

## **Committee Report**

**Item No:** 1

**Reference:** DC/17/05666

**Case Officer:** Gemma Walker

**Ward:** Palgrave.

**Ward Member/s:** Cllr David Burn.

---

### **Description of Development**

Planning Application - Erection of a new processing facility, waste water treatment plant and gatehouse with associated car park and service yards, two vehicle access points, drainage swale and landscaping.

### **Location**

Land To The South Of Eye Airfield And East Of The A140

**Parish:** Yaxley

**Site Area:** 108700 m<sup>2</sup>

**Conservation Area:** No

**Listed Building:** No

**Received:** 11/11/2017

**Expiry Date:** 27/02/2018

---

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

**Development Type:** Major Large Scale - All Other

**Environmental Impact Assessment:** Schedule 2; EIA not required.

**Applicant:** Cranswick Country Foods PLC

**Agent:** Mr Mark Bassett

---

## **DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION**

This decision refers to drawing number PL001FF received 23/02/2018 as the defined red line plan with the site shown edged red. Any other drawing showing land edged red whether as part of another document or as a separate plan/drawing has not been accepted or treated as the defined application site for the purposes of this decision.

The plans and documents recorded below are those upon which this decision has been reached:

Topographic Survey PL002 SHEET 1 - Received 11/11/2017

Topographic Survey PL003 SHEET 2 - Received 11/11/2017

Topographic Survey PL004 SHEET 3 - Received 11/11/2017

Topographic Survey PL005 SHEET 4 - Received 11/11/2017

Topographic Survey PL006 SHEET 5 - Received 11/11/2017

Topographic Survey PL007 SHEET 7 - Received 11/11/2017

Floor Levels Plan PL011 BUILDING LAYAOUT PLAN F F - Received 11/11/2017  
General Details PL012 SECURITY GATEHOUSE - Received 11/11/2017  
General Details PL014 ELEV WASTE WATER PLANT - Received 11/11/2017  
General Details PL013 PROP WASTE WATER TRTMNT - Received 11/11/2017  
Floor Plan - Proposed PL010B BUILDING LAYOUT GF - Received 28/11/2017  
General Details PL016A - EXTERNAL LIGHTING PLAN - Received 28/11/2017  
Elevations - Proposed PL201B PROPOSED ELEV TREATMENTS - Received 28/11/2017  
Proposed Site Plan PL008H PROP DEV PLAN SHEET 1 H - Received 23/02/2018  
Defined Red Line Plan PL001F F - Received 23/02/2018

The application, plans and documents submitted by the Applicant can be viewed online at [www.midsuffolk.gov.uk](http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk). Alternatively a copy is available to view at the Mid Suffolk and Babergh District Council Offices.

---

## **PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE**

---

The application is referred to committee for the following reason/s:

It is a “Major” application for: industrial floorspace in excess of 3,750 sq metres.

---

## **PART TWO – APPLICATION BACKGROUND**

---

### **History**

There is no relevant planning history relating to the application site, however a detailed assessment of the planning history of relevant neighbouring sites including any material Planning Appeals will be carried out as needed in Part Three.

### **All Policies Identified As Relevant**

The proposal has been assessed with regard to adopted development plan policies, the National Planning Policy Framework and all other material considerations. Highlighted local and national policies are listed below. Detailed assessment of policies in relation to the recommendation and issues highlighted in this case will be carried out within the assessment:

### **Summary of Policies**

NPPF

CS2 Development in the Countryside and Countryside Villages

CS3 Reduce Contributions to Climate Change

CS5 Mid Suffolk’s Environment

FC1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

FC1.1 Mid Suffolk approach of delivering Sustainable Development

FC3 Employment

GP1 Design and Layout of Development

HB1 Protection of Listed Buildings

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

T9 Parking standards

T10 Highway considerations in development

Eye Airfield Planning Position Statement

Eye Airfield Development Framework

## **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**

#### **Yaxley Parish Council**

The Parish Council objects to the application for the following reasons:

o The traffic assessment does not take into account the following problems:

- The concentration of traffic on Castleton Way and on Eye Road, Yaxley from Hartismere High School, Mellis Primary School and the processing facility, at the beginning and end of the school day, as it tries to join the A140, in particular as it tries to turn right towards Norwich.

- The potential for heavy good vehicles (HGVs) to drive through Mellis and Yaxley, for twenty-four hours each day, from the A143 to the processing facility. The road is inadequate for this type of traffic, and in addition there would be noise and vibration which would affect the properties in the village. Any permission for the application to go ahead should require that HGVs use the A143 and A140 only.

- The problem of vehicles stacking on the A 140 as they try to enter the processing facility.

- There is no public transport locally that would reduce the traffic to the process facility.

- The processing facility will open before any road improvements are completed.

o Environmental considerations:

- The problem of odours from the processing facility. The Parish Council requires confirmation that the processing facility will meet the requirements of the regulations that would prevent this.

- Light pollution: this is a major problem which will be caused by a processing facility that will operate for 24 hours each day.

- Noise: this is a major problem which will be caused by a processing facility that will operate for 24 hours each day. The noise from lorries with refrigerated bodies running will cause a disturbance, especially at night.

- Flooding: the risk of flooding from the water course which will be on two sides of the processing facility.

o A buffer zone would be essential with planting that would limit the impact of the processing facility.

#### **Eye Town Council**

Whilst we have no fundamental objections to this development we do have several concerns as follows:-

---

- 1) Turning right across the traffic flow into the factory complex
  - 2) Flooding concern as outline in the report. Restrictions and conditions should be fully implemented
  - 3) All HGV traffic from the east of Eye during construction and afterwards should wherever possible be directed away from Eye.
  - 4) we have concerns over the light pollution as the factory is a 24/7 operation and there is a considerable quantity of lighting shown on the plan.
- Having said the above we welcome the opportunity of local employment (600+)

### **Environment Agency**

No objection to the proposal.

### **Natural England**

Statutory nature conservation sites - no objection

Natural England has assessed this application using the Impact Risk Zones data (IRZs) and is satisfied that the proposed development being carried out in strict accordance with the details of the application, as submitted, will not damage or destroy the interest features for which the Gypsy Camp Meadows, Thrandeston SSSI has been notified. We therefore advise your authority that this SSSI does not represent a constraint in determining this application. Should the details of this application change, Natural England draws your attention to Section 28(1) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), requiring your authority to re-consult Natural England.

### **SCC Highways**

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as the local highway authority has no objections to the proposal subject to the imposition of the conditions shown below on any permission to be granted and the

completion of a S106 planning obligation to its satisfaction:

#### Comments

The County Council remains strongly supportive of this application in principle but would like to make the following comments:

1. It is agreed the design for the access off the A140 as shown on Drawing 17091/010, has no technical deficiency and is within current design guidelines. However, due to the concerns and the history of accidents due to right turning traffic onto and off the highway in this location, our preferred option is for all traffic accesses the site via the industrial estate road off Castleton Way. However, SCC and the applicant has agreed that 'left only in and out' would be acceptable due to the proposed construction of the roundabouts north and south of the site.

2. Due to the programming of construction works of the roundabout and the site, there will be a temporary period where the staff will be accessing the site via Castleton Way until the roundabouts are completed. If however, the construction of the roundabouts do not proceed or are severely delayed, then the original layout for the access on the A140 would be acceptable.

No objections subject to conditions.

### **SCC Archaeology**

The site lies in an area of high archaeological potential recorded in the County Historic Environment Record, within the extent of a former Second World War airfield (EYE 072). Current archaeological investigations as part of the Eye Progress Power scheme have identified an area of Roman settlement to the north-east of the proposed development area, as well as evidence of medieval occupation, plus the remains of prehistoric and Roman field systems immediately to the south of the current application site.

---

There are no grounds to consider refusal of permission in order to achieve preservation in situ of any important heritage assets. However, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 141), any permission granted should be the subject of a planning condition to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed.

### **SCC Flood and Water**

Recommend approval subject to conditions

### **SCC Fire and Rescue**

Recommends fire hydrants be installed within the development and controlled by imposition of suitable planning condition.

### **Economic Development**

Mid Suffolk DC Economic Development support this application and recommend grant of planning permission, for the following reasons:

- It supports BMSDC Joint Strategic Plan (Priority 1) Economy and Growth – development of employment sites in the right place, encouraging investment in infrastructure, skills and innovation to increase productivity
- It supports MSDC Planning Position Statement for Eye Airfield 2013
- Eye Airfield is a MSDC Strategic Employment location
- The application will safeguard circa 300 local jobs, provide opportunities for upskilling existing workforce and potential for additional FTEs on site in the future
- The application has acted as a catalyst for delivery of much needed Highways improvements around Eye junctions with A140 that would have been a barrier to future growth – commercial and housing
- The application represents significant investment in an important local industry sector – food manufacturing/processing – the applicant has indicated that there will be significant investment in the local supply chain to support the production requirements of this plant, thereby providing additional benefit to the local economy

### **Environmental Health – Land contamination**

No objection

### **Environmental Health – Other**

The operation and control of emissions to air, land and water for this premise will be regulated by the Environment Agency, and the premises (intensive food manufacture) subject to a permit within the regime of Integrated Pollution Prevention Control under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. I would recommend that Agency is consulted with respect to any impacts from odour and noise etc.

I note the report by Sharps Redmore Acoustic consultants which assesses the noise impact of the development from operation and loading/transport activities. The report concludes that noise from the service yard, car parking and dispatch areas will not have any significant impact on local residents

At the current stage there is no information on mechanical plant and refrigeration equipment, and therefore, there is no proposed plant noise to assess. Accordingly, the noise assessment has been based on an environmental survey to establish target sound emission limits for the development.

Items of static services, plant and machinery associated with development will be designed to give a cumulative sound rating level (LA,T) along with operational noise from the enterprise park, of no greater than the current prevailing typical background sound level (LA90,T) at any time at the nearest noise

sensitive receptors, identified as the existing and proposed residential dwellings around the site boundary.

To meet this requirement, the noise plant sound limits are set out in Table 4.2 have been proposed based on the typical background daytime and night-time sound levels in the area. These limits will apply to all noise emissions from all operational activities and static plant within the new development.

The report advises that this is reasonable and achievable and could be secured by a way of a condition to any approval.

This approach is reasonable and robust.

I do not, therefore, have any adverse comments to make and no objection to the proposed development in outline.

### **Environmental Health – Air Quality**

I can confirm that I have no objection to the proposed development from the perspective of air quality. Operational emissions are covered by environmental permitting regulations as outlined in the response from the Environment Agency.

### **Arboricultural Officer**

No objection subject to being undertaken in accordance with the precautionary measures outline in the accompanying report. A Tree Protection Plan clearly identifying the position for protective fencing should also be submitted in order to help ensure effective implementation.

Although a number of trees are proposed for removal they are generally of limited amenity value and their loss will have negligible impact upon the arboricultural quality of the site or character of the local area.

### **Landscape**

The full application proposed site development plan includes the indicative locations of the proposed development, vehicle access points, soft and hard landscape areas, a tree belt of 15m which seems fitting for a development of this scale to reduce the noise and visual pollution. Trees have been proposed within the hard landscaped parking areas to break up the harsh effect of the expanse of hard landscape. Swales have been suitably implemented within the south and eastern part of the site as anticipated water runoff will be directed to the lowest part of the site here.

The Landscape and Visual impact Assessment identifies policies that state the need for new housing and employment and accurately represents the likely effects of the proposal on the landscape.

Constraints and opportunities have successfully been identified amongst local context, current site conditions have been studied as well as the visual setting of the development within the landscape. The scenic quality is already influenced by large industrial units, signage, commercial vehicles and wind turbines, and so the proposed development would only be in keeping with the existing scenic quality. Nevertheless the proposed development has made substantial efforts to screen the site at all boundaries. This concludes that there has been an identified need in the area, which will be met within an appropriate like setting.

### **Proposed mitigation**

The development has recognised opportunities to screen the eastern, southern and western boundaries of the site through the strategic planting of a 15m belt of wooded area along with low level hedging, and so there is suitable mitigation in place to minimise the impact of the proposed development. This further enhances mature hedgerow or tree planting currently in place around the site.

---

## **Waste**

No objection

## **Ecology**

Additional comments following red line amendment:

I have reviewed the revisions to this application and recommend that a further ecological assessment is undertaken to cover the full red line boundary, highlighted in the PI001f revised location plan (February 2018). This could be provided with an addendum to the initial ecological report (FPCR Environment and Design, November 2017). This would then provide the LPA with certainty of likely impacts for protected species and priority species/habitats.

Any mitigation measures and reasonable enhancements for protected species and priority species/habitats, recommended within the further ecological assessment, can then be secured as a condition of consent.

Initial Comments

No objection subject to conditions to secure mitigations and enhancements for protected and priority species.

## **Heritage**

No objection.

## **B: Representations**

3 Objections:

Countryside location

Sensitivity of landscape

Contrary to development framework

No access from Castleton Way

HGV ban through Yaxley and Mellis

Odour control

Noise levels should be monitored

1 Support:

Provides Cranswick with an opportunity to extend and become a state of the art facility with good road links for expanding the business

---

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

---

From an assessment of relevant planning policy and guidance, representations received, the planning designations and other material issues the main planning considerations considered relevant to this case are set out including the reason/s for the decision, any alternative options considered and rejected. Where a decision is taken under a specific express authorisation, the names of any Member of the Council or local government body who has declared a conflict of interest are recorded.

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

1.1 The application site forms land at the South of Eye airfield, North of Castleton Way, and East of the A140. It is currently relatively open agricultural land, enclosed by roads on three sides. To the north of the site is the wider Eye Airfield with existing commercial and industrial development.

- 1.2 To the North of the site are existing business uses on Eye Airfield in a variety of uses. The surrounding area is otherwise predominantly open. With regards to residential properties Yaxley village is to the west, across the A140, further residential properties are on the outskirts of Eye and also to the south of the site, with agricultural land in the intervening areas.

## **2. The Proposal**

- 2.1. The proposal is for a production facility for processing chickens, to be situated at the northern part of the application site, with access for lorries by way of access from Potash Lane onto Castleton Way. An additional access is proposed onto the A140 for access for staff/visitors.
- 2.2 The proposed building is a maximum height of 12.02m, with a low-pitched roof and eaves between 7.02m and 9.06m.

## **3. National Planning Policy Framework**

- 3.1. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 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-making purposes.

## **4. Core Strategy**

- 4.1 Policy FC3 of the Core Strategy Focused sets out the allocation of employment sites, including Eye Airfield for B1, B2 and B8 use.

## **5. The Principle Of Development**

- 5.1. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27th March 2012. It provides that the NPPF "does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved, and proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise".
- 5.2 The NPPF also provides (paragraph 14) that there is "a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking". This paragraph continues "for decision-taking this means approving proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted".
- 5.3 Local Plan Policy E10 allows new industrial and commercial development in the countryside where there is a need for it to be located away from towns and villages. Given the size, scale and nature of this proposal it is reasonable to consider that the proposal should be situated away from towns and villages.
- 5.4 Furthermore Eye Airfield is set out in the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Focused Review FC3, as a site for economic growth including commercial development. The application site is



further set out for commercial development in the Eye Airfield Planning Position Statement and Framework, which include guidance on designations and development.

- 5.5 The Eye Airfield Development Framework indicative masterplan shows the site as having the potential for development, although part of the site is shown on the indicative plan for additional landscaping. This is supported by the subsequent Position Statement plan. Consideration as to the impact of the change to the indicative landscaping shown on the masterplan is considered in the report with regards to the overall landscape impact, although the principle is considered acceptable in this regard.
- 5.6 It is noted that the Position Statement sets out that the site is outside the definition of the Eye Airfield 'site', and should therefore be treated as countryside, however nonetheless the site is designated as part of Phase 1 of the southwestern zone (Map 7) in the Position Statement.
- 5.7 In the light of all of the above, and having regard to the requirements of the NPPF, although the site may be considered 'countryside' it is nonetheless within the locale of existing employment development, with good transport links and the proposal has a need to be located away from towns and villages, such that the principle of the proposal is considered to be acceptable, subject to the detailed requirements of policies and the impacts of the proposal.

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

- 6.1. Access to the site would be in two parts, firstly from Castleton Way onto Potash Lane and subsequently into the site. This would be the main site entrance and exit for deliveries and dispatches. Many of the existing businesses on Eye Airfield operate from this access point including use by HGVs. SCC Highways have confirmed that the use of this access is appropriate, subject to the appropriate visibility splay being implemented. This would offer benefit to the wider traffic using this junction by enhancing the visibility splays to highways requirements.
- 6.2 The second access to the site is proposed from the A140. Following conversations with SCC Highways the details of this have been agreed. However, the final format of this access depends on future delivery of proposed highways infrastructure, although it is noted that either access would be acceptable.
- 6.3 Roundabouts are proposed for the A140 to the north and south of the proposed access onto the A140, if this comes forward as planned then a 'left in, left out' junction has been agreed. It is only if the roundabouts do not come forward as planned then it would be acceptable to revert to the proposed junction. In the interim period all access to the site would be from Castleton Way.
- 6.4 As such whilst the proposal would add another junction onto the A140 this is not considered to result in harm to highway safety and alternatives to limit the use are proposed on the basis that the proposed roundabouts are implemented. Furthermore, the proposal would enhance the existing visibility at the Castleton Way junction.
- 6.5 Conditions are proposed to ensure the delivery of the Castleton Way and A140 visibility splay and to confirm the detail of the access, to allow either variant to be delivered, depending on the timing and delivery of the roundabouts. Conditions to support sustainable travel options are also proposed to enhance sustainable access to the site.
- 6.6 In light of all of the above the proposal is not considered to result in harm to highway safety to consider refusal in this respect.

## **7. Design And Layout**

- 7.1. The proposed layout reflects the existing development on Eye Airfield, with the narrower aspect of the building facing towards the A140, and the building extending lengthways eastwards away from the A140. The built form itself would be situated to the northern part of the application site, closest to the existing developed areas and with the southern part remaining open. Given that the proposal reflects the existing built form and character of the area the layout of the proposal is not considered to be unacceptable, having particular regards for existing development and the impact of the proposed design and layout.
- 7.2. The proposed building is a maximum of 12.02m to the ridge, with a dual ridge forming a valley roof, and with a wide spanned roof to reduce the overall height of the building. This is comparable to the buildings to the north of the site at 11.14m (permission for new warehouse 0564/05). As such the proposed building would not be out of keeping with the scale of development on the airfield with regards to the height.
- 7.3. The proposed building is of a large scale with regards to the footprint proposed, however there is sufficient room on the site to accommodate the proposal both with regards to the building, operation space, parking and landscaping. Furthermore, the design and orientation consider the predominant views across the site and reflect the existing layout of development on the wider Eye Airfield.

## **8. Landscape Impact**

- 8.1. Eye Airfield is largely situated within the Ancient Plateau Clayland character area and part in the Rolling Valley Claylands. The landscape has become degraded with the hedgerows and trees having been eroded and commercial development having extended across the airfield. The Development Framework therefore sets out a strategic layout to improve the landscape quality of the site through extensive planting of hedgerows and shelterbelts to contribute to habitat connectivity and local amenity.
- 8.2. The site is also in a sensitive area with regards to views and visual sensitivity, with viewpoints which extend across the Eye Airfield and into the historic centre of Eye. As such the Development Framework sets out requirements for Strategic Landscape Planting across the airfield.
- 8.3. The Eye Airfield Planning Position Statement further develops these points as part of the masterplan, which includes the application site within the south-western zone as Phase 1 of the development of the airfield.
- 8.4. The layout of the proposed development would result in the imposition of part of the site into an area indicatively allocated in the Development Framework and Position Statement for landscaping designed to provide woodland screening between the airfield and Yaxley, although equally the Position Statement allows this area for "some later business development once planting is well established".
- 8.5. In the light of this whilst it is recognised that the site in part extends into this area, the site could also provide landscaping such that this would still provide a landscape enclosure as envisaged by the Position Statement and can be appropriately secured by means of condition. Furthermore, whilst the proposal would result in a small loss of the overall area expected for landscaping this application can secure the initial phase of that landscaping insofar as it relates to the application site. As such the proposal will have the benefit of securing an initial phase of the landscape

delivery proposed by the planning guidance, if not absolutely in the way envisioned. Overall the proposal is not considered to result in unacceptable harm in this regard, and whilst not wholly in compliance with the masterplan would deliver some of the benefits these intended. It is further noted that the Development Framework and Position Statement are non-statutory planning guidance, rather than policy.

- 8.6 With regards to the wider landscape setting, the proposal includes landscaping areas, a tree belt and use of trees to soften the impact of hard landscaped area to break up the effect on the landscape. As such it is considered that the design and layout consider and mitigate the impact of the proposal on the wider locality.
- 8.7 The site is in an area of existing commercial development, including the wind turbines, and consent has also been granted for a gas fired power station on Eye Airfield. The proposal would be reasonably well related to the existing development on the airfield and in the light of this and the considerations made to provide landscaping screening, which can be appropriately secured by means of condition, is such that the proposal is not considered to have an unacceptable impact on the landscape to consider refusal on this basis.

## **9. Environmental Impacts - Ecology And Land Contamination**

- 9.1. With regards to ecology the existing site is open land with limited opportunities for biodiversity. As such whilst the proposal would result in the loss of this land, the proposal includes landscaping, which in itself will offer biodiversity enhancements. Furthermore, additional mitigation and enhancements can also be secured on the site, offering benefit in this regard.
- 9.2 Initially our ecologist raised no objection to the proposal subject to the appropriate mitigation measures being implemented. However, the highway element of the proposal resulted in a change to the red line site to include appropriate visibility splays. To Castleton Way this is as previously agreed for other works on Eye Airfield, whilst to the A140 this is existing verge alongside the A140 with limited landscaping. In the light of this the proposal is not considered to risk harm in this respect to warrant refusal. Conditions are proposed to ensure that the proposal would comply with the ecological appraisal submitted and provide appropriate mitigation.
- 9.3 Eye Airfield was a second world war airfield, and as a result is potentially contaminated, however Environmental Health, Land Contamination, do not have any objection to the proposal in this respect.
- 9.4 The Environment Agency did comment with regards to environmental permitting and confirmed that, depending on the total production, a permit would be required, which would be subject to conditions to control emissions in terms of noise and odour. The Environment Agency state that there may be some residual noise and odour, however the impact has also been considered by our Environmental Health Team who do not have any objection subject to conditions.

## **10. Heritage Issues**

- 10.1. Eye Airfield was a second world war airfield, Potash Lane being the old runway. The proposal includes access from Potash Lane and would remain within the boundaries of the airfield such that the proposal is not considered to result in harm to the airfield as a heritage asset.
- 10.2 The surrounding area is, as set out in the landscape section of this report, relatively open with viewpoints which provide views across the airfield, in particular to the historic centre of Eye.

There are multiple listed buildings within Eye, including the Church and Castle and also Langton Green, Brome and Yaxley to identify the most relevant locations.

- 10.3 The proposal would represent further built development which would have some impact on the distant views of some of these, most notably the Church and Castle in Eye. However, the site forms part of the wider Eye Airfield development area and includes appropriate landscape screening to mitigate this impact. As such the proposal is considered to have a limited impact on the setting and significance of the Listed Buildings, resulting in less than substantial harm. The limited, less than substantial, harm is, in accordance with paragraph 134 of the NPPF, considered to be outweighed by the public benefit of delivering an employment generating development on a site allocated as such.
- 10.4 The application site is also within an area of high archaeological potential, being within the extent of the former Second World War airfield, however SCC Archaeology recommend that there are no grounds to consider refusal of permission in order to achieve preservation of any heritage assets in situ. Conditions are therefore proposed to ensure that appropriate archaeological investigation and recording is carried out.

### **11. Impact On Residential Amenity**

- 11.1. The application site is relatively remote from neighbouring residential properties, nearby properties being across the A140 in Yaxley, on the outskirts of Eye and to the south, either with intervening agricultural land or separated by the A140.
- 11.2 In the light of this, the design and scale of the proposal, and the proposed landscaping the proposal is not considered to have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity to consider refusal in this respect.

### **12. Environment And Flood Risk**

- 12.1 The Environment Agency and our Environmental Health Team have considered the proposal and raise no objections in this respect. The proposal would be subject to relevant permitting requirements of the Environment Agency.
- 12.2 The proposal includes surface water drainage which has been agreed by SCC Flood and Water and is acceptable subject to conditions, such that the proposal does not have a detrimental impact in this respect.

### **13. Planning Obligations / CIL**

- 13.1 The proposal as employment floorspace would have a CIL rate of £0.
- 13.2. In accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations, 2010, the obligations recommended to be secured by way of a planning obligation deed are (a) necessary to make the Development acceptable in planning terms (b) directly related to the Development and (c) fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the Development.

### **14. Details Of Financial Benefits / Implications (S155 Housing and Planning Act 2016)**

- 14.1. The development will lead to benefits including additional Business Rates payments. These considerations are not held to be material to the recommendation made on this application, nor its decision.

---

## **PART FOUR – CONCLUSION**

---

### **15. Statement Required By Article 35 Of The Town And Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015.**

- 15.1. When determining planning applications The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 requires Local Planning Authorities to explain how, in dealing with the application they have worked with the applicant to resolve any problems or issues arising.
- 15.2. In this case the officer liaised with the applicant's agents and sought further information to resolve issues raised.

### **16. Planning Balance**

- 16.1 The application site is designated in adopted planning guidance for development, and for the provision of landscape screening. Whilst the proposed footprint of the site would extend in part into the area designated for further landscaping this is not considered to be unacceptable to warrant refusal. A robust landscape screening of the site can be provided on site and appropriate controlled by way of condition, delivering the first part of the landscape screening as part of this proposal.
- 16.2 In the light of the benefits of delivering employment development on the site and the proposed mitigation which can be appropriately secured by way of condition the proposal is not considered to have unacceptable impacts, with particular regards to design, layout, access, landscape, ecology, amenity and heritage assets, such that the proposal is not considered to be acceptable.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That authority be delegated to Corporate Manager - Growth & Sustainable Planning to grant outline planning permission subject to the conditions as set out below:

- Time limit
- Approved plans
- Restriction on changes of use
- Implementation of FRA
- Sustainable Urban Drainage System included on Flood Risk Asset Register
- Construction Surface Water Management Plan
- Noise limit including further noise assessment
- Construction management plan
- Construction working hours
- Operational working hours
- Landscaping scheme including tree protection and boundary treatment
- Finishes and materials to be agreed
- Compliance with ecological appraisal and mitigation
- Archaeological investigation and recording
- Fire hydrants
- Provision of visibility splays

- Means to prevent discharge of surface water onto highway
- Submission final details of access including phasing of construction and access in the interim
- Details of parking, manoeuvring and cycle storage
- Travel plan information pack
- Lighting design scheme
- Works within the public highway