

Committee Report

Item No: 7B

Reference: DC/21/05596

Case Officer: Jasmine Whyard

Ward: Claydon & Barham.

Ward Member/s: Cllr Timothy Passmore. Cllr John Whitehead.

RECOMMENDATION – GRANT FULL PLANNING PERMISSION

Description of Development

Full Planning Application. Change of use of part of land to use as a construction and agricultural training facility including new training centre and associated car park and hardstand, equipment/machinery store and scaffold area. Change of use of remainder of land to use for the grazing of horses and sheep including new stables and storage shed. Erection of fencing and landscaping and alterations to existing access to site

Location

Land at Pippis Ford, A14 Slip off to A140, Coddendam, Suffolk IP6 8LJ

Expiry Date: 11/01/2022

Application Type: FUL - Full Planning Application

Development Type: Major Small Scale - All Other

Applicant: Construction Training Services

Agent: Mr Ben Elvin

Parish: Coddendam

Site Area: 3.31 hectares

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

Has a Committee Call In request been received from a Council Member (Appendix 1): Yes

Has the application been subject to Pre-Application Advice: Yes

PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

The application is referred to committee for the following reason:

I. The application has been called into committee by Councillor Whitehead and Councillor Passmore and meets the criteria for a call-in request.

CLASSIFICATION: Official

PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Summary of Policies

The Development Plan

The following policies are considered the most relevant and important to the determination of this proposal. The policies are all contained within the adopted development plan for Mid Suffolk District which for the purposes of determining this application is comprised of: Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Focused Review (2012), Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (2008) and Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998). All policies, save for CS1 and CS2 are afforded full weight in the determination process as they are considered consistent with the policies of the NPPF in accordance with paragraph 219 of that document. This will be explained further, later in this report.

- Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Focused Review (2012)

FC1- Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

FC1.1- Mid Suffolk Approach to Delivering Sustainable Development

- Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (2008)

CS1- Settlement Hierarchy

CS2- Development in the Countryside & Countryside Villages

CS3- Reduce Contributions to Climate Change

CS4- Adapting to Climate Change

CS5- Mid Suffolk's Environment

- Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998)

GP1- Design and layout of development

CL2- Development within special landscape areas

CL8- Protecting wildlife habitats

E10- New Industrial and Commercial Development in the Countryside

E12- General Principles for Location, Design and Layout of Industrial and Commercial Development

HB1- Protection of Historic Buildings

T9- Parking Standards

T10- Highway considerations in development

T11- Facilities for pedestrians and cyclists

RT12- Footpaths and Bridleways

Neighbourhood Plan Status

This application site is not within a Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Emerging Joint Local Plan Policies

The emerging Joint Local Plan is currently at Regulation 22 (Examination), based on the current progress of the examination and outstanding issues to be examined, the plan continues to hold limited weight.

The National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021 contains the Government's planning policies for England and sets out how these are expected to be applied. Planning law continues to require that applications for planning permission are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The policies contained within the NPPF are a material consideration and should be taken into account for decision-taking purposes.

Particularly relevant elements of the NPPF include:

- Chapter 2: Achieving Sustainable Development
- Chapter 4: Decision-Making
- Chapter 6: Building a Strong, Competitive Economy
- Chapter 9: Promoting Sustainable Transport
- Chapter 12: Achieving Well-Designed Places
- Chapter 14: Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change
- Chapter 15: Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment
- Chapter 16: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Other Considerations

- Suffolk County Council- Suffolk's Guidance for Parking (2014 most recently updated in 2019)

The national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provides guidance and advice on procedure and elaboration of NPPF policies rather than explicit additional policy; however, it has been taken into account in reaching the recommendation made on this application.

Consultations and Representations

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

A: Summary of Consultations

Town/Parish Council (Appendix 3)

- **Coddenham Parish Council**
Object on the basis of 1) previously refused, 2) proposed screen fence of up to 2m is unacceptable, and 3) sheep farming will likely be removed as it does not require planning permission.

- **Needham Market Town Council**

Object on the basis of 1) situated in a tranquil area, 2) conflict with the River Gipping Walk, 3) numerous other commercial sites where the site could be located, 4) pollution, 5) ecological damage and 6) contrary to neighbourhood plan.

National Consultee (Appendix 4)

- **East Suffolk Drainage Board**

No objection. Recommend informatives.

- **Environment Agency**

No objection. Recommend informative.

- **National Highways**

No objection, subject to condition on providing access. Recommend informatives.

- **Natural England**

No objection.

County Council Responses (Appendix 5)

- **Archaeology**

No objection subject to conditions 1) written scheme of investigation and 2) post investigation.

- **Highways**

No objection subject to conditions 1) providing visibility splays, 2) providing parking and manoeuvring space, 3) electric vehicle charging information, 4) measures for prevention of surface water onto highway, 5) bin presentation and storage information and 6) construction management plan. Recommend informatives.

- **Fire and Rescue**

No objection subject to condition for the provision of fire hydrants.

- **Floods and Water**

No objection subject to conditions 1) surface water drainage implemented, 2) surface water drainage verification report and 3) surface water construction management plan. Recommend informatives.

- **Minerals and Waste**

No objection.

- **Public Rights of Way**

No objection and recommend informatives.

- **Travel Plan**

No comment.

Internal Consultee Responses (Appendix 6)

- **Arboricultural Officer**

No objection subject to a condition requiring works to be carried out in accordance with arboricultural report. The trees proposed for removal are of limited public amenity value and/or are of poor condition.

- **Economic Development**

Support the application as it would develop and provide new skills and is unlikely to be suitable for an existing employment site. Locally infrastructure projects are expected to be worth £35 billion in the next 15 years. Skills shortages have been identified within the construction industry, compounded by Brexit. The site is well connected to the highway network and easy distance to public transport.

- **Environmental Health: Air Quality**

No objection.

- **Environmental Health: Noise, Odour, Light and Smoke**

No objection subject to conditions 1) site management plan, 2) assessment to ensure noise levels are kept to those projected, 3) restriction on noisy activities

- **Environmental Health: Land Contamination**

No comment.

- **Environmental Health: Sustainability**

No objection subject to condition on providing a scheme for water, energy and resource efficiency measures.

- **Heritage**

Identify that there would be a low level of less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets. Recommend harms are weighed with public benefits.

- **Place Services: Ecology**

No objection subject to conditions on 1) construction environmental management plan, 2) biodiversity enhancement strategy and 3) wildlife sensitive lighting design

- **Place Services: Landscaping**

Conclude that the overall landscape contribution of the site means it can accommodate change, however there would be localised visual impacts from the development of the site. Recommend conditions 1) soft landscaping implemented, 2) hard landscaping plan, 3) landscape management plan implemented

- **Public Realm**

No comment.

- **Waste Services**

No objection subject to ensuring that there is room for a refuse vehicle to manoeuvre around the site.

Other Consultee Responses

- **Suffolk Preservation Society**

Object on the basis of 1) impact on Gipping Valley Landscape from intrusion into tranquil remote area 2) impact on designated heritage assets, 3) support economic development schemes for local jobs but the site is an entirely inappropriate location.

- **Stowmarket Ramblers**

Object on the basis of 1) development too high, 2) landscape impact, 3) overlooking, 4) affects enjoyment and safety of PROW.

B: Representations

At the time of writing this report at least 17 letters/emails/online comments have been received. It is the officer's opinion that this represents 17 objections. A verbal update shall be provided as necessary.

Views are summarised below:

- Landscape impact (12)
- Inadequate access (11)
- Noise (11)
- Impacts to PROW (10)
- Out of character with the area (10)
- Affects local wildlife/ ecology (10)
- Increased traffic/ highways issues (9)
- Overlooking (7)
- Conflicts with district plan (6)
- Conflict with neighbourhood plan (6)
- Design (6)
- Pollution (6)
- Dominating/ overbearing (6)
- Sustainability (5)
- Loss of outlook (5)
- Better located on industrial/ brownfield land (5)
- Health and safety (4)
- Boundary issues (4)
- Conflict with NPPF (4)
- Light pollution (4)
- Loss of open space (4)
- Inappropriate in Conservation Area (3)
- Smells-odour (3)
- Development too high (3)
- Loss of privacy (3)
- Destruction of greenfield land (3)
- Drainage (3)
- Inadequate public transport (2)
- Trees (2)
- Scale (2)
- Lack of justification (2)
- Increase in pollution (2)
- Residential amenity (2)
- Building work (2)
- Overdevelopment of site (2)
- Application lacks information

- Fear of crime
- Undermines emerging Joint Local Plan
- Increased danger of flooding
- Further surveys required
- Inadequate parking
- Disturbance
- Loss of view
- Heritage impacts
- Surplus of employment land in JLP
- Vibration
- Imposed on residents
- Inadequate screening
- Incorrect application information
- Urbanisation
- Proposed highways works affect designated heritage assets
- Job creation is limited

(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

This application is a resubmission of DC/21/00487. This previous application was refused on four grounds under delegated authority but was subject to a conditional call-in request.

The reasons are summarised below:

- Lack of information to justify the principle of development
- Impacts on landscape, amenity, and natural environment
- Impact from noise
- Lack of information in relation to flooding and drainage

Previously the Local Planning Authority adopted a precautionary approach in the absence of adequate information as to the overall operations of the site. The applicant has now submitted further information and amended the scheme to overcome and mitigate many of the issues previously raised.

It is now considered the benefits of the proposal outweigh the harms (even where considerable importance and great weight is attached to the heritage harm identified) and the recommendation and assessment has been updated accordingly as reflected within this report.

REF: DC/21/00487

Planning Application - Change of use of part of land to use as a construction and agricultural training facility including new training centre and associated car park and hardstand, equipment/machinery store and scaffold area. Change of use of remainder of land to use for the grazing of horses and sheep including new stables and storage shed. Associated fencing and landscaping and alterations to existing access to site.

DECISION: REF
14.09.2021

REF: 1378/12	Application for a new planning permission to replace an extant planning permission in order to extend the time limit for implementation. (Planning permission 1174/09 - Erection of stables and tack room)	DECISION: GTD 15.06.2012
REF: 1174/09	Erection of stables and tack room.	DECISION: GTD 17.06.2009
REF: 2612/06	Change of use of agricultural land to keeping of horses.	DECISION: GTD 30.04.2007
REF: 0468/04/	CHANGE OF USE OF BED AND BREAKFAST ACCOMMODATION TO DWELLING.	DECISION: GTD 27.09.2004

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1. The Site and Surroundings

- 1.1. The site extends 3.31 hectares and is solely comprised of grade 4 agricultural land (described as poor quality) and is within the parish of Coddendam. The site is entirely within the 'Countryside' as identified under policy CS1. The site is however adjacent to the A14 and accessed via the Beacon Hill Interchange down a private road which is hard surfaced. Agricultural land is located north, south and west of the site, but there some sporadically located dwellings within the locality.
- 1.2. The site is visually well-enclosed along its northern and eastern boundaries by mature hedgerows and trees, with the eastern boundary adjacent to the A14. The site is relatively open along its north-western boundary adjoining the River Gipping. There is an existing fence partially along the south-east of the site, with the southern boundary adjoining a private road leading towards the nearest dwellings.
- 1.3. There are no protected trees on site. In context of the site's immediate environs, the site is at a significantly lower level than the A14. The site is 7m lower at the western side than the eastern side and is 4m lower on the northern side than southern side. The site falls within the Gipping Valley Special Landscape Area. There are no nearby protected nature reserve or Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the site is not within any Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The site falls within a Mineral Consultation Area.
- 1.4. The site is not within any Conservation Area, however there are nearby listed buildings. To the north east (193 metres) is Grade II listed Needham Lodge (separate from the site by the A14), south (230 metres) is Grade II listed Pipp's Ford and north west (275 metres) is Pippins.
- 1.5. There is a Public Right of Way (PROW) (footpath 27) running through the centre of the site (north to south). The site is also visible from the western side of The Gipping via another Public Right of Way (footpath) which is part of the Gipping Valley River Path. There are a range of nearby ponds and Gallows Hill Quarry Gravel and Sand Workings to the southwest.

- 1.6. The site is primarily within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of fluvial flooding), however the western edge of the site marginally falls within Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3 (medium and high risk of fluvial flooding). The site is at a very low risk of pluvial flooding.

2. The Proposal

- 2.1. Overall, the site is to be split into two distinct parts, with the northern area (measuring 1.65 hectares) being used as an educational construction and agricultural training facility which would have a F1 use class. The southern area (1.66 hectares) would be separated by hedgerow from the northern area and is to be used for agricultural/ equestrian uses (sheep and horse grazing). As part of the development of the site associated landscaping, car parking, hardstanding and storage is to be provided.

The training to be offered on site comprises of:

Classroom based

- General health and safety- first aid training
- Construction supervisory and management training
- Waste and recycling management training
- Environmental management training
- Agricultural training
- Quality assurance i.e., ISO 9000
- Logistics and HGV drive CPC

Practical Training

- Construction plant and access equipment
- Agricultural plant equipment
- Summer maintenance (i.e., grass and hedge cutting)
- Street works
- Safe confined space entry
- Construction/ utilities civils courses
- ATVs (all terrain vehicles)

Alongside the main training centre building the following are also proposed on site within the northern area:

- Four temporary cabin buildings
- Container storage comprised of four containers grouped together
- Two car parks (providing 41 bay spaces) and plant parking area (all areas of hardstanding)
- Roller area
- Access road with a 1m wide footpath
- Generator Shed
- Crushed access route
- Telehandler training tower
- SuDS basin
- External bollard lighting and CCTV

In the southern area the following would be included:

- Stable Block
- Manure Storage Area
- Storage Shed

- Crushed concrete area for equestrian use
- Tarmacked access

2.2. Associated soft and hard landscaping (including fencing, gates, hedgerows and earth bank/wildlife corridor) is incorporated across the whole site. A range of environmental sustainability measures are also incorporated throughout the scheme, as discussed within section 7 of this report. Highway works to upgrade the existing access and accommodate the development are also proposed and are discussed further in section 5 of this report.

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, then that determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Policy CS1

3.2. Policy CS1 sets out a settlement hierarchy based on the services, facilities and connectivity within the district and accordingly directs all development sequentially towards the most sustainable areas in regard to their location. Under policy CS1 the site falls within the 'Countryside', with the closest settlement boundary being Needham Market (Town), located 0.73 miles southwest of the site. Whilst policy CS1 is restrictive of development in the countryside, it is permissive when working inter alia with policy CS2, and explicitly states that it is permissive of '*particular types of development to support the rural economy*', the types of development are expanded upon within policy CS2. Whilst the settlement boundaries have not been reviewed and policy CS1 lacks flexibility on other matters, in relation to the facts of this application, full weight can be attached to policy CS1, noting that it seeks to support the rural economy and is consistent with the approach within the NPPF and specifically paragraphs 84 and 85.

3.3. Broadly speaking, the proposal is considered '*to support the rural economy*' as expanded on in subsequent sections of this report and thus the proposal is considered to accord with policy CS1.

Policy CS2

3.4. Policy CS2 follows policy CS1 by expanding upon the particular types of compatible countryside development permitted in countryside locations. Similarly, to policy CS1, aspects of policy CS2's blanket approach to development in the countryside are inconsistent with the NPPF. However, in this instance one particular type of countryside compatible development defined under policy CS2 is '*new-build employment generating proposals where there is a strategic, environmental or operational justification*'. Policy CS2 is clearly flexible and does not preclude employment generating proposals in the countryside, consistent with paragraphs 84 and 85 of the NPPF. Policy CS2 is therefore considered to hold full weight for the purposes of determining this application.

3.5. As the construction/ training facility aspect of this proposal is a new-build employment generating proposal, both directly and indirectly, and sufficient strategic and operational justification has been given, as explored further under assessment of policy E10 below, the proposal accords with policy CS2.

3.6. The southern area of the site is proposed for the grazing of horses and sheep, this represents a mixture of equestrian and agricultural uses, which is again considered to be compliant with policy

CS2, which is permissive of agriculture, with equestrian uses also being characteristic of the countryside. The applicant's long-term aspirations for this part of the site is to use it for hobby farming. This aspect of the proposal is also compliant with policy CS2.

Policy E10

- 3.7. Policy E10 works alongside CS2 in assessing the location of new industrial and commercial development and is considered to be broadly in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF, specifically paragraphs 84 and 85. Policy E10 seeks to direct new industrial/ commercial development to settlement boundaries unless an overriding need can be demonstrated for such development to be located away from such settlements and within the countryside. Where such need can be demonstrated assessment is guided by 6 key criteria:
- 1) The impact of the development on the surrounding countryside, including its landscape and wildlife features.
 - 2) The prospect of pollution including the effect on nearby watercourses and groundwater sources
 - 3) The amount of traffic generated and likelihood of unacceptable traffic movement, particularly lorries, on non-principal roads
 - 4) The loss of high-quality agricultural land
 - 5) The contribution to the rural economy
 - 6) The employment opportunities created for nearby communities
- 3.8. The applicant has provided a range of information to demonstrate how the proposal is to be delivered alongside the business's long-term aspirations, whilst demonstrating that there is an overriding need for the proposal to be in this countryside location. The proposal offers unique and exceptional circumstances that requires a countryside location but is also well-connected to a strategic transport network and nearby settlement.
- 3.9. The proposal is driven by a locally embedded business (Construction Training Services) which has well established connections with local and national businesses. The proposal represents the expansion of Construction Training Services as a business by seeking to deliver training in both practical and soft skills for a range of local and national businesses. A key aspect of the proposal and overall business, is to deliver a construction and agricultural training centre in a location which integrates, supports and emphasises the importance of the environment at all levels, whilst being accessible and with an appropriate land composition. As such there is a specific locational requirement for the centre to be in a rural but well-connected location in order to deliver outdoor training with easy access to nature.
- 3.10. A number of operational justifications have been provided in support of the proposal being located within the countryside. It is important that the proposal is well connected adjacent to the Beacon Hill Interchange which links the site to the A14 and A140, two key trunk roads. Based on industry norms and training to be delivered for a range of companies based around the UK, there is an operational requirement to be near to key trunk roads as a large majority of trainees travel by car.
- 3.11. The catchment for such training delivered on site is expected to be within a 50-mile radius. The applicant does however note a strong desire to encourage sustainable forms of transport once operational by encouraging travelling by train with the potential to establish taxi/ shuttle bus services from Needham Market Station (6 minutes' drive from the site). A travel plan is to be secured via condition.

- 3.12. Construction Training Services currently have 200 clients, such training must therefore be tailored to and supportive of their client's needs. Between 2019 and 2022, between 40 to 60 candidates per week were participating in training. With the creation of this proposed facility, it is anticipated that between 150 and 200 candidates would visit the facility per week. This is guided by the levels of interest that has been registered with Construction Training Services in this type of facility and courses.
- 3.13. Ensuring people can and are willing to attend training is imperative. Pitfalls of existing training centres is that they are located in congested locations. As such existing clients have expressed their desire for training to be delivered in an easily accessible and well-connected location.
- 3.14. There are currently no training centres like the one proposed in Suffolk, with the nearest being in Basildon, Kentford and Norwich. Existing centres have been unable to deliver practical outside training all year round based on clay ground conditions, which this site would overcome with its chalk land composition.
- 3.15. Beyond delivering skills, the training centre is likely to directly support the rural economy through trainees using local accommodation and restaurants, especially in Claydon, Needham Market and Stowmarket. Moreover, local companies will be used where possible to source plant and fulfil other requirements.
- 3.16. The applicant has presented a clear case underpinning their reasons behind choosing the site, alongside detailing the specific operational requirements attached to the business and the stakeholders involved in it. A condition forms part of the recommendation in order to restrict the proposed building's use to be exclusively an F1 use for the delivery of construction and agricultural training.
- 3.17. It is noted that several representations have been made that suggest that the proposal should be located elsewhere on brownfield land or within industrial sites. Existing commercial sites are typically comprised of a mixture of Class E (g), B2 and B8 uses. The proposed development could not be located within an existing employment site as it would conflict with and undermine the Council's employment strategy within industrial/ commercial business parks, owing to its F1 use. The development would take up in demand fit for purpose commercial space and would in any event require planning permission for a change of use if it were to be located within an existing employment site. Moreover, the operational requirements of the proposal could not be accommodated within the spatial and building constraints of conventional employment sites, nor would be it practical, owing to the deliver practical training which must be done in accordance with governing body's standards.
- 3.18. Whilst it is supported by local and national policy, such policy does not require brownfield land to be developed over greenfield land, nor is there a presumption against granting planning permission on greenfield sites.
- 3.19. The application therefore remains to be assessed against the six criteria of policy E10. Criteria 4, 5 and 6 is discussed within this section of the report. The remaining criteria (1, 2, and 3) is discussed in later sections of this report.
- 3.20. In regard to criterion 4, firstly and notably an area measuring 1.66 hectares is to be retained for equestrian/ agricultural use, the scheme therefore only represents a loss of 1.65 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land, which is considered of poor quality and does not fall within the best and most versatile agricultural land worthy of protection.

- 3.21. In regard to criteria 5 and 6, significant information has been supplied to demonstrate that whilst on site employment is likely to amount to around 15 jobs initially this may increase, and the broader value of the proposal is to upskill local people enabling them to contribute to the local and national economy through construction and agriculture.
- 3.22. It is envisaged that in future years, the possibility to recruit apprentices will be explored. The contribution to the rural economy is significant and based on the nature and size of the scheme, the employment generated directly on site is proportionate.

NPPF

- 3.23. At a national level Chapter 6 of the NPPF is of particular relevance seeking to build a strong and competitive economy. Specific direction is given within paragraphs 84 and 85 as to supporting the rural economy.
- 3.24. More generally at a national level, paragraph 81 of the NPPF echoes this sentiment stating that, *“planning policies and decisions should help 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. The approach taken should allow each area to build on its strengths, counter any weaknesses and address the challenges of the future. This is particularly important where Britain can be a global leader in driving innovation, and in areas with high levels of productivity, which should be able to capitalise on their performance and potential.”*
- 3.25. Paragraph 84 a) of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should enable *“the sustainable growth and expansion of types of businesses in rural areas, both through the conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings”*.
- 3.26. Paragraph 85 goes further stating, *“planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads and exploits any opportunities to make a location more sustainable (for example by improving the scope for access on foot, by cycling or by public transport). The use of previously developed land and sites that are physically well-related to existing settlements, should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist”*.
- 3.27. The Council’s Economic Development Team are wholly supportive of the proposal. They noted that there will be some direct on-site job creation, albeit this is relatively limited, however the overall value of providing training and uplifting skills locally and nationally (through delivering training for national companies) is emphasised as of considerable public benefit and importance.
- 3.28. Based on the number of infrastructure projects within the region (totalling £35 billion), alongside a national shortage in construction skills, compounded by Brexit, the proposal offers opportunities for the local and national workforce to uplift and maintain skills as well as enabling people to change careers.
- 3.29. The Council’s Open for Business Strategy provides a useful starting point which demonstrates the aspirations of the Council in supporting the local rural economy. The strategy identifies key existing issues and challenges within the district, which include: lower skills level and educational attainment, lower levels of young people to recruit and poor rural infrastructure. There is a desire to raise the employability and skill levels of the workforce and improve productivity.

- 3.30. The information submitted demonstrates that the proposal is supportive of the Council's aspirations for powering economic prosperity in the district going forward.
- 3.31. A number of national and local companies have endorsed the proposed training delivered by the applicant (Construction Training Services) via signed supporting letters which have been submitted alongside the application. Such companies include: Hopkins Homes, Landex, SEH Ipswich Civil Engineering, Highway Assurance, A D Bly Construction, TRU Plant Hire Services, Holmes Plant and Construction, J.J. Sugrue Civil Engineering and Plant Hire, Richardson Haulage, ARC (additions recruitment consultants), Palmer Group, Brown Builders Building Contracts, Emmitt Plant, HDD, Gibbons Plant Hire, Capital Sky Demolition, Elan Civil Engineering, JB Turf and Landscapes, M V Kelly, CLR Groundworks, N.P.H Developments, The Lyndon Pallett Group, CPD Powerline and Newton and Frost Fencing.

Basket of Policies

- 3.32. As detailed above, policies CS1, CS2 and E10 are all considered to hold full weight in the determination of this application.
- 3.33. Policies CS4 and CS5 are further relevant in determining the acceptability of the principle of development on site, by assessing the relationship with existing development and the character of the locality, specifically with regard to flood risk, pollution, landscape, biodiversity and heritage. These policies hold full weight as they are consistent with the policies of the NPPF. Assessment of the application against these policies is discussed in subsequent sections of this report. It is however noted at this stage that there is a level of landscape and heritage harm which cannot be mitigated, and thus the proposal conflicts with aspects of policy CS5.
- 3.34. The most important policies relevant to the determination of this application are considered to hold full weight.

Summary

- 3.35. The southern area of the site is proposed for the grazing of horses and sheep, this represents a mixture of equestrian and agricultural uses. It is the applicant's long-term intention to use this area of land as a smallholding for hobby farming. These uses are in accordance with policy CS1 and CS2 and are characteristic of the countryside location. The principle of these uses is therefore acceptable.
- 3.36. In regard to the construction/ agricultural training facility, the proposal accords with policies CS1, CS2 and E10 based on the strategic and operational justification given. Owing to the landscape and heritage harm that would arise that cannot be mitigated, there is also conflict with some, but not all, aspects of policy CS5. On balance the principle of development of the training centre is considered to be acceptable.
- 3.37. The information and evidence submitted as part of the application has demonstrated that there would be significant direct and indirect economic and social public benefits of the scheme. Moreover, a large proportion of the site will remain free of any operational development, and as this report will go on to discuss in section 7, the environmental credentials of the scheme are also considered to be of a high standard, providing both ecological benefits and environmentally friendly energy generation. The proposal represents sustainable development as per policies FC1 and FC1.1 and paragraph 8 of the NPPF.

3.38. The principle of development is therefore acceptable.

4. Nearby Services and Connections Assessment of Proposal

4.1. The site is located just off of the Beacon Hill Interchange, with easy access to the A140 and A14 trunk roads. The nearest train station to the site is Needham Market, which is 1.5 miles northwest.

4.2. Footpath 27 (PROW) runs through the centre of the site. SCC's PROW Team raised no objection to the proposal subject to a range of informatives, which are reflected in the recommendation. Footpath 27 would not be obstructed across the site and would be retained for recreational use in accordance with Local Plan policy RT12 and paragraph 100 of the NPPF. It is noted that Footpath 27 is obstructed further along its route in adjacent land outside of the applicant's control.

4.3. In the event that fences, gates or hedgerows were proposed along the PROW, these would be subject to a separate consent that would have to be sought from SCC PROW Team post planning.

5. Site Access, Parking and Highway Safety Considerations

5.1. The proposal includes provision to upgrade the junction between the existing private road and the Beacon Hill Interchange roundabout. As part of the upgrades the junction radius is to be increased 10.67 metres and a splitter island is to be created on the junction to ensure vehicles turn left onto the roundabout. An existing timber post and rail fencing and lamp column to the east of the junction are to be repositioned further south back from the junction onto the Beacon Hill Interchange in order to facilitate increased visibility splays to accommodate the intensification of use. New road markings are to be painted and existing ones refreshed, alongside the erection of new signage on the slip road and next to the access. Such upgrades will be subject to a section 278 Agreement, which is a separate consent that the applicant will be required to apply for post planning in order to carry out the proposed upgrade works within the highway and to ensure they are built to an adoptable standard. A planning condition is also recommended to ensure the required works are carried out prior to first use.

5.2. National Highways assessed the application in relation to its impact on the A14 and A140 trunk roads. National Highways recommended a condition for the proposed upgrades to the access to be implemented prior to first use. SCC Highways also assessed the application in conjunction with the comments made by National Highways. A Transport Statement, Road Safety Audit and access design revisions have been made during the course of the application to overcome previous concerns. SCC Highways have recommended several conditions in addition to the recommended condition by National Highways, these are all recommended to be imposed as reflected within the recommendation.

5.3. The private road adjoining the roundabout and leading to the site would also be widened to 5.5 metres.

5.4. Within the confines of the site a 6-metre-wide access road with a 1-metre-wide footpath running alongside is proposed, which travels along the eastern boundary of the site providing access to the car parking areas and for less frequent access to the southern equestrian land. 1-metre-high lit bollards are proposed to the access road. A sign is proposed along the existing private road adjoining the site to the east, to ensure traffic associated with the training centre does not travel past the site.

- 5.5. 41 parking spaces are to be provided on site, with a plant parking area, container storage and roller area provided also provided to ensure adequate storage space is provided alongside parking for vehicles. The plant parking area would comprise of hardstanding adjoining one car park and would measure 30 metres by 30 metres.
- 5.6. A Travel Plan is recommended to be secured via condition which would ensure that there is a genuine choice of transport modes, specifically active and sustainable transport options, open to staff and visitors.
- 5.7. The proposal would achieve safe and suitable access for all users and the local highway network would not be impacted to a severe degree. The proposal would thus accord with Local Plan policies T9 and T10 and paragraphs 105, 110 and 111 of the NPPF.

6. Design and Layout

- 6.1. The main training building would be located along the eastern boundary of the site and would have a low profile pitched roof, measuring 4.5 metres to the ridge, 2.5 metres to the eaves, 30 metres in width and 20 metres deep. The training building would be constructed from black vertical ribbed cladding with brickwork plinth (TBS Farmhouse blend) elevations, composite panels and PV panels on the roof with black uPVC windows and doors. The training building would comprise of one office area, entrance lobby, three WCs, two storage areas, six classrooms and canteen area.
- 6.2. The telehandler training tower would be located within the centre of the northern boundary and would measure 9.95 metres in overall height (including handrail), 3 metres in width and 3 metres in depth. Whilst this is the tallest structure proposed, owing to the fall in land levels, it would visually appear lower than the main training building. Whilst it is the tallest structure it is of an open construction consisting of steel bars, minimising its overall visual impact.
- 6.2. The container storage is comprised of four containers grouped together measuring a total of 6 metres in width, 16 metres in length and 2.6 metres in height which will provide permanent storage capacity on site.
- 6.3. Five hired temporary cabins are incorporated into the scheme for use as classrooms, office and toilet, with four of them measuring 9.6 metres in length, 3 metres in width and 2.6 metres in height and one measuring 4.8 metres in length, 2.7 metres in width and 2.6 metres in height. All temporary cabins would be used during the construction period to deliver the training prior to the main training building being made functionally available. It is proposed that a condition is imposed to ensure the cabins are removed from site within a year from the date of commencement.
- 6.4. A small sound proofed shed with single pitched roof (2.5 metres in width, 4 metres in length and a maximum of 2 metres in height) would be located to the north-eastern corner of the site to house a generator.
- 6.5. The proposed access road, both car parks, plant car parking area and crushed access route would be the main hardstanding areas in the northern half of the site, all of which would be constructed from crushed subbase with tarmac plannings over to reduce dust. There would also be a crush concrete area in the southern half of the site for equestrian use. All hardstanding is positioned to the outer edges of the site, retaining grassland for the largest proportion of the site.
- 6.6. The training to be delivered is in accordance with specific awarding bodies, including Construction Plant Competence Scheme (CPCS) and National Plant Operators Registration Scheme

(NPORS). As such some of the aspects of the site (such as the roller area and telehandler) must therefore be designed and constructed to specified standards.

- 6.7. The stable block would be located within the centre of the southern boundary and measure 4.23 metres to the ridge, 2.5 metres to the eaves, 11 metres wide and 11 metres deep. The manure storage area would measure 3 metres wide by 2 metres deep. The storage shed would be adjacent to the stable block and measure 3.775 metres to the ridge, 2.25 metres to the eaves, 6 metres deep and 6 metres wide. The stable block and storage shed would be constructed from natural timber boarding with corrugated roof panels and PV panels. All of these buildings/ structures would be located within the crush concrete area.
- 6.8. The proposed training facility and stable buildings would be designed to reflective of their functional use but would nonetheless both adopt a sympathetic utilitarian appearance.
- 6.9. The proposal would accord with Core Strategy policy CS5, Local Plan policies GP1 and E12 and paragraph 130 of the NPPF.

7. Sustainability Measures

- 7.1. The site would incorporate a number of sustainability measures:
 - Energy efficient windows and high levels of insulation incorporated into training building to secure high levels of natural lighting and regulate temperature.
 - Solar PV panels are proposed on the roof of the training building and stable block for generating solar power which is intended to deliver the electricity and heating for the site. Prior to these becoming operational/ in the event of requiring a backup a small silent run diesel generator will be used.
 - All internal and external lighting on site would be in the form of low energy and glare LEDs.
 - Biodiversity enhancements proposed in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal
 - All materials and trees on site are to be/ have been sourced from within a 15-mile radius of the site
- 7.2. Whilst building regulations would ensure the training building is insulated to a certain standard, in order to further reduce energy usage, these standards will be exceeded where financially possible during the construction of the building. There are also ambitions to recycle as much water for internal and external use via a recyclable grey water system.
- 7.3. The specific details of these measures are recommended to be secured via condition and will be reviewed by the Council's Sustainability Team. Specific biodiversity measures are also secured via condition and will be reviewed by the Council's Ecology Team.
- 7.4. All plant and equipment used on site will be hired from three local plant hire companies, with equipment to be low emission, low noise and low vibration, operating on site primarily using an 'eco mode'. It is further noted that such equipment is moving towards electric power source.
- 7.5. The proposal would thus accord with Core Strategy policies CS3 and CS4 and paragraph 157 of the NPPF.

8. Landscape Impact, Trees, Ecology, Biodiversity and Protected Species

- 8.1. Along the western boundary of the site, a wildlife corridor with new earth bank and tree/ shrub line is proposed. This would adjoin an existing 40-metre-long fence (2-metre-high fence panels slotted

between concrete posts and gravel boards) which is set back 1 metre from the western boundary with hedgerows in front and is to be retained. An existing 5 bar field gate would be retained along the western boundary.

- 8.2. Alongside the existing western fence, an existing close boarded fence measuring a maximum of 2 metres in height is to be retained along a short section of the southern boundary adjoining an existing access. These fences were erected under permitted development rights and did not require planning permission but are shown on the plans for completeness.
- 8.3. A 1.2-metre-high 3 bar field fence and hedgerow is proposed running east to west through the centre of the site to demarcate the training facility from the grazing land.
- 8.4. A number of tree clusters have already been planted around the site, with existing trees to be retained including a mature row of conifer trees along the eastern boundary.
- 8.5. Lighting will be kept to a minimum at all times, with minimal lighting left on for security purposes outside of operating hours around the car park and access road. The access road would also be secured to the north-eastern corner via a 2-metre-high close boarded fence with gates.
- 8.6. A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal was submitted with the application, which has been assessed by Place Services Ecology in regard to the potential impacts on designated sites and Protected and Priority Species and Habitats. They have raised no objection subject to a range of conditions to mitigate impacts on the River Gipping and Protected and Priority Species alongside securing biodiversity enhancements, all of which are recommended to be imposed. Ecological measures were proposed within the submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal which are to be secured via condition in order to achieve biodiversity net gain on the site.
- 8.7. Policy CL2 states, *'within Special Landscape Areas, particular care will be taken to safeguard landscape quality, and where development does occur it should be sensitively designed, with high standards of layout, materials and landscaping'*.
- 8.8. A Landscape and Visual Appraisal, Soft landscaping plans, a Landscape Management Plan and Arboricultural Report have been submitted following earlier comments made by Place Services Landscaping. Place Services Landscaping have reviewed this additional information and accept the methodology that has been used in assessing the overall landscape impacts arising from the development.
- 8.9. Whilst the site falls within the Gipping Valley Special Landscape Area, in assessing the site's contribution to overall landscape character Place Services Landscaping state, *"though the site and the surrounding landscape is designated at the local level and in isolation, the site's landscape condition is considered 'ordinary' due to intrusive elements including infrastructure which means that the area has the ability to accommodate change"*.
- 8.10. Place Services Landscaping go on to assess the visual effects of the development which are the *"result of the sensitivity of visual receptors (people who will experience changes to existing views) to the proposed development and the magnitude of those changes"*. In accounting for these public views (not private views which are not a material planning consideration), Place Services Landscaping concluded that *"on completion of the development after 15 years, there would be some adverse visual effects but only in the immediate proximity of the site."* One such example of the moderate adverse visual effect would be on the Gipping Valley River Path given the change of character to an outlook that would be more suburban.

- 8.11. The overall impacts on landscape and visual amenity arising from the development would be adverse impact on visual effects which are confined within immediate proximity of the site, as opposed to wide ranging impacts in landscape character terms. Visual effect impacts of the development have been mitigated where possible and through additionally recommended conditions (as reflected in the recommendation section of this report). In conclusion there will be a level of adverse impact and harm arising from the development in respect of visual effects, which must be weighed against the overall merits of the scheme.
- 8.12. From the perspective of ecology and arboricultural impact, the proposal would accord with Core Strategy policies CS4 and CS5, Local Plan policy CL8 and paragraphs 174, 175 and 180 of the NPPF. However, the proposal would result in a level of landscape harm conflicting with Core Strategy policy CS5, Local Plan policy CL2 and paragraph 174 of the NPPF. As discussed within the overall planning balance and conclusion, in exercising a planning judgement it is considered that the landscape harm is outweighed by the merits of the proposal.

9. Land Contamination, Flood Risk, Drainage and Waste

- 9.1. The Council's Environmental Health Team raised no objection from the perspective of land contamination, noting the site's existing and historical use.
- 9.2. There is an existing water main which is suitable for the site to connect into. Foul water is to be disposed either by septic tank or Klargestor type treatment plant.
- 9.4. SCC Floods and Water assessed the submitted Flood Risk Assessment, Drainage Strategy and SuDs location and SuDS Risk Assessment and raised no objection.
- 9.5. The Environment Agency assessed the application from the perspective of fluvial flood risk arising from the River Gipping and raised no objection.
- 9.6. Whilst the site marginally falls within vulnerable Flood Zones (2 and 3) the operational development proposed is entirely within Flood Zone 1 and is also at a very low risk of pluvial flooding. The proposal would therefore be safe for its lifetime and would not increase flood risk elsewhere.
- 9.7. The proposal would accord with Core Strategy policies CS4 and CS5 and paragraphs 159, 167, 169 and 174 of the NPPF.

10. Heritage

- 10.1. The Council's Heritage Team provided full comments on the application and identified that the proposal would cause:
- A low level of less than substantial harm to the setting of Pipp's Ford (Grade II listed), a designated heritage asset, because it would erode the rural character of the wider setting of a listed farmhouse. There would thus be a very low level of less than substantial harm to the significance of Pipp's Ford.
 - A low level of less than substantial harm to the setting of Pippins (Grade II listed), a designated heritage asset.
 - A low level of less than substantial harm to the setting and thus significance of non-designated farm buildings associated with Pipp's Ford.
- 10.2. The full comments are as follows:

“The proposal is an amended version of the scheme refused under reference DC/21/00487. The principal revision is that the layout is adjusted so that one of the parking areas is moved to the eastern boundary. In terms of potential heritage impacts, my view is that the revision does not materially change the scheme’s impact on heritage assets. The following comment is essentially repeated from the earlier application.

The site lies adjacent to the slip road from the A14 westbound to the A140 roundabout, and slopes down generally to the west. Close to the south west corner of the site is a group of farm buildings converted to residential use. To their south west stands Pipp’s Ford, a listed farmhouse associated with the farm buildings. The farmhouse is somewhat secluded among trees, but more open towards to the farm buildings. As an open area of undeveloped land, the site makes a significant contribution to the setting of the historic farm buildings, and to the setting of the listed farmhouse itself. As buildings that historically had an intimate functional relationship with farmland around them, the open land contributes to appreciating their historic significance.

To the north west of the site stands Pippins, listed at Grade II. Given the distance from the site, the closer position of the roundabout, and the line of tree growth to the south, the site makes little contribution to the setting of this listed building.

The proposal has two elements – a building and associated development providing training, and provisions for grazing for horses, with ancillary structures. The training building is towards the north east corner of the site, some 190m from the farm buildings, with grazing in the southern half. The building itself would be a rather functional structure with broad footprint and shallow roof pitch reaching 4.5m at the ridge. Similarly, the scaffold tower and storage container would appear incongruous in the setting of historic buildings.

Of more immediate concern would be panel fencing proposed at the boundary shared with the historic farm buildings, and close-boarded gates on the south boundary near the stable, which would adversely impact on the rural setting. There would also be panel fencing to the north east boundary, and close-boarded fence and gate to the entrance.

In my view the proposal would have a low impact on the setting of Pippins, not resulting in harm to its significance. Impact on the setting of Pipp’s Ford would also be low, resulting in harm at a very low level to the significance of the listed building. Impact on the setting of the non-designated farm buildings would be a little higher, with harm to their significance as non-designated assets at a low level.

If the proposal receives a positive recommendation, it seems likely that my concerns on boundary treatments could be addressed through a landscaping scheme.”

- 10.3. As a level of harm to designated heritage assets (Pipp’s Ford and Pippins), regardless of the level, has been identified, paragraph 202 of the NPPF is thus engaged. The statutory duties within the Listed Buildings Act impose a strong presumption against granting planning permission where harm is identified, and harm of any quantum is a matter of considerable importance and weight.
- 10.4. Paragraph 202 requires harm to designated heritage assets to be weighed against public benefits. In this instance officers are satisfied that the creation of a construction training facility and the social and economic benefits that would result, as outlined within section 3 of this report, are significant enough public benefits to outweigh the harm identified.

- 10.5. In regard to the harm identified to the significance non-designated heritage assets, paragraph 203 of the NPPF does not require harm to be weighed against public benefits as such test does not exist like it does in paragraph 202. Paragraph 203 instead requires such harm to be taken into account and a *'balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset'*.
- 10.6. Such harm to all identified assets, designated or otherwise, nevertheless stands to be considered again in the overall planning balance alongside the benefits in section 13.
- 10.7. The Council's Heritage Team suggested that a condition on boundary treatments may be required, this is not considered necessary and is not included within the recommendation, noting that the fencing along the western and southern boundaries has already been erected under permitted development rights and is included on the plans for completeness.
- 10.8. There is thus tension with Core Strategy policy CS5 in so far as there would be harm to heritage assets, such harm is however considered to be outweighed by public benefits, and for those reasons given it otherwise complies with Local Plan policy HB1 and the paragraphs of the NPPF in so far as clear and convincing justification has been given for the harm arising.

11. Impact on Residential Amenity

- 11.1. The nearest proposed operational development associated with the F1 use class proposed under this application is approximately a minimum of 150 metres away from the nearest dwelling. Notably there is also an operational quarry (Gallows Hill Quarry Gravel and Sand Workings) approximately 176 metres away from the nearest dwellings to the site. Most significantly however is that traffic noise from the A14 can be heard from all corners of the site.
- 11.2. A Noise and Vibration impact Assessment was supplied with the application, with environmental sound levels taken at the boundary of the nearest noise sensitive location. It was concluded that vibration levels arising from the development will not be readily perceptible and that noise may be heard but would not be of a level that is unacceptable or would result in a change of behaviour or attitude. It is acknowledged that there may be some change in the acoustic character of the area, however this would not be to a level to alter the perceived quality of life.
- 11.3. As the plant is used for training purposes it does not run at full capacity as if it were on a construction site. The telehandler and roller are the only two items of plant which have reversing beepers on them, these will be disconnected when on site. This is proposed to be conditioned.
- 11.4. Appropriately bound surfaces are proposed around the site to reduce the potential of dust creation. The access road and car park would be crushed subbase with tarmac plantings over. Moreover, as the site would be used for training purposes, the risks of dust pollution are significantly lower than if the site was an operational construction site.
- 11.5. The proposal would accord with Core Strategy policy CS4, Local Plan policies H16 and H17 and paragraphs 126 and 130 of the NPPF.

12. Parish Council Comments

- 12.1. Both Needham Town Council and Coddendam Parish Council raised a number of objections, which have primarily been addressed within the body of this report. The matters that have not been previously addressed are assessed below.
- 12.2. Needham Market Town Council did however raise an objection on the basis that the proposal is contrary to their Neighbourhood Plan, for the avoidance of doubt the site lies entirely outside of the Neighbourhood Plan Area.
- 12.3. Coddendam Parish Council also raised an objection in regard to the removal of sheep from the proposal in the future as they do not require permission, whilst this is true, the southern portion of the land could only be used for either equestrian or agricultural use in the future unless planning permission as sought otherwise.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

13. Planning Balance and Conclusion

- 13.1. Decision taking begins with the development plan and it is of vital importance that planning decisions are plan-led. The NPPF, an important material consideration, reiterates this fundamental point.
- 13.2. The basket of policies identified hold full weight, of specific importance and relevance are Core Strategy policies CS1, CS2, CS4 and CS5 and Local Plan policies CL2, E10 and HB1.
- 13.3. The policy is compliant with a range of policies which are permissive of this type of development within the countryside (CS1, CS2 and E10). However, the site is undeniably in a particularly sensitive part of the district within a Special Landscape Area, and a level of landscape harm is inevitable. A moderate adverse impact has been identified to visual effects within immediate proximity of the site, but no wider, with the wider area capable of accommodating change in landscape terms. The identified impacts have been mitigated as far as reasonably practicable given the nature of the development, however there will be a residual level of adverse impact on visual effects. This therefore represents non-compliance with the plan in regard to Core Strategy policy CS5 and Local Plan policy CL2 which must be weighed in the overall planning balance.
- 13.4. Whilst there is some tension with policy CS5 in regard to heritage harm, for the reasons given within sections 3 and 10 of this report. Notwithstanding that any level of harm is identified as a matter of considerable importance and weight, the proposal otherwise complies with policy HB1 and the paragraphs of the NPPF as clear and convincing justification for the harm has been given.
- 13.5. When assessed against the policies of the NPPF taken as a whole, the application is broadly supported by the NPPF by offering significant economic and social public benefits, with good environmental credentials in relation to a proposal of this nature. The proposal does however conflict with paragraph 174 of the NPPF in regard to landscape harms.

- 13.6. In forming an overall balance, the proposal does not comply with the development plan as a whole with regard to the significant landscape harm and approval of the application would strictly represent a departure from the plan. However, officers are satisfied that the proposal is a unique and exceptional circumstance in which material considerations, notably the support offered by the NPPF and public benefits, indicate that in this instance a decision should be taken that departs from the plan as the benefits significantly and demonstrably outweigh the harms (landscape and heritage). The recommendation is therefore the grant planning permission.
- 13.7. In conclusion this proposal for full planning permission for the part change of use of land for the erection of a construction/ training facility, associated storage and landscaping and part change of use of land for the grazing of horses and sheep with associated stables and storage, is considered to be a development that has been sufficiently justified in this location and would offer significant public benefits, which reflects the overall strategy of Mid Suffolk's Development Plan. The application accords with the development plan as a whole and permission should be granted.

RECOMMENDATION

- 1) That Members resolve to: Delegate Authority to the Chief Planning Officer to GRANT planning permission, including the imposition of relevant conditions and informatives as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Chief Planning Officer:

Conditions

- Standard 3-year time limit
- Approved plans
- Sustainability measures (broadly in accordance with the proposed measures submitted under the application- including EV charging points and PV panels) to be submitted
- Construction Environmental Management Plan to be submitted
- Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy to be submitted
- Wildlife Sensitive Lighting Scheme to be submitted
- Fire hydrants to be submitted
- Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation to be submitted
- Archaeological Post Investigation to be submitted
- Surface Water Drainage and Flood Risk Assessment Strategy implemented
- Surface Water Drainage Verification Report to be submitted
- Construction Surface Water Management Plan to be submitted
- Visibility splays to be provided in full and no obstruction to be within those splays.
- Parking provision provided in full
- Details of means to prevent surface water entering highway to be submitted
- Bin storage and presentation areas to be submitted
- Construction Management Plan to be submitted
- Access upgrades to be implemented
- Temporary cabins to removed from site 1 year after commencement
- Travel Plan to be submitted

- Notwithstanding the provisions of F1 use class, the building shall be exclusively for delivery of construction and agricultural training
- Container storage shall solely be used for incidental purposes to the construction and agricultural training
- Arboricultural report to be adhered to
- Materials details of all buildings (including colours) to be submitted
- Soft landscaping plan to be implemented
- Notwithstanding soft landscaping further landscaping details of SuDS to be submitted
- Notwithstanding soft landscaping plan, additional information on root barrier membranes to be submitted
- Landscape Management Plan to be implemented
- Hard Landscaping details to be submitted
- Equestrian land used for private use- no commercial equestrian use permitted
- Site Management Plan to be submitted
- Independent noise assessment to be carried out prior to first use
- Construction and agricultural activities shall be confined to the dedicated areas on site plan

Informatives

- Positive working with NPPF- pre-app
- National Highways recommended notes
- SCC Highways recommended notes
- SCC Public Rights of Way recommended notes
- SCC Floods and Water recommended notes
- Environment Agency recommended notes
- East Suffolk Drainage Board recommended notes