

Committee Report

Item No: 7B

Reference: DC/22/06214

Case Officer: Daniel Cameron

Ward: Eye

Ward Member/s: Cllr Peter Gould.

RECOMMENDATION – GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS

Description of Development

Planning Application - Erection of 1No storage building

Location

Eye Airfield Industrial Estate, Eye Road, Brome, IP23 8AW

Expiry Date: 17/03/2023

Application Type: FUL - Full Planning Application

Development Type: Major Small Scale - Manu/Ind/Storg/Wareh

Applicant: R H Developments (East Anglia) Ltd

Agent: Hollins Architects, Surveyors & Planning Consultants

Parish: Eye

Site Area: 1.49ha

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

Has a Committee Call In request been received from a Council Member (Appendix 1): No

Has the application been subject to Pre-Application Advice: No

PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

The application is referred to committee for the following reason:

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

PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Summary of Policies

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

NPPG-National Planning Policy Guidance

FC01 - Presumption In Favour Of Sustainable Development

CLASSIFICATION: Official

FC01_1 - Mid Suffolk Approach To Delivering Sustainable Development
FC03 - Supply Of Employment Land

CS03 - Reduce Contributions to Climate Change
CS04 - Adapting to Climate Change
CS05 - Mid Suffolk's Environment
CS06 - Services and Infrastructure

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

Eye Neighbourhood Plan

Neighbourhood Plan Status

The Eye Neighbourhood Plan is an adopted part of the Development Plan. It carries significant weight in the decision-making process.

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)

Eye Town Council Comments received 22nd December 2022

No objection.

Brome and Oakley Parish Council Comments Received 16th January 2023

Brome and Oakley Parish Council considered this application at a meeting on 16 January 2023. It was agreed to recommend approval of the application subject to the public right of way being signed, accessible and maintained and light pollution being mitigated as far as possible.

Thrandeston Parish Council Comments Received 6th January 2023

Thrandeston Parish Council objects to this application for the following reasons:

The increase in the area of impervious surfaces on Eye Airfield have the following impact:

For every 1mm of rainfall on 1 sq. m of surface, 1 litre of water will result. On Eye Airfield there are already 7 hectares of hardstanding and roof therefore for every 1mm of rainfall on 70,000 sq. m of surface 70,000 litres of water results.

It is not unusual for there to be 20mm of rainfall in one day and this would result in 1,400,000 litres of water from the 70,000 sq. m of surface. Water management systems need to be included in any development.

This needs to be factored into any discussion on the development on land in the Thrandeston area as most of the water runoff will be through the village.

Yaxley Parish Council Comments Received 13th January 2022

Yaxley Parish Council objects to this application for the following reasons:

The increase in the area of impervious surfaces on Eye Airfield have the following impact:

For every 1mm of rainfall on 1 sq. m of surface, 1 litre of water will result. On Eye Airfield there are already 7 hectares of hardstanding and roof therefore for every 1mm of rainfall on 70,000 sq. m of surface 70,000 litres of water results.

It is not unusual for there to be 20mm of rainfall in one day and this would result in 1,400,000 litres of water from the 70,000 sq. m of surface. Water management systems need to be included in any development.

This needs to be factored into any discussion on the development on land in the Thrandeston/Yaxley area of Eye Airfield although most of the water runoff will be through Thrandeston but it will flood areas of farmland in Yaxley.

National Consultee (Appendix 4)

Historic England Comments Received 22nd December 2022

No comment.

County Council Responses (Appendix 5)

Archaeological Service Comments Received 9th January 2023

No objection.

Fire and Rescue Team Comments Received 5th January 2023

It is recommended that a water tank for fire-fighting purposes separate from any other water system be installed to serve the development.

Flood and Water Team Comments Received 28th December 2022

Holding objection until the sequential test as required by NPPF paragraph 161 has been completed due to low surface water flood risk associated with the site.

Further Flood and Water Team Comments Received 13th February 2023

It is noted that the sequential test has been undertaken and that the exceptions test has also been performed. The holding objection is maintained to secure additional details regarding the attenuation basin and SuDS on site.

N.B – Members are advised that Officers have undertaken the required sequential and exceptions tests and that further consultation with the Flood and Water Team is currently being undertaken. For reference similar work was undertaken with regards to application DC/21/04697 with the Flood and Water Team content that the application could be managed by way of planning conditions. A further update from the Flood and Water Team will be delivered verbally once received.

Highways Comments Received 4th January 2023

No objection and no conditions noted.

Public Rights of Way Team Comments Received 10th January 2023

We accept the proposal but ask that an informative is applied making clear the legal responsibility of the landowner with regards to the public right of way.

Travel Plan Officer Comments Received 21st December 2022

Due to the limited increase in anticipated employees and parking, we do not believe it to be necessary to require a travel plan on this occasion.

Internal Consultee Responses (Appendix 6)

Climate Change Officer Comments Received 6th January 2023

No objection.

Environmental Health – Air Quality Comments Received 5th January 2023

No objection.

Environmental Health – Land Contamination Comments Received 5th January 2023

No objection.

Environmental Health – Noise, Odour, Smoke and Light Comments Received 21st December 2022

Having regard to the application we recommend the use of an acoustic assessment condition should any fixed plant or equipment be proposed to be installed within the warehouse proposed.

Place Services – Ecology Comments Received 3rd February 2023

No objection subject to securing biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures.

Public Realm Comments Received 19th December 2022

No comments.

Other Consultee Responses (Appendix 7)

British Horse Society Comments Received 9th January 2023

No objection, although encouragement is given for the improvement and upgrading of the public right of way within the wider site such that it could become a bridleway and suitable for use by a wider array of users.

Ramblers – Bury St. Edmunds Group Comments Received 9th January 2023

No comments.

Ramblers – Stowmarket Group Comments Received 9th January 2023

No comments.

B: Representations

At the time of writing this report no letters/emails/online comments have been received. It is the officer opinion that this represents no public representations being made on the application. A verbal update shall be provided as necessary.

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

PLANNING HISTORY

REF: DC/21/04697	Planning Application. Erection of new storage building No.10 for B8 use	DECISION: GTD 26.11.2021
REF: 0724/10	Erection of 2no. 130m wind turbines, electricity transformer and temporary works compound, construction of access tracks, hard standings and temporary access alterations.	DECISION: GTD 20.07.2010
REF: 0212/95/	Layout of roads and sewers using existing vehicular access with off-site infrastructure for future industrial development.	DECISION: GTD 24.05.1995
REF: DC/22/00416	Application for Outline Planning Permission (All matters reserved) - Erection of petrol and electric charging facility with associated shop; roadside restaurant with drive through facility; E(g) (formerly B1) and B8 starter units; HGV lorry parking facility for rest area and drivers' facilities as a phased development.	DECISION: PCO
REF: 3449/10	Erection of 1 electricity substation, 2 electrical enclosures and temporary construction compound. Construction of access track.	DECISION: WDN 25.01.2011
REF: 0852/10	Use of land for the display of motor vehicles for sale, erection of vehicle retail showroom, construction of raised display platforms and parking areas.	DECISION: REF 02.07.2010
REF: 0881/09	Erection of 70m high anemometry mast for temporary period of 2 years.	DECISION: GTD 08.05.2009
REF: 0677/09	1. Erection of met mast 2. Erection of 2 no. 2/3MW wind turbines	DECISION: REC
REF: 1061/08	Post enforcement appeal PD Rights Query.	DECISION: REC
REF: 0212/95/	Layout of roads and sewers using existing vehicular access with off-site infrastructure for future industrial development.	DECISION: GTD 24.05.1995
REF: 0247/90/	CONTINUED USE OF REDUNDANT BUILDINGS AS TAXI OFFICE AND THE PARKING OF 4 TAXIS	DECISION: GTD 20.06.1990
REF: 0212/95/	Layout of roads and sewers using existing vehicular access with off-site infrastructure for future industrial development.	DECISION: GTD 24.05.1995

REF: 0247/90/	CONTINUED USE OF REDUNDANT BUILDINGS AS TAXI OFFICE AND THE PARKING OF 4 TAXIS	DECISION: GTD 20.06.1990
REF: DC/19/00657	Full Planning Application - Erection of 2no. B8 storage buildings and link extension between buildings 6 and 7.	DECISION: GTD 01.05.2019
REF: DC/19/02711	Discharge of Conditions Application for DC/19/00657 - Condition 8 (Surface Water Drainage), Condition 9 (Implementation, Maintenance and Management of Surface Water Drainage), Condition 11 (Construction Surface Water Management Plan), Condition 12 (Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation), Condition 14 (Sustainable Efficiency Measures) and Condition 16 (Construction Management Plan).	DECISION: PGR 29.07.2019
REF: DC/19/03950	Discharge of Conditions Application for DC/19/00657 - Condition 8 (Surface Water Drainage) and Condition 11 (Construction Surface Water Management Plan)	DECISION: GTD 09.09.2019
REF: 0407/16	Proposed business park (poss. to be developed in 2 or more phases) See plans in IDOX from pre-meeting 28/01/16.	DECISION: REC
REF: 2644/13	Creation of new enclosed substation	DECISION: PDV 25.09.2013
REF: 0086/79	Erection of buildings for the manufacture of semi-trailers, rigid commercial vehicle bodies and ancillary purposes including open storage of trailer and construction of private sewage treatment plant.	DECISION: GTD 19.09.1979
REF: 0156/78/OL	Erection of buildings for manufacture of semi-trailers, rigid commercial vehicle bodies and ancillary purposes including open storage of trailer units and construction of private sewage treatment plant.	DECISION: GTD 13.10.1978
REF: 0212/95/	Layout of roads and sewers using existing vehicular access with off-site infrastructure for future industrial development.	DECISION: GTD 24.05.1995
REF: DC/18/02715	Notification of SCC Scoping Opinion (EIA) - The construction of two roundabouts along	DECISION: DEC 10.07.2018

the A140 and a road linking the northern roundabout with the B1077.

REF: DC/20/03957	Application for Advertisement Consent - Erection of 2No signs each consisting of 14 plate signs advertising Roy Humphrey Group businesses within the Eye airfield industrial complex.	DECISION: GTD 12.11.2020
REF: 1102/13	Use of land for the display of motor vehicles for sale, erection of vehicle retail showroom, construction of raised display platforms and parking areas (revised scheme to that previously approved under reference 2059/12).	DECISION: GTD 05.07.2013
REF: 0993/13	Use of land for the display of motor vehicles for sale, erection of vehicle retail showroom, construction of raised display platforms and parking areas.	DECISION: REC
REF: 2059/12	Use of land for the display of motor vehicles for sale, erection of vehicle retail showroom, construction of raised display platforms and parking areas.	DECISION: GTD 11.09.2012
REF: 3856/11	Use of land for siting storage container	DECISION: GTD 16.12.2011
REF: 0810/11	Erection of 1 electricity substation, 2 electrical enclosures and temporary construction compound. Construction of access track.	DECISION: GTD 27.05.2011
REF: 1480/09	Scoping Opinion request under part 4 of the EIA regulations 1999 (proposed wind turbines).	DECISION: EIA 26.06.2009
REF: 0858/09	Screening Opinion - for a wind energy scheme consisting of a maximum of two wind turbines	DECISION: EIA 15.04.2009
REF: 2533/05	Erection of a car showroom.	DECISION: REF 13.06.2006
REF: 0212/95/	Layout of roads and sewers using existing vehicular access with off-site infrastructure for future industrial development.	DECISION: GTD 24.05.1995

REF: 0212/95/	Layout of roads and sewers using existing vehicular access with off-site infrastructure for future industrial development.	DECISION: GTD 24.05.1995
REF: DC/17/05674	Application for Discharge of Condition for Requirement 9 (1) (Archeology) pursuant to The Progress Power (Gas Fired Power Station) Order 2015	DECISION: GTD 06.12.2017
REF: DC/19/02532	Discharge of Conditions Application for DC/17/05666 - Condition 23 (Renewable Energy Technology).	DECISION: REF 05.07.2019
REF: DC/19/04522	Discharge of Conditions Application for DC/17/05666 - Condition 17 (Highways - Access) and Condition 18 (Highways - Surface Water Discharge Prevention).	DECISION: GTD 11.10.2019
REF: DC/21/03894	Application for the Modification of a Section 106 Planning Obligation relating to Progress Power (Gas Fired Power Station) dated 13/01/2015 - Modification of Education and Employment Scheme	DECISION: GTD 01.09.2022
REF: 0549/17	Change of use to canine creche facility offering canine day care services, including secure fenced external exercise area and staff/customer parking.	DECISION: GTD 28.04.2017
REF: 0404/17	Buildings 1 & 2 - Change of use from B1 to Sui Generis - to set up a dog creche.	DECISION: ECP 31.01.2017
REF: 3619/13	Use class of building last occupied by Speed Deck.	DECISION: REC
REF: 2052/13/FUL	Change of use from B8 to B2 including installation of new door and windows.	DECISION: GTD 21.08.2013
REF: 0499/11	manufacture and storage of straw bedding material	DECISION: REC
REF: 2398/10	Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site	DECISION: REC
REF: 0021/85/A	Non illuminated company name and logo signs,	DECISION: GTD 22.10.1985
REF: 2350/08	use of land for stationing of simulated fire-test container	DECISION: REC

REF: 0212/95/	Layout of roads and sewers using existing vehicular access with off-site infrastructure for future industrial development.	DECISION: GTD 24.05.1995
REF: 0160/90/	PROPOSED PHASED EXPANSION OF STRAMIT INDUSTRIES TO INCLUDE EXTENSION TO EXISTING SPEED-DECK FACTORY, MATERIALS AND FINISHED GOODS STORE, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BUILDING, NEW FACTORY BUILDING INCORPORATING AN OFFICE ADMINISTRATION BLOCK, CAR PARKING, TRAILER PARK WITH OPERATIONAL SPACE AND STORM WATER STORAGE LAGOON OF 750,000 LITRE CAPACITY.	DECISION: GTD 20.11.1990
REF: 0247/90/	CONTINUED USE OF REDUNDANT BUILDINGS AS TAXI OFFICE AND THE PARKING OF 4 TAXIS	DECISION: GTD 20.06.1990
REF: 4166/11	Erection of B2 seed processing building and 9 silos and construction of hard standing following demolition of 4 agricultural buildings.	DECISION: GTD 28.03.2012
REF: 0212/95/	Layout of roads and sewers using existing vehicular access with off-site infrastructure for future industrial development.	DECISION: GTD 24.05.1995
REF: 0273/87	Layout of roads and sewers and other offside infrastructural works for industrial development.	DECISION: GTD 14.07.1987
REF: 0055/81/OL	Redevelopment of site including the erection of 3 blocks containing 24 units	DECISION: WDN 15.12.1983
REF: 0086/79	Erection of buildings for the manufacture of semi-trailers, rigid commercial vehicle bodies and ancillary purposes including open storage of trailer and construction of private sewage treatment plant.	DECISION: GTD 19.09.1979
REF: 2484/05	New building to provide vehicle storage and warehousing.	DECISION: GTD 27.04.2006
REF: 0370/90/	CHANGE OF USE TO HAULAGE DEPOT.	DECISION: GTD 20.06.1990
REF: 0051/99/	ERECTION OF 2 NO. SINGLE STOREY EXTENSIONS TO EXISTING UNIT;	DECISION: GTD 03.03.1999

	ERECTION OF DETACHED TIMBER STORE AND NEW OFFICE BLOCK.	
REF: 0404/98/	ERECTION OF TOILET BLOCK TO SERVE UNITS 8A-E AND UNITS 9A-D.	DECISION: GTD 18.06.1998
REF: 0212/95/	Layout of roads and sewers using existing vehicular access with off-site infrastructure for future industrial development.	DECISION: GTD 24.05.1995
REF: 0062/00/	ERECTION OF UNLOADING CANOPY OVER PART OF PAVED FORECOURT.	DECISION: GTD 29.02.2000
REF: 0341/00/	ERECTION OF WORKSHOP AND SHOWROOM BUILDING.	DECISION: GTD 07.06.2000
REF: 1436/02/	REMOVE EXISTING SETTLEMENT TANK. REPLACE WITH FILTER PRESS.	DECISION: GTD 30.12.2002
REF: 0026/89/	ERECTION OF TRAFFIC OFFICE EXTENSION	DECISION: GTD 22.03.1989
REF: 0002/99/A	INFORMATION PANEL AND DIRECTION SIGN.	DECISION: GTD 19.02.1999
REF: 0715/90/	USE OF FORMER COUNCIL DEPOT BUILDING FOR LIGHT VEHICLE BODY REPAIRS AND PAINT SPRAYING.	DECISION: GTD 08.10.1990
REF: 0371/96/	USE OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AS OFFICES AND GENERAL INDUSTRIAL USE	DECISION: GTD 11.06.1996

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1. The Site and Surroundings

- 1.1 The site is a level, rectangular shaped area of land that is located towards the southern end of, but within the defined Eye Airfield Business Park, with a given area of 1.49 hectares. It is located adjacent to two recently constructed B8 storage buildings, approved under planning application reference DC/19/00657 and immediately adjacent to another B8 storage building built out under planning permission DC/21/04697.
- 1.2 A notable feature to the north-east of the site is a substantial wind turbine, whereas adjacent to the north are a number of large, single volume, commercial buildings. The proposed development would be the eleventh such building on site. The site itself currently given over to grass.
- 1.3 The overall Eye Airfield site is readily accessible by road from the A140 trunk road that connects Ipswich with Norwich. The A140 is noted as a strategic lorry route within the Suffolk Lorry Route Network.

2. The Proposal

- 2.1 Under this full application submission, permission is sought for the erection of 1 no. B8 storage unit (identified in the application submission as building 11). No processes are proposed to be undertaken within the building except for loading and unloading stored materials using forklift trucks and no fans for ventilation, extraction or air conditioning are proposed. The proposed location of building 11 would continue the row of established buildings on the Business Park.
- 2.2 In the case of building 11, this would have external dimensions of 114.9 metres in length and 45.6 metres width (and hence an overall floor area of 5,310 sqm) with a maximum height of 11.4 metres to roof ridge and 8.0m to the eaves of the roof.
- 2.3 In terms of materials, the proposed building would be constructed in profiled steel sheet cladding walls and roofs – this being the prevalent material utilised on the other large, single volume buildings already located on the site with the colour of materials to match those existing on the site.

3. The Principle of Development

- 3.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that *'If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.'*
- 3.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states inter alia at paragraph 81: *'Planning policies and decisions should help to create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development...'*
- 3.3 The site for this application is located within the defined Eye Airfield Industrial Estate, as allocated in the adopted Local Plan. In this regard, Local Plan Policy E2 – Industrial Uses on Allocated Sites states that *'Favourable consideration will be given to applications for Industrial and Commercial development, as defined by Classes B1 and B8 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended), on the allocated sites, in accordance with the provisions of Table 4...'* In addition, Policy E3 – Warehousing, Distribution and Haulage Depots inter alia states that *'Favourable consideration will be given to applications for warehousing, storage and distribution on the sites allocated for such purposes in the Local Plan and identified in Table 4...'* Members are advised that the identified Table does include Eye Airfield, listing B1, B2 and B8 uses within the Use Classes Order as being suitable.
- 3.4 Leading on from this, the Eye Airfield Planning Position Statement, which has the status of Non-Statutory Planning Guidance, was adopted by the Council in November 2013. This document was intended to confirm the Council's decision that the Eye Airfield Development Framework (February 2013) should guide future development of the site. Within these documents, the application site is located in area 7 – Existing Business, described as *'Sites given planning permission, some scope for extensions, B1, B2, B8, logistics and data centre type use, retain and upgrade accesses.'* Again, in your officers' view the proposal for a warehouse and distribution centre, with associated office accommodation, conforms with the Framework and Position Statement's identified acceptable land uses – being a mixed B8 and B1 use.

- 3.5 Members are advised that the most up to date adopted policy document is the Eye Neighbourhood Plan (2018 – 2036). In this document, the application site is located within the defined Eye Business Area, and in this regard policy Eye 27 – Eye Business Area states:
'Eye Business Area shall be developed in accordance with the national and strategic policies. Any development should include Electric Vehicle Charging points consistent with Eye Policy 25 and Cycle Parking consistent with County Council Parking Guidance. Rights of Way should be maintained and enhanced within the area to allow access to and from the Town and to encourage wartime heritage visiting.'

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

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

4. Site Access, Parking and Highway Safety Considerations

- 4.1 The application development would be served by the existing access that serves the overall site. It is noted that SCC Highway Authority does not object to the proposals on grounds of the inadequacy of the access to serve the resultant amount of traffic.
- 4.2 In terms of parking provision, it is noted that the Council's adopted parking standards for B8 (Storage and Distribution) use are expressed as a *maximum* – therefore there is no minimum provision that would be applicable in this case. In terms of vehicle parking the adopted maximum standard is 1 space per 150 sqm. In total, the amount of new floorspace proposed under this application would be approximately 5,310 sqm and therefore the maximum number of spaces that would need to be proposed to meet the adopted standard is 35 spaces. The submitted proposal advises that 5 new car parking spaces would be provided with this building in addition the existing car and HGV parking already provided on the site.
- 4.3 Clearly the number of parking spaces proposed is below the maximum level required by the Council's adopted guidance in this matter. However, the number of spaces proposed would, it is felt, be an appropriate provision bearing in mind the nature (storage) of the development and the fact that the Council's adopted standard doesn't require a minimum provision as such. Further, the proposed warehouse is estimated to create three FTE jobs, such that the 5 parking spaces proposed would be more than adequate for the development even allowing for a small degree of visitor parking. It should also be noted that no retail element is proposed within the development such that there would be no public access to the site that may require a greater degree of visitor parking.

5. Design and Layout

- 5.1 Adopted Local Plan Policy GP1 – Design and Layout of Development requires inter alia that '...proposals should maintain or enhance the character and appearance of their surroundings and respect the scale and density of surrounding development...' Leading on from this, Local Plan policy E12 – General principles for Location, Design and Layout of Industrial and Commercial development includes a series of criteria that such proposals would be expected to comply with. As may be expected with a development of the type proposed, the submitted scheme is primarily driven by the functional needs arising from a warehousing and distribution type use. This requires the provision of a large single volume building that may be easily serviced. In this regard vehicular

access to the site is via the service road adjacent to the southern boundary. The access leads to a service and parking area – behind which would be the proposed built form.

- 5.2 The overall site is viewable from extensive publicly-accessible locations – not least from the A140 trunk road and also the public footpath that is adjacent to the southern boundary of the application site. To this end, it is considered that the existing built form to the north of the application site sets a strong development context. In this regard it is noted that the proposed layout and form of the development follows the established pattern – the new warehouse buildings continuing the row of buildings already located on site. It is considered that such an approach would be logical in terms of the arrangement of development and would not appear incongruous in the wider landscape setting.
- 5.3 The design of the buildings reflects the appearance of other buildings already on site. The commercial nature of the overall site has resulted in built form having a strong functional appearance. The design approach taken is considered to be wholly appropriate in the context of the surrounding form of development. Lastly it is noted that the submitted scheme does not include any external storage proposals, and this can be appropriately controlled by means of condition.
- 5.4 Core Strategy policy CS3 requires non-residential development proposals of over 1,000 sqm be required to integrate renewable energy technology in order to provide at least 10% of their projected energy requirements. With regards to this application, it is considered that the building will give rise to very limited energy requirements given the B8 storage use and lack of powered equipment within the proposed warehouse. The submitted planning statement notes that the entirety of the power required by the warehouse would be provided by the existing wind turbines on site.

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

- 6.1 The character of the site is such that it does not contain any trees or hedging. The nearest hedging that would potentially be impacted by the development proposed is located adjacent to the southern boundary, but it is considered that the distance between built form and this feature would mean that its structural integrity is not likely to be adversely impacted.
- 6.2 With regard to impacts on ecology, this aspect has been considered by the Council's retained ecological consultants. Their findings based on a review of the submitted Ecological Survey and Assessment provided by Essex Mammal Surveys, dated September 2022, Suffolk Biodiversity Information Services and DEFRA records are as follows:

'We are satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available for determination of this application... The Ecological Survey and Assessment details the pond closest to the site, we agree that terrestrial habitat is not present. However, due to the network of ponds close by the site, with the closest being less than 50m away from the site of the proposed building, and District Level Licencing Risk Zones for GCN rating the site as Amber risk, we believe that adequate mitigation for GCN has not been recommended and that submission and approval of a Precautionary Method Statement for GCN should be secured as a condition of any consent.'

We also support the proposed bespoke biodiversity enhancements, provided in the Ecological Survey and Assessment, which have been recommended to secure net gains for biodiversity, as outlined under paragraph 174d of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). Biodiversity enhancements include two barn owl nesting boxes. The bespoke biodiversity enhancement measures should be outlined within a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy and should be secured by a condition of any consent.'

- 6.3 Their response also notes the need to consider a condition to secure good practice mitigation to avoid ecological impacts, all of which can be appropriately secured by means of condition.

7. Land Contamination, Flood Risk, Drainage and Waste

- 7.1 This application proposal has not given rise to concerns regarding land contamination – as is noted from the consultation response received from the Council’s Environmental Health Officer. In any event, it is recommended that an informative be added to a grant of planning permission that identifies the developer’s responsibility in the event that unexpected land contamination is found during the construction process.
- 7.2 As regards flood risk, the site is located in flood zone 1 and therefore is not in an area that is adversely impacted by fluvial (river flooding). That said, the site is impacted by potential surface water flooding issues, in an unusual pluvial (rainfall) event. In this regard, the following comments are made by the applicant’s agent:
‘The surface water runoff will discharge into a drainage system, designed to contain up to and including the 1 in 100 year rainfall event including CC. To prevent pollution to the surface waters, underlying geology, and groundwater an appropriate level of water treatment stages have been incorporated into the design. To reduce risk of flooding due to the failure of the surface water drainage system over its lifespan, a maintenance scheme should be adhered to, as detailed.’
- 7.3 The submission advises that surface water run-off from the building will be accommodated within the existing drainage system on the site which discharges into an above ground SuDS system. This was expanded to accommodate the neighbouring buildings and is proposed to be further expanded to accommodate this building. Further, site users will be signed up to receive advance flood warning information and the building is proposed to be built in accordance with water resistant building methods.
- 7.4 Officers have undertaken the sequential and exceptions tests and it is determined that this site is the most suitable, available location for the proposed development. Given strategic land allocations it is sequentially preferable to locate the development here. In addition, it is considered that the development of the site can take place safely, bearing in mind the impacts that could arise from the pluvial flood events. Similar work was undertaken for the previous application on site, with similar conclusions reached. Advice from the Flood and Water Team was that the development was acceptable subject to the imposition of conditions which is considered likely to be the case here.
- 7.5 The site lies within Essex and Suffolk Water’s Hartismere Water Resource Zone which they note in response to the emerging Joint Local Plan to have limited availability for non-domestic water users. In this regard, the application presented is non-domestic for their purposes and such will not be able to abstract groundwater to meet its needs.
- 7.6 This being said, no water use is proposed within the proposed building given its use as storage. This is further restricted via planning condition such that if a more water intensive user occupies the building, planning permission would be required to approve the use which would be dependent on their proving themselves to be water neutral in their resource requirements.
- 7.7 With regards to the internal layout of the building, no staff room or toilet is proposed within the building, however, even if they were, this would likely be acceptable as the information presented by Essex and Suffolk Water indicates that they consider this use to be so akin to domestic water use so as to be acceptable even within the Hartismere Water Resource Zone.

8. Heritage Issues

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

9. Impact on Residential Amenity

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

10. Planning Obligations / CIL

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

11. Parish Council Comments

- 11.1 The comments of the Town and Parish Councils are noted in respect of this application and are addressed in the report above.
- 11.2 With regards to the comments raised by Brome and Oakley Parish Council and to a lesser extent the British Horse Society, no such requirement for upgrading has been made by the Public Rights of Way Team at SCC who would ultimately be responsible for the upgrading and maintenance of the public right of way on site. Having visited the site, the run of the public right of way is unobstructed and signed to a degree. Given the lack of support from the SCC Public Rights of Way Team for this, upgrading of the route has not been brought forward within this application.
- 11.3 With regards to the comments of Thrandeston and Yaxley Parish Councils, the supporting evidence prepared in support of this application notes that the adjacent buildings on site (buildings 8, 9 and 10) all collectively drain into a collective SuDS feature with an effective working life of 75 years and provides for drainage from over 3ha of hardstanding on the site. Planning applications are only required to mitigate their own impacts, which has been demonstrated here, it is not possible to require additional surface water drainage works to be implemented as a result of offsite flooding from other parts of the site. An informative has been added to the recommendation below to ensure that maintenance of other exiting SuDS and drainage features on site is undertaken.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

12. Planning Balance and Conclusion

- 12.1 The submitted proposal seeks to augment and add to existing commercial development on the former Eye airfield. The site forms part of an area that is recognised as being an appropriate location for industrial and commercial development in the Council's adopted plan and other supplementary documents as identified in this report. Furthermore, the form of development proposed would reflect the context of development that is established on the site. The scheme would result in the creation of job opportunities which is welcomed, and it is considered that impacts arising from the development could be properly mitigated through the imposition of conditions.
- 12.2 In conclusion it is recommended that the Council grants a conditional planning permission for this development proposal.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary by the Chief Planning Officer:

- Standard time limit
- Approved plans
- Materials to be as stated within application
- Use of building to be B8 only
- Control of hours of work for building
- No installation of plant/machinery/equipment within the building without appropriate noise assessment
- No external storage to be permitted within the red line site
- Limit to construction hours of work
- No burning of materials on site
- Work to be undertaken in accordance with construction method statement
- Sewage plant to be installed prior to first use
- Details of fire fighting water tank to be erected on site to be agreed and installed prior to first use
- Submission of scheme of water, energy and resource efficiency measures for both construction and operational phase
- Details of provision for electric vehicle charging points
- Provision of parking area prior to first use
- Ecological good practice measures during construction, GCN method statement, biodiversity enhancement strategy and lighting
- Final flood measures to be agreed and implemented in full including maintenance

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

- Proactive working statement
- Support for sustainable development principles

- Note regarding unexpected ecological presence
- Note regarding unexpected land contamination
- Note regarding public rights of way
- Note regarding maintenance of other SuDS features and drains onsite.