storage, cycle parking, pedestrian access arrangements, landscaping and infrastructure.

- REF:** DC/19/04840 Application for approval of reserved matters relating to DC/17/05687 - Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for 214m of new road, attenuation basin number 2 and associated landscaping and utilities (drainage, gas, water, electricity and communications) for Development Areas 11 and 19 and part 4. **DECISION:** GTD
07.11.2019
- REF:** DC/20/01275 Non-Material Amendment to DC/19/03371 - Lowering of finished floor level, relocation of bollards in relation to canopies over van loading areas, relocation of some louvres, provision of additional louvres, removal of roof hatches, provision of extract flues at roof level, glazed panels added to door at left hand end of south elevation, change of colour to window surrounds on north elevation and reduction in number of PV panels **DECISION:** GTD
03.04.2020
- REF:** DC/20/03691 Application for consent to display an advertisement(s) - Installation of 54no. Non-illuminated directional signs **DECISION:** GTD
06.10.2020
- REF:** DC/21/06666 Non-Material Amendment sought following Outline Planning Permission DC/17/05687 - Amendments to Development Areas Plan and Parameters Plan to allow removal of an ancillary road on the south eastern corner of the site between Development Areas 20 and 22 **DECISION:** GTD
13.01.2022
- REF:** DC/22/00610 Application for a Non-Material Admendment relating to DC/17/05687 - Amendment to plan no 619185-MLM-ZZ-XX-DR-C-0650 P02 allowing: 1. The removal of an ancillary road between Development Areas 20 and 22 2. The moving south of the northern boundary of Development Areas 12 and 13 to avoid a conflict with buried services. **DECISION:** PCO

| | | |
|-------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| REF: DC/22/00682 | Application for Approval of Reserved Matters following Outline Approval DC/17/05687 - Submission of details for Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for an Industrial development with ancillary office space (B2/B8 & E(g)ii/E(giii)), including related servicing arrangements, car parking, landscaping, and associated works. | DECISION: PCO |
| REF: DC/22/00828 | Application for approval of Reserved Matters following Outline Planning Permission DC/17/05687 dated: 03/12/2018 - Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for construction of a further phase of infrastructure (Phase 2B) including 510m of new roads, footway/cycleway, associated landscaping, access bell mouths and utilities (including gas, water, electricity, communications, drainage, sewerage and construction of new pumping station) for Development Areas 7, Part 6b, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15 and 17, 18 and Part 19. | DECISION: PCO |
| REF: DC/17/04873 | Screening Opinion-Proposed redevelopment of the site to provide an Enterprise Park comprising up to 90,000sqm GIA of employment floorspace (B1/B2/B8), 9,000sqm GIA of motor vehicle sales (sui generis), a local centre (accommodating with up to 1,250 sqm NIA of retail floorspace including local retail and services (A1 and A2) restaurants, pubs and takeaways (A3, A4, A5), an 80-bed hotel (C1); new and improved access from Sproughton Road, new landscaping, infrastructure, utilities, engineering works and demolition. | DECISION: EAN 17.10.2017 |
| REF: DC/17/04936 | Screening Opinion - Regulation 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 - Proposed redevelopment of the site to provide an Enterprise park 90,000sqm GIA of employment floorspace(B1/B2/B8, 9,000sqm GIA of Motor Vehicle Sales (sui generis), a local centre (accommodating with up to 1,250sqm NIA of retail floorspace including local retail and services (A1 and A2) Restauarants, pubs and takeaways (A3,A4 A5) together with an 80 bed hotel (C1); new and improved access from Sproughton Road; together with the provision of landscaping, | DECISION: EAN 17.10.2017 |

infrastructure (inc. movement (highways, parking cycle and pedestrian routes), utilities (gas, electricity, water, sewage and telecommunications) and sustainable drainage systems), engineering works inc demolition of existing structures and buildings, breaking-up and recycling of hardstanding and ground remodelling and enabling works).

- REF:** DC/17/06058 Planning Application - Construction of infrastructure to serve the first phase of development at Sproughton Enterprise Park including highways, parking, cycle and pedestrian routes, utilities and sustainable drainage systems, provision of landscaping and removal/management of existing landscaping and engineering works (including demolition of existing structures and buildings, breaking-up and recycling of hardstanding and ground remodelling and enabling works). **DECISION:** GTD
20.04.2018
- REF:** DC/18/03532 Application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act- B/16/00762/FUL; Variation of Condition 1 (Expiry of Permission) **DECISION:** GTD
31.08.2018
- REF:** DC/19/04258 Discharge of Conditions Application for DC/17/05687 - Condition 8 (Management and Maintenance) (Part Discharge in relation to Development Areas 11 and 19 only) **DECISION:** GTD
02.10.2019
- REF:** DC/19/04840 Application for approval of reserved matters relating to DC/17/05687 - Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for 214m of new road, attenuation basin number 2 and associated landscaping and utilities (drainage, gas, water, electricity and communications) for Development Areas 11 and 19 and part 4. **DECISION:** GTD
07.11.2019
- REF:** DC/21/06666 Non-Material Amendment sought following Outline Planning Permission DC/17/05687 - Amendments to Development Areas Plan and Parameters Plan to allow removal of an ancillary road on the south eastern corner of the site between Development Areas 20 and 22 **DECISION:** GTD
13.01.2022

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|----------------------|
| REF: DC/22/00610 | Application for a Non-Material Admendment relating to DC/17/05687 - Amendment to plan no 619185-MLM-ZZ-XX-DR-C-0650 P02 allowing: 1. The removal of an ancillary road between Development Areas 20 and 22 2. The moving south of the northern boundary of Development Areas 12 and 13 to avoid a conflict with buried services. | DECISION: PCO |
| REF: DC/22/00682 | Application for Approval of Reserved Matters following Outline Approval DC/17/05687 - Submission of details for Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for an Industrial development with ancillary office space (B2/B8 & E(g)ii)/E(g)iii), including related servicing arrangements, car parking, landscaping, and associated works. | DECISION: PCO |
| REF: DC/22/00828 | Application for approval of Reserved Matters following Outline Planning Permission DC/17/05687 dated: 03/12/2018 - Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for construction of a further phase of infrastructure (Phase 2B) including 510m of new roads, footway/cycleway, associated landscaping, access bell mouths and utilities (including gas, water, electricity, communications, drainage, sewerage and construction of new pumping station) for Development Areas 7, Part 6b, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15 and 17, 18 and Part 19. | DECISION: PCO |