Application Number: DC/17/05666 Proposal:
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.

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

- 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 A140 as they try to enter the processing facility.
  - There is no public transport locally that would reduce the traffic to the processing facility.
  - The processing facility will open before any road improvements are completed.
- 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.
- A buffer zone would be essential with planting that would limit the impact of the processing facility.

Subject:FW: The Responses of Yaxley Parish Council to Planning Applications.

From: philip.c.freeman@btinternet.com [mailto:philip.c.freeman@btinternet.com]
Sent: 21 December 2017 13:59
To: BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Cc: Gemma Walker
Subject: The Responses of Yaxley Parish Council to Planning Applications.

Please find below the responses of Yaxley Parish Council to your requests for comments.

Many thanks,

Philip Freeman

Clerk to Yaxley Parish Council.

i. Application Number: DC/17/05666 Proposal:
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.

- The Parish Council objects to the application for the following reasons:
    - 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 A140 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.

- 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.

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

Consultee Comments for Planning Application DC/17/05666

Application Summary
Application Number: DC/17/05666
Address: Land To The South Of Eye Airfield And East Of The A140
Proposal: 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.
Case Officer: Gemma Walker

Consultee Details
Name: Mrs Wendy Alcock
Address: 20 Broad Street, Eye, Suffolk IP23 7AF
Email: townclerk@eyesuffolk.org
On Behalf Of: Eye Town Clerk

Comments
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+)

Consultee Comments for Planning Application DC/17/05666

Application Summary
Application Number: DC/17/05666
Address: Land To The South Of Eye Airfield And East Of The A140
Proposal: 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.
Case Officer: Gemma Walker

Consultee Details
Name: Mrs Wendy Alcock
Address: 20 Broad Street, Eye, Suffolk IP23 7AF
Email: townclerk@eyesuffolk.org
On Behalf Of: Eye Town Clerk

Comments
Comments as previous consultation plus the need if possible to restrict the flow of traffic from the east after completion of the processing facility through Eye.

Mid Suffolk District Council
Planning Department
131, Council Offices High Street
Needham Market
Ipswich
IP6 8DL

Our ref: AE/2018/122384/01-L01
Your ref: DC/17/05666

Date: 17 January 2018

Dear Ms Walker

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.

LAND TO THE SOUTH OF EYE AIRFIELD AND EAST OF THE A140

Thank you for consulting us on this application which we received on 3 January 2018. We have no objection to the proposal and offer the following advice.

Environmental Permitting

Based on the information provided, a development for the processing of chickens would require a permit under the section 6.8 Part A (1) (b) of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 if the relevant threshold of 50 tonnes carcass production capacity is met. Additionally the effluent treatment plant proposed to process the wastewater at the facility, section 5.4 part A (1) A(i)/(ii) of the regulations permitted activities may also apply, if the threshold for disposal of non-hazardous waste is greater than 50 tonnes per day.

Environmental permit conditions require an operator to use Best Available Techniques (BAT) to minimise emissions from the activities likely to cause pollution to demonstrate compliance. Indicative BAT are defined within our Technical Guidance and BAT reference documents (BREFs).

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/treating-and-processing-poultry-additional-guidance - EPR 6.11 Treating and Processing Poultry Additional Guidance.

http://eippcb.jrc.ec.europa.eu/reference/sa.html - BAT reference document (BREF) - Slaughterhouse and Animal Bi-products Industries.

In this location such a development may cause nuisance to neighbouring properties due to the nature of slaughtering activities and processing animal raw materials. For such activities environmental permits will contains conditions relating to emissions of noise and odour from the permitted activities. However, we would point out that if Best Available Techniques (BAT) are being used some residual odour nuisance or noise may nevertheless be experienced by the local community and local businesses.

Our technical guidance specifies the measures an operator must have regard to for control of emissions of noise and odour.

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environmental-permitting-h3-part-2-noise-assessment-and-control - Horizontal Guidance - H3 Noise assessment and Control.

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environmental-permitting-h4-odour-management - Horizontal Guidance - H4 Odour Management

The applicant should contact our national permitting team, 03708 506 506, if the application is approved to discuss the above requirements, prior to submitting a permit application.

Yours sincerely

Mr GRAHAM STEEL
Sustainable Places - Planning Advisor

Direct dial 02 03 02 58389
Direct e-mail graham.steel@environment-agency.gov.uk

Date: 15 December 2017
Our ref: 232847
Your ref: DC/17/05666

Gemma Walker
planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

BY EMAIL ONLY

Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

T 0300 060 3900

Dear Ms Walker

Planning consultation: 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

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 28 November 2017 which was received by Natural England on 28 November 2017.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)
The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

Natural England's comments in relation to this application are provided in the following sections.

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(I) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), requiring your authority to re-consult Natural England.

Additional Information
Surface water discharges should be set to comply with standards set to protect aquatic life.

Protected species
We have not assessed this application and associated documents for impacts on protected species.

Natural England has published Standing Advice on protected species.

You should apply our Standing Advice to this application as it is a material consideration in the determination of applications in the same way as any individual response received from Natural

England following consultation.

The Standing Advice should not be treated as giving any indication or providing any assurance in respect of European Protected Species (EPS) that the proposed development is unlikely to affect the EPS present on the site; nor should it be interpreted as meaning that Natural England has reached any views as to whether a licence is needed (which is the developer's responsibility) or may be granted.

If you have any specific questions on aspects that are not covered by our Standing Advice for European Protected Species or have difficulty in applying it to this application please contact us with details at consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Local sites
If the proposal site is on or adjacent to a local site, e.g. Local Wildlife Site, Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Site (RIGS) or Local Nature Reserve (LNR) the authority should ensure it has sufficient information to fully understand the impact of the proposal on the local site before it determines the application.

Sites of Special Scientific Interest Impact Risk Zones
The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 requires local planning authorities to consult Natural England on "Development in or likely to affect a Site of Special Scientific Interest" (Schedule 4, w). Our SSSI Impact Risk Zones are a GIS dataset designed to be used during the planning application validation process to help local planning authorities decide when to consult Natural England on developments likely to affect a SSSI. The dataset and user guidance can be accessed from the data.gov.uk website

We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.

For any queries regarding this letter, for new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

We really value your feedback to help us improve the service we offer. We have attached a feedback form to this letter and welcome any comments you might have about our service.

Yours sincerely

Jacqui Salt
Consultations Team

From: Consultations (NE) [mailto:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk]
Sent: 02 March 2018 15:02
To: BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Subject: Planning Consultation DC/17/05666 - NE Response

Dear Ms Walker,

Our ref: 240238
Your ref: DC/17/05666 - Amendment

Thank you for your consultation.

Natural England has previously commented on this proposal and made comments to the authority in our letter dated 15 December 2017. I enclose a copy of the letter for your reference.

The advice provided in our previous response applies equally to this **amendment** although we made no objection to the original proposal.

The proposed amendments to the original application are unlikely to have significantly different impacts on the natural environment than the original proposal.

Should the proposal be amended in a way which **significantly** affects its impact on the natural environment then, in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, Natural England should be consulted again. Before sending us the amended consultation, please assess whether the changes proposed will materially affect any of the advice we have previously offered. If they are unlikely to do so, please do not re-consult us.

Yours sincerely

Clare Foster
Natural England
Consultation Service
Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way,
Crewe
Cheshire, CW1 6GJ

Tel: 020802 68362
Email: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk
www.gov.uk/natural-england

Your Ref: DC/17/05666
Our Ref: 570\CON\4429\17
Date: 31st January 2018

Suffolk County Council

All planning enquiries should be sent to the Local Planning Authority.
Email: planningadmin@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

The Planning Officer
Mid Suffolk District Council
1st Floor, Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich
Suffolk
IP1 2BX

For the Attention of: Gemma Walker

Dear Gemma

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

CONSULTATION RETURN DC/17/05666

PROPOSAL: **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: **Eye Airfield, A140 Ipswich Road, Brome, Eye, Suffolk**

ROAD CLASS:

While the County Council is strongly supportive of this application in principle there are a significant number of issues that remain to be addressed before it is acceptable. Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highways Authority recommends a holding objection for the following reasons:

1. The red line on the drawings does not include all the land necessary to carry out the proposed development such as the proposed carriageway widening, the visibility splays proposed for the car park access off A140 and the access onto / off Castleton Way.

2. For safety reasons, it is not desirable to have the access into the development car park on the A140. It is considered the number of connections for vehicular accesses onto the A140 should be limited as access traffic increases hazards to the highway; it adds to the traffic on the trunk road, interferes with the through traffic on the major road and it can give rise to accidents such as shunts and right turn collisions. Experience has shown that It will be very difficult to gain access and exit the site for right turning vehicles due to the high traffic volumes on the A140. The County Councils preference is for this car park to be accessed via the private road off Castleton Way provided that improvements can be made at the A140 / Castleton Way junction.

3. The proposed visibility of 100m for the access onto Castleton Way would not be acceptable to the Highways Authority for a road of this character, particularly as it is a derestricted road.

4. The application does not take into account the Power Plant committed development in the area which may affect the proposal such as construction and traffic flows, trips etc. Specifically, the

effects of the proposed temporary access on the A140 immediately north of this site are not addressed.

5. The Travel Plan does not supply:

    - any data to back the claim of multiple occupancy use of cars
    - any details on cycle storage
    - requirement for charging points for electric vehicles
    - any details for support of sustainable modes of transport such as walking and cycling such as off-site improvements to the Public Rights of Way network.

Although the above points may seem negative, we do not have any objection to the proposal beyond the access concerns which in turn has safety implications. However, SCC have plans to construct a roundabout on the A140/Castleton Way junction, which will provide safer access to the new development therefore, we would like to meet the developer to find a better solution and share information.

Yours sincerely,

Sam Harvey
Senior Development Management Engineer
Strategic Development

Your Ref: DC/17/05666
Our Ref: 570\CON\4429\17
Date: 12th March 2018

Suffolk County Council

All planning enquiries should be sent to the Local Planning Authority.
Email: planningadmin@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

The Planning Officer
Mid Suffolk District Council
1st Floor, Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich
Suffolk
IP1 2BX

For the Attention of: Gemma Walker

Dear Gemma

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

CONSULTATION RETURN DC/17/05666

PROPOSAL: **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: **Eye Airfield, A140 Ipswich Road, Brome, Eye, Suffolk**

ROAD CLASS:

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.

Conditions

Should the Planning Authority be minded to grant planning approval the Highway Authority in Suffolk would recommend they include the following conditions and obligations:

1 V 1
Condition: Before the access is first used visibility splays on A140 and Castleton Way shall be provided as shown on Drawing No. 17091/11A and 17091/010A and thereafter retained in the specified form. Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 2 Class A of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no obstruction over 0.6 metres high shall be erected, constructed, planted or permitted to grow within the areas of the visibility splays.
Reason: To ensure vehicles exiting the drive would have sufficient visibility to enter the public highway safely and vehicles on the public highway would have sufficient warning of a vehicle emerging in order to take avoiding action.

2 D 2
Condition: Before the development is commenced details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority showing the means to prevent the discharge of surface water from the development onto the highway. The approved scheme shall be carried out in its entirety before the access is first used and shall be retained thereafter in its approved form.
Reason: To prevent hazards caused by flowing water or ice on the highway.

3 AL2
Condition: No part of the development shall be commenced until details of the proposed access (including the position of any gates to be erected) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved access shall be laid out and constructed in its entirety prior the occupation of the property.
Thereafter the access shall be retained in its approved form.
Reason: To ensure that the access is designed and constructed to an appropriate specification and made available for use at an appropriate time in the interests of highway safety.
NOTE – please refer to comments 1 and 2 above regarding access and programming.

4 P2
Condition: Before the development is commenced details of the areas to be provided for the [LOADING, UNLOADING,] manoeuvring and parking of vehicles including secure cycle storage and electric charging points shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be carried out in its entirety before the development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter and used for no other purpose.
Reason: To ensure the provision and long term maintenance of adequate on-site space for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles, where on-street parking and manoeuvring would be detrimental to highway safety.

5 TRAVEL PLAN
Condition: Within one month of first occupation, each employee shall be provided with Travel Information Pack that contains the sustainable transport information and measures to encourage the use of sustainable transport identified in the Travel Plan dated November 2017. Not less than 3 months prior to the occupation, a completed Travel Information Pack shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority and shall include up-to-date walking, cycling and bus maps, relevant bus and rail timetable information, car sharing information, and sustainable transport discounts.
Reason: In the interests of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF and policies SO3 and S06 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2008) and Core Strategy Focused Review (2012)

6 WELFARE FACILITIES
Condition: Before the development is commenced details of the areas to be provided for secure covered cycle storage for both customers and employees and details of changing facilities including storage

lockers and showers shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be carried out in its entirety before the development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter and used for no other purpose.
Reason: In the interests of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF and policies SO3 and S06 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2008) and Core Strategy Focused Review (2012)
Note: The employee cycle storage shall be in a lockable facility away from public access to maximise the uptake in cycling among staff.

7 HGV – CONSTRUCTION CONDITIONS
Condition - Before the development hereby permitted is commenced a Construction Management Plan shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Construction of the development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved plan. The Construction Management Plan shall include the following matters:
a) parking and turning for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
b) loading and unloading of plant and materials
c) piling techniques
d) storage of plant and materials
e) programme of works (including measures for traffic management and operating hours)
f) provision of boundary hoarding and lighting
g) details of proposed means of dust suppression
h) details of measures to prevent mud from vehicles leaving the site during construction
I) haul routes for construction traffic on the highway network and
j) monitoring and review mechanisms.
k) Details of deliveries times to the site during construction phase
Reason: In the interest of highway safety to avoid the hazard caused by mud on the highway and to ensure minimal adverse impact on the public highway during the construction phase.

9 – LIGHTING
Condition: Before the development hereby permitted is commenced a Lighting design shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In the interest of highway safety to avoid the hazard caused by disability or discomfort glare for motorists.

10 SECTION 278
Condition: Before the development hereby permitted is commenced the works within the public highway will be required to be designed and constructed in accordance with the County Council's specification. The applicant will also be required to enter into a legal agreement under the provisions of Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 relating to the construction and subsequent adoption of the highway improvements. Amongst other things the Agreement will cover the specification of the highway works, safety audit procedures, construction and supervision and inspection of the works, bonding arrangements, indemnity of the County Council regarding noise insulation and land compensation claims, commuted sums, and changes to the existing street lighting and signing.
Note: It is an OFFENCE to carry out works within the public highway, which includes a Public Right of Way, without the permission of the Highway Authority.

Yours sincerely,

Sam Harvey
Senior Development Management Engineer
Strategic Development

The Archaeological Service

Resource Management
Bury Resource Centre
Hollow Road
Bury St Edmunds
Suffolk
IP32 7AY

Philip Isbell
Corporate Manager - Development Manager
Planning Services
Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich IP1 2BX

Enquiries to: Rachael Abraham
Direct Line: 01284 741232
Email: Rachael.abraham@suffolk.gov.uk
Web: http://www.suffolk.gov.uk

Our Ref: 2017_05666
Date: 14th February 2018

For the Attention of Gemma Walker

Dear Mr Isbell

Planning Application DC/17/05666– Land to the south of Eye Airfield and east of the A140, Eye: Archaeology

This 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. Recent archaeological evaluation to the east as part of the adjacent Eye airfield housing scheme has defined extensive archaeology, dating from the Neolithic, Iron Age and Roman periods, as well as a probable Anglo-Saxon cemetery (EYE 123). Roman and Saxon settlement activity has also been recorded during archaeological investigations at Hartismere High School (EYE 083 and 094) and several other probably Anglo-Saxon cemeteries have been identified through metal detected artefact scatters to the south-east and north-east of the proposed development area. A geophysical survey of this site has identified a number of anomalies which are likely to be archaeological in nature. As a result, there is high potential for previously unidentified archaeological remains to be present at this location. The proposed development would cause significant ground disturbance that has potential to damage or destroy any below ground heritage assets that exist.

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.

In this case the following two conditions would be appropriate:

1. No development shall take place within the area indicated [the whole site] until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been secured, in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme of investigation shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:
a. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
b. The programme for post investigation assessment
c. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
d. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
e. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
f. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.
g. The site investigation shall be completed prior to development, or in such other phased arrangement, as agreed and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

2. No building shall be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed, submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under part 1 and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition.

REASON:
To safeguard archaeological assets within the approved development boundary from impacts relating to any groundworks associated with the development scheme and to ensure the proper and timely investigation, recording, reporting and presentation of archaeological assets affected by this development, in accordance with Core Strategy Objective SO 4 of Mid Suffolk District Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2008) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

INFORMATIVE:
The submitted scheme of archaeological investigation shall be in accordance with a brief procured beforehand by the developer from Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service, Conservation Team.

I would be pleased to offer guidance on the archaeological work required and, in our role as advisor to Mid Suffolk District Council, the Conservation Team of SCC Archaeological Service will, on request of the applicant, provide a specification for the archaeological work required at this site. In this case, an archaeological evaluation will be required to establish the potential of the site and decisions on the need for any further investigation (excavation before any groundworks commence and/or monitoring during groundworks) will be made on the basis of the results of the evaluation.

Further details on our advisory services and charges can be found on our website: http://www.suffolk.gov.uk/archaeology/

Please do get in touch if there is anything that you would like to discuss or you require any further information.

Yours sincerely,

Rachael Abraham

Senior Archaeological Officer

The Archaeological Service

Resource Management
Bury Resource Centre
Hollow Road
Bury St Edmunds
Suffolk
IP32 7AY

Philip Isbell
Corporate Manager - Development Manager
Planning Services
Mid Suffolk District Council
131 High Street
Needham Market
Ipswich IP6 8DL

Enquiries to: Rachael Abraham
Direct Line: 01284 741232
Email: Rachael.abraham@suffolk.gov.uk
Web: http://www.suffolk.gov.uk

Our Ref: 2017_05666
Date: 1st December 2017

For the Attention of Gemma Walker

Dear Mr Isbell

Planning Application DC/17/05666– Land to the south of Eye Airfield and east of the A140, Eye: Archaeology

This site lies in an area of very high archaeological potential recorded in the County Historic Environment Record, within the extent of a former Second World War airfield (EYE 072). It is situated in a topographically favourable location for archaeological activity, overlooking a tributary of the River Dove. 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. These remains were not detected by the preceding geophysical survey and have survived the impacts of agriculture and the airfield. Recent archaeological evaluation to the east as part of the adjacent Eye airfield housing scheme has defined extensive archaeology, dating from the Neolithic, Iron Age and Roman periods, as well as a probable Anglo-Saxon cemetery (EYE 123). Roman and Saxon settlement activity has also been recorded during archaeological investigations at Hartismere High School (EYE 083 and 094) and several other probably Anglo-Saxon cemeteries have been identified through metal detected artefact scatters to the south-east and north-east of the proposed development area. However, this site has never been the subject of systematic archaeological investigation and as a result there is high potential for previously unidentified archaeological remains to be present. The proposed development would cause significant ground disturbance that has potential to damage or destroy any below ground heritage assets that exist.

Given the high potential, lack of previous investigation and large size of the proposed development area, I recommend that, in order to establish the full archaeological implications of this area and the suitability of the site for the development, the applicant should be required to provide for an archaeological evaluation of the site prior to the determination of any planning application submitted for this site, to allow for preservation *in situ* of any sites of

national importance that might be defined (and which are still currently unknown). This large area cannot be assessed or approved in our view until a full archaeological evaluation has been undertaken, and the results of this work will enable us to accurately quantify the archaeological resource (both in quality and extent). This is in accordance with paragraphs 128 and 129 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Decisions on the suitability of the site, and also the need for, and scope of, any further work should below-ground heritage assets of significance be identified, will be based upon the results of the evaluation.

In order to establish the archaeological potential of the site, a geophysical survey will be required in the first instance. The geophysical survey results will be used to make a decision on the timing and extent of the metal detecting survey and trial trenched evaluation which are also required at this site.

The results of the evaluation must be presented as part of the application, along with a detailed strategy for further investigation and appropriate mitigation. The results should inform the development to ensure preservation *in situ* of any previously unknown nationally important heritage assets within the development area.

The Conservation Team of the Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service would be pleased to offer guidance on the archaeological work required and will, on request, provide a brief for each stage of the archaeological investigation. Please see our website for further information on procedures and costs: http://www.suffolk.gov.uk/archaeology

Please do get in touch if there is anything that you would like to discuss, or you require any further information.

Yours sincerely,

Rachael Abraham

Senior Archaeological Officer
Conservation Team

Subject:FW: MSDC Planning Re-consultation Request - DC/17/05666

From: Rachael Abraham
Sent: 27 February 2018 07:49
To: BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Cc: Gemma Walker
Subject: RE: MSDC Planning Re-consultation Request - DC/17/05666

Dear Gemma,
Thank you for re-consulting us on this application.
Our advice remains the same as that sent on 14/2, which I have attached again for convenience.
Best wishes,
Rachael

Rachael Abraham B.A. (Hons), M.A.
Senior Archaeological Officer

Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service, Bury Resource Centre, Hollow Road, Bury St Edmunds, IP32 7AY

Tel.:01284 741232
Mob: 07595 089516
Email: rachael.abraham@suffolk.gov.uk

Website: http://www.suffolk.gov.uk/culture-heritage-and-leisure/suffolk-archaeological-service/
Suffolk Heritage Explorer: www.heritage.suffolk.gov.uk Twitter Page: www.twitter.com/SCCArchaeology

-----Original Message-----
From: planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk [mailto:planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk]
Sent: 26 February 2018 16:23
To: RM Archaeology Mailbox <archaeology@suffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: MSDC Planning Re-consultation Request - DC/17/05666

Please find attached planning re-consultation request letter relating to planning application - DC/17/05666 - Land To The South Of Eye Airfield And East Of The A140, , ,

Kind Regards

Planning Support Team

From: RM Floods Planning
Sent: 04 December 2017 10:15
To: BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Cc: Gemma Walker
Subject: 2017-12-04 JS Reply Land To The South Of Eye Airfield And East Of The A140 Ref DC/17/05666

Dear Gemma Walker,

Subject: Land To The South Of Eye Airfield And East Of The A140 Ref DC/17/05666

Suffolk County Council, Flood and Water Management have reviewed application ref DC/17/05666.

The following submitted documents have been reviewed and we recommend a **holding objection** at this time:

- Flood Risk Assessment and appendices Ref A/FRAIRFIELD.10
- Site Location Plan Ref 17-L07-PL001D
- Proposed Site Plan Ref 17-L07-PL008
- Construction Management Plan Ref 17-L07

The reason why we are recommending a **holding objection** is because whilst the applicant has demonstrated that they have a assessed the flood risk for the site and has referenced a method for the disposal of surface water from the site, they have not provided the level of detail required for a full application. The applicant have ruled out the use of infiltration due to ground conditions not being favourable, so they are proposing to discharge at a controlled rate from a attenuation swale. However, the proposal to use a pumped surface water system which is contrary to the following local and national policies:

1. **Babergh District Council's Local Plan 2011-2031 Core Strategy & Policies (February 2014), Section 3**: The Delivery of growth, provision of infrastructure and monitoring - 3.2 Sustainability: The Babergh Approach and Interpretation which requires the development to be environmentally, economically and socially sustainable.
2. **Suffolk County Council's Local Surface Water Drainage (SuDs) Guidance, Standards and Information** regarding designing for maintenance considerations; Ref: Ciria – SuDS Manual 2016 p.165 – "SuDs schemes…pumping stations….should be a last resort and only allowable in situations where guaranteed a maintenance of the pumps can be ensured".
3. **S12 of the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) Sustainable Drainage Systems: Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems** (March 2015) – "S12: Pumping should only be used to facilitate drainage for those parts of the site where it is not reasonably practicable to drain water by gravity".
4. **House of Commons: Written Statement (HCWS161), Department for Communities and Local Government - Written Statement made by: The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Mr Eric Pickles)** on 18 December 2014 (Sustainable Drainage Systems) which states that "the sustainable drainage system should be designed to ensure that the maintenance and operation requirements are economically proportionate". Suffolk County Council does not consider the pumped drainage system to be designed so as to ensure the maintenance and operations requirements are economically proportionate because the applicant has failed to provide sufficient evidence as to the future maintenance and operation of the proposed system and how the cost of such will be secured and met.

The applicant will need to submit a written justification for the use of a pumped system and that a gravity system is not an option

The applicant also should consider whether or not they could look to utilise a rain water harvesting system or a green roof as an alternative, which would help to reduce the environmental impact of the development.

We also note that the construction management plan does not does not included a method or plan on how they will manage the surface water and flood during the construction of the site.

The points below detail the action required in order to overcome our current objection:-

1. Submit a justification for the use of a pumped surface water drainage system
2. Submit detailed drawings of the surface water drainage and each drainage asset
3. Submit a full set of hydraulic calculation for the surface water drainage system and the volume of attenuation required
4. Submit maintenance program and ongoing maintenance responsibilities for the surface water drainage system and its assets
5. Submit details of the outfall from the watercourse and where it drains to
6. Amend the Construction Management Plan to include a section on managing surface water and storm water on the site during all stages of construction or submit a separate construction surface water management plan (CSWMP). The CSWMP and shall include:
    a. Scaled plans and drawings of the construction surface water drainage scheme outlining:-
        i. Temporary drainage system
        ii. Measures for managing all forms of pollution
        iii. Measures for managing any offsite flood risk

Documents required to be submitted with each type of application should be as per the following table*

Pre-app	Outline	**Full**	Reserved Matters	Discharge of Conditions	Document Submitted
✓	✓	✓			**Flood Risk Assessment/Statement (Checklist)**
	✓	✓			**Drainage Strategy/Statement & sketch layout plan (checklist)**
	✓				Preliminary layout drawings
	✓				Preliminary "Outline" hydraulic calculations
	✓				Preliminary landscape proposals
	✓				Ground investigation report (for infiltration)
	✓	✓			Evidence of 3rd party agreement to discharge to their system (in principle/consent to discharge)
		✓		✓	**Maintenance program and ongoing maintenance responsibilities**
		✓	✓		**Detailed development layout**
		✓	✓	✓	**Detailed flood & drainage design drawings**
		✓	✓	✓	**Full structural, hydraulic & ground investigations**

		✓	✓	✓	**Geotechnical factual and interpretive reports, including infiltration test results (BRE365)**
		✓	✓	✓	**Detailed landscape details**
		✓	✓	✓	Discharge agreements (temporary & permanent)
		✓	✓	✓	**Development management & construction phasing plan**

Kind Regards

Jason Skilton
Flood & Water Engineer
Suffolk County Council

Tel: 01473 260411

From:RM Floods Planning
Sent: Mon, 29 Jan 2018 13:45:01 +0000
To:BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Cc: Gemma Walker
Subject:2018-01-29 JS Reply Land To The South Of Eye Airfield And East Of The A140 Ref DC/17/05666

Dear Gemma Walker,

Subject: Land To The South Of Eye Airfield And East Of The A140 Ref DC/17/05666

Suffolk County Council, Flood and Water Management have reviewed application ref DC/17/05666.

We have reviewed the following submitted documents and we recommend **approval of this application subject to conditions**:

- Flood Risk Assessment and appendices Ref A/FRAIRFIELD.10 5th issue
- Site Location Plan Ref 17-L07-PL001D
- Proposed Site Plan Ref 17-L07-PL008E
- Construction Management Plan Ref 17-L07 – REV 2
- Sustainable Drainage Systems – Management & Maintenance Plan Dec 2017
- Hydro Brake Extract Design Data
- Slot Drain Extract
- Bypass Separator Extract
- Permeable Paving Extract
- Correspondence between Jason Skilton (SCC Floods & Water) & Steven Lecocq (Mayer Brown Ltd) – Dec 2017
- Eye Airfield Ditch Routing Plan
- Permeable Paving Construction Drawing MB/C/01
- Proposed Surface Water Drainage General Arrangement Ref A/FRAIRFIELD.10/10
- General Drainage Layout Ref MB/F/01

We propose the following condition in relation to surface water drainage for this application.

i. The strategy for the disposal of surface water and the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (dated Oct 2017, ref: A/FRAIRFIELD.10 5th issue) shall be implemented as approved in writing by the local

planning authority. The strategy shall thereafter be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved strategy.

Reason: To ensure that the principles of sustainable drainage are incorporated into this proposal, to ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained

ii. The buildings hereby permitted shall not be put into use until details of all Sustainable Urban Drainage System components and piped networks have been submitted, in an approved form, to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for inclusion on the Lead Local Flood Authority's Flood Risk Asset Register.

Reason: To ensure all flood risk assets and their owners are recorded onto the LLFA's statutory flood risk asset register as per s21 of the Flood and Water Management Act.

iii. No development shall commence until details of a Construction Surface Water Management Plan (CSWMP) detailing how surface water and storm water will be managed on the site during construction (including demolition and site clearance operations) is submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The CSWMP shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved plan for the duration of construction. The approved CSWMP and shall include:

a. Method statements, scaled and dimensioned plans and drawings detailing surface water management proposals to include :-

i. Temporary drainage systems

ii. Measures for managing pollution / water quality and protecting controlled waters and watercourses

iii. Measures for managing any on or offsite flood risk associated with construction

Kind Regards

Jason Skilton

Flood & Water Engineer, Flood & Water Management

Growth, Highways and Infrastructure

Suffolk County Council

Endeavour House, 8 Russell Rd, Ipswich, Suffolk IP1 2BX

Telephone: 01473 260411

Email: jason.skilton@suffolk.gov.uk

Website: www.suffolk.gov.uk

-----Original Message-----
From: planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk [mailto:planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk]
Sent: 22 January 2018 12:43
To: RM Floods Planning <floods.planning@suffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: MSDC Planning Re-consultation Request - DC/17/05666

Please find attached planning re-consultation request letter relating to planning application - DC/17/05666 - Land To The South Of Eye Airfield And East Of The A140, , ,

Kind Regards

Planning Support Team

From:RM Floods Planning
Sent: Mon, 8 Jan 2018 11:21:30 +0000
To:BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Cc: Gemma Walker
Subject:2018-01-08 JS Reply Land To The South Of Eye Airfield And East Of The A140 Ref DC/17/05666

Dear Gemma Walker,

Subject: Land To The South Of Eye Airfield And East Of The A140 Ref DC/17/05666

Suffolk County Council, Flood and Water Management have reviewed application ref DC/17/05666.

The following submitted documents have been reviewed and we recommend maintaining our **holding objection** at this time:

- Flood Risk Assessment and appendices Ref A/FRAIRFIELD.10
- Site Location Plan Ref 17-L07-PL001D
- Proposed Site Plan Ref 17-L07-PL008
- Construction Management Plan Ref 17-L07
- Sustainable Drainage Systems – Management & Maintenance Plan Dec 2017
- Hydro Brake Extract Design Data
- Slot Drain Extract
- Bypass Separator Extract
- Permeable Paving Extract
- Correspondence between Jason Skilton (SCC Floods & Water) & Steven Lecocq (Mayer Brown Ltd) – Dec 2017

The points below detail the action required in order to overcome our current objection:-

1. Submit detailed drawings of the surface water drainage and each drainage asset
2. Submit a full set of hydraulic calculation for the surface water drainage system and the volume of attenuation required
3. Submit details of the outfall from the watercourse and where it drains to

4. Amend the Construction Management Plan to include a section on managing surface water and storm water on the site during all stages of construction or submit a separate construction surface water management plan (CSWMP). The CSWMP and shall include:

    a. Scaled plans and drawings of the construction surface water drainage scheme outlining:-

        i. Temporary drainage system

        ii. Measures for managing all forms of pollution

        iii. Measures for managing any offsite flood risk

Documents required to be submitted with each type of application should be as per the following table*

Pre-app	Outline	**Full**	Reserved Matters	Discharge of Conditions	Document Submitted
✓	✓	✓			**Flood Risk Assessment/Statement (Checklist)**
	✓	✓			**Drainage Strategy/Statement & sketch layout plan (checklist)**
	✓				Preliminary layout drawings
	✓				Preliminary "Outline" hydraulic calculations
	✓				Preliminary landscape proposals
	✓				Ground investigation report (for infiltration)
	✓	✓			Evidence of 3rd party agreement to discharge to their system (in principle/consent to discharge)
		✓		✓	**Maintenance program and ongoing maintenance responsibilities**
		✓	✓		**Detailed development layout**
		✓	✓	✓	**Detailed flood & drainage design drawings**
		✓	✓	✓	**Full structural, hydraulic & ground investigations**
		✓	✓	✓	**Geotechnical factual and interpretive reports, including infiltration test results (BRE365)**

		✓	✓	✓	**Detailed landscape details**
		✓	✓	✓	Discharge agreements (temporary & permanent)
		✓	✓	✓	**Development management & construction phasing plan**

Kind Regards

Jason Skilton

Flood & Water Engineer

Suffolk County Council

Tel: 01473 260411

-----Original Message-----
From: planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk [mailto:planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk]
Sent: 21 December 2017 10:55
To: RM Floods Planning <floods.planning@suffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: MSDC Planning Re-consultation Request - DC/17/05666

Please find attached planning re-consultation request letter relating to planning application - DC/17/05666 - Land To The South Of Eye Airfield And East Of The A140, , ,

Kind Regards

Planning Support Team

From:RM Floods Planning
Sent: Tue, 27 Feb 2018 10:15:16 +0000
To:BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Cc: Gemma Walker
Subject:2018-02-27 JS Reply Land To The South Of Eye Airfield And East Of The A140 Ref DC/17/05666

Dear Gemma Walker,

Subject: Land To The South Of Eye Airfield And East Of The A140 Ref DC/17/05666

We have no further comment to add.

Kind Regards

Jason Skilton

Flood & Water Engineer, Flood & Water Management

Growth, Highways and Infrastructure

Suffolk County Council

Endeavour House, 8 Russell Rd, Ipswich, Suffolk IP1 2BX

Telephone: 01473 260411

Email: jason.skilton@suffolk.gov.uk

Website: www.suffolk.gov.uk

-----Original Message-----
From: planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk [mailto:planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk]
Sent: 26 February 2018 16:23
To: RM Floods Planning <floods.planning@suffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: MSDC Planning Re-consultation Request - DC/17/05666

Please find attached planning re-consultation request letter relating to planning application - DC/17/05666 - Land To The South Of Eye Airfield And East Of The A140, , ,

Kind Regards

Planning Support Team

Suffolk County Council

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service

Fire Business Support Team
Floor 3, Block 2
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich, Suffolk
IP1 2BX

Mid Suffolk District Council
Planning Department
Endeavour House
Russell Road
Ipswich
IP1 2BX

Your Ref:
Our Ref: ENG/AK
Enquiries to: Mrs A Kempen
Direct Line: 01473 260486
E-mail: Angela.Kempen@suffolk.gov.uk
Web Address www.suffolk.gov.uk

Date: 12 December 2017

Planning Ref: DC/17/05666

Dear Sirs

RE: PROVISION OF WATER FOR FIRE FIGHTING
ADDRESS: Land to the south of Eye Airfield and east of the A140
DESCRIPTION: Processing facility, water treatment and gatehouse
NO: HYDRANTS POSSIBLY REQUIRED: Required

If the Planning Authority is minded to grant approval, the Fire Authority will request that adequate provision is made for fire hydrants, by the imposition of a suitable planning condition at the planning application stage.

If the Fire Authority is not consulted at the planning stage, the Fire Authority will request that fire hydrants be installed retrospectively on major developments if it can be proven that the Fire Authority was not consulted at the initial stage of planning.

The planning condition will carry a life term for the said development and the initiating agent/developer applying for planning approval and must be transferred to new ownership through land transfer or sale should this take place.

Fire hydrant provision will be agreed upon when the water authorities submit water plans to the Water Officer for Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service.

Where a planning condition has been imposed, the provision of fire hydrants will be fully funded by the developer and invoiced accordingly by Suffolk County Council.

Until Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service receive confirmation from the water authority that the installation of the fire hydrant has taken place, the planning condition will not be discharged.

Continued/

Should you require any further information or assistance I will be pleased to help.

Yours faithfully

Mrs A Kempen
Water Officer

Suffolk County Council

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service

Fire Business Support Team
Floor 3, Block 2
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich, Suffolk
IP1 2BX

Your Ref:
Our Ref: FS/F190982
Enquiries to: Angela Kempen
Direct Line: 01473 260588
E-mail: Fire.BusinessSupport@suffolk.gov.uk
Web Address: http://www.suffolk.gov.uk

Date: 12/12/2017

Mid Suffolk District Council
Planning Department
Endeavour House
Russell Road
Ipswich
IP1 2BX

Dear Sirs

Land to the south of Eye Airfield and east of the A140
Planning Application No: DC/17/05666

I refer to the above application.

The plans have been inspected by the Water Officer who has the following comments to make.

Access and Fire Fighting Facilities

Access to buildings for fire appliances and firefighters must meet with the requirements specified in Building Regulations Approved Document B, (Fire Safety), 2006 Edition, incorporating 2010 and 2013 amendments Volume 1 - Part B5, Section 11 dwelling houses, and, similarly, Volume 2, Part B5, Sections 16 and 17 in the case of buildings other than dwelling houses. These requirements may be satisfied with other equivalent standards relating to access for fire fighting, in which case those standards should be quoted in correspondence.

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service also requires a minimum carrying capacity for hard standing for pumping/high reach appliances of 15/26 tonnes, not 12.5 tonnes as detailed in the Building Regulations 2000 Approved Document B, 2006 Edition, incorporating 2010 and 2013 amendments.

Water Supplies

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service recommends that fire hydrants be installed within this development on a suitable route for laying hose, i.e. avoiding obstructions. However, it is not possible, at this time, to determine the number of fire hydrants required for fire fighting purposes. The requirement will be determined at the water planning stage when site plans have been submitted by the water companies.

Continued/

Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service recommends that proper consideration be given to the potential life safety, economic, environmental and social benefits derived from the provision of an automatic fire sprinkler system. (Please see sprinkler information enclosed with this letter).

Consultation should be made with the Water Authorities to determine flow rates in all cases.

Should you need any further advice or information on access and fire fighting facilities, you are advised to contact your local Building Control in the first instance. For further advice and information regarding water supplies, please contact the Water Officer at the above headquarters.

Yours faithfully

Mrs A Kempen
Water Officer

Enc: PDL1

Copy: Mr M Bassett, Freeths LLP Cumber Court, 80 Mount Street, Nottingham NG1 6HH
Enc: Sprinkler information

Consultation Response

1	**Application Number**	17/05666	
2	**Date of Response**	13/12/2017	
3	**Responding Officer**	Name:	Delia Cook
		Job Title:	Economic Development Officer
		Responding on behalf of...	Economic Strategy
4	**Recommendation** Note: This section must be completed before the response is sent. The recommendation should be based on the information submitted with the application.	No objection. Mid Suffolk Economic Development Team support this application for the resaons in Discussion section below.	
5	**Discussion** Please outline the reasons/rationale behind how you have formed the recommendation. Please refer to any guidance, policy or material considerations that have informed your recommendation.	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 benfit to the local economy	
6	**Amendments, Clarification or Additional**	*Not applicable*	

Please note that this form can be submitted electronically on the Councils website. Comments submitted on the website will not be acknowledged but you can check whether they have been received by reviewing comments on the website under the application reference number. Please note that the completed form will be posted on the Councils website and available to view by the public.

	Information Required (if holding objection) if concerns are raised, can they be overcome with changes? Please ensure any requests are proportionate	
7	**Recommended conditions**	No conditions suggested

Please note that this form can be submitted electronically on the Councils website. Comments submitted on the website will not be acknowledged but you can check whether they have been received by reviewing comments on the website under the application reference number. Please note that the completed form will be posted on the Councils website and available to view by the public.

From: Nathan Pittam
Sent: Mon, 18 Dec 2017 13:41:18 +0000
To: Gemma Walker
Cc:BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Subject:DC/17/05666. EH - Land Contamination.

Dear Gemma,

EP Reference : 223306

DC/17/05666. EH - Land Contamination.

Land Eye Airfield, Castleton Way, EYE, Suffolk.

Land To The South Of Eye Airfield And East Of The A140. Erection of a new processing facility, waste water treatment plant and gatehouse with associated car park and service yards, etc (see remarks)

Many thanks for your request for comments in relation to the above application. I can confirm that I have no objection to the proposed development from the perspective of land contamination. I would only request that we are contacted in the event of unexpected ground conditions being encountered during construction and that the developer is made aware that the responsibility for the safe development of the site lies with them.

Kind regards

Nathan

Nathan Pittam BSc. (Hons.) PhD

Senior Environmental Management Officer

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils – Working Together

From: Nathan Pittam
Sent: Wed, 28 Feb 2018 12:25:27 +0000
To: Gemma Walker
Cc:BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Subject:DC/17/05666. EH - Land Contamination

Dear Gemma

EP Reference : 223306

DC/17/05666. EH - Land Contamination.

Land Eye Airfield, Castleton Way, EYE, Suffolk.

Erection of a new processing facility, waste water treatment plant and gatehouse with associated car park and service yards, etc

Many thanks for your request for comments in relation to the above application. I can confirm that I have no objection to the proposed development from the perspective of land contamination. I would only request that we are contacted in the event of unexpected ground conditions being encountered during construction and that the developer is made aware that the responsibility for the safe development of the site lies with them.

Kind regards

Nathan

Nathan Pittam BSc. (Hons.) PhD

Senior Environmental Management Officer

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils – Working Together

9ABERGH & MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEMORANDUM

TO: Gemma Walker Development Control Team

FROM: Environmental Protection Team DATE: 29.12.2017

YOUR REF: DC/17/05666

SUBJECT: Land at Eye Airfield, Castleton Way, Eye.

Thank you for consulting me on the above application for a new poultry processing facility.

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 ($L_{A,T}$) along with operational noise from the enterprise park, of no greater than the current prevailing typical background sound level ($L_{A90,T}$) 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 nigh-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.

Please note, when specific details of operational activities, plant and equipment become known, further noise assessment will be required typically using BS 4142 for commercial and industrial noise to demonstrate that the above background noise levels are not exceeded.

Due to the nature of large construction sites and the impact on amenity of nearby noise sensitive premises for a long period of time, I would recommend that a condition limiting the operating hours of the construction phase of the development to 08.00 – 18.00 hours Monday – Friday and 0800 – 13.00 hours Saturdays, with no work to take place on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

In addition, I would suggest that a construction management plan to include mitigation from noise and vibration, to be agreed in writing with the LPA prior to commencement of works, should be required by means of a condition. Such a plan should include but not be limited to:

Noise

a) Working hours to be restricted between 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Saturday (finishing at 13:00 on Saturday) with no working of any kind permitted on Sundays or any Public/Bank Holiday days. The contractor shall provide the Local Authority with as much advance warning as possible of any emergency work that is necessary to conduct outside of the permitted working hours.

b) No vehicle connected with the works to arrive on site before 07:30 or leave after 19:00 (except in the case of emergency).

c) All vehicles and mechanical plant used for the purpose of the works shall be fitted with effective exhaust silencers and shall be maintained in good and efficient working order. All compressors and generators shall be “sound reduced” models fitted with properly lined and sealed acoustic covers which shall be kept closed whenever the machines are in use, and all ancillary pneumatic percussive tools shall be fitted with mufflers or suppressers of the type recommended by the manufacturers and shall be kept in a good state of repair. Full use should be made of acoustic screens where necessary.

d) Machines in intermittent use shall be shut down in the intervening periods between work or where this is impracticable, throttled down to a minimum.

e) Where practicable, plant with directional noise characteristics shall be positioned to minimise noise at adjacent properties. Static machines shall be sited as far as is practicable from inhabited buildings.

Vibration

f) The Developer or their Contractor shall comply with BS 6472: 1992 Evaluations of Human Exposure to Vibration in Buildings (1Hz-80Hz). Any vibration monitoring carried out shall also be in compliance with BS 6472: 1992.

Dust & Smoke

g) The Developer or their Contractor shall not be permitted to burn any materials on Site.

h) Machinery with obvious defects, e.g. plant which emits an unreasonable amount of noise or exhaust smoke, shall be withdrawn from service without delay.

i) The Developer or their Contractor shall take all reasonable measures which shall include the provision and use of adequate water spraying equipment to minimise dust nuisance and to damp down areas where activities are likely to create dust. Measures shall include the spraying by pressure hoses to suppress dust and also the provision of bowsers where appropriate, and ensuring that stockpiles shall be covered to prevent the generation of dust.

j) The Developer or their Contractor shall take all measures necessary to prevent spillage onto roads adjoining the Site and in wet weather shall prevent mud from the site being carried onto the highway.

I trust the above advice and recommendations are of assistance.

David Harrold

Senior Environmental Health Officer.

From: Nathan Pittam
Sent: Wed, 28 Feb 2018 12:23:10 +0000
To: Gemma Walker
Cc:BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Subject:DC/17/05666. EH - Air Quality

Dear Gemma

EP Reference : 238483

DC/17/05666. EH - Air Quality.

Land Eye Airfield, Castleton Way, EYE, Suffolk.

Re-consultation: Land To The South Of Eye Airfield & East Of A140. Erection of a new processing facility, waste water treatment plant & gatehouse with associated car park and service yards, etc

Many thanks for your request for comments in relation to the above application from the perspective of 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

Kind regards

Nathan

Nathan Pittam BSc. (Hons.) PhD

Senior Environmental Management Officer

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils – Working Together

From: David Harrold
Sent: Wed, 28 Feb 2018 10:36:20 +0000
To:BMSDC Planning Mailbox
Cc: Gemma Walker
Subject: Plan ref DC/17/05666 Land at Eye Airfield, Castleton Way, Eye. EH - Noise/Odour/Light/Smoke

Thank you for consulting me on the additional information received.

I can confirm I do not have any comments to make other than those already submitted.

David Harrold MCIEH

Senior Environmental Health Officer

Babergh & Midsuffolk District Councils

t: 01449 724718

e: david.harrold@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

From: Nathan Pittam
Sent: Mon, 5 Feb 2018 11:16:32 +0000
To: Gemma Walker
Cc:BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow
Subject:DC/17/05666. EH - Air Quality.

Dear Gemma,

EP Reference : 223314

DC/17/05666. EH - Air Quality.

Land Eye Airfield, Castleton Way, EYE, Suffolk

Land To The South Of Eye Airfield And East Of The A140. Erection of a new processing facility, waste water treatment plant and gatehouse with associated car park and service yards, etc

Many thanks for your request for comments in relation to the above application from the perspective of air quality. I can confirm that I have no objection to the propsoed development from the perspective of air quality. Operational emissions are covered by environmental permitting regulations as outlined in the response from the Environment Agency

Kind regards

Nathan

Nathan Pittam BSc. (Hons.) PhD

Senior Environmental Management Officer

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils – Working Together

From: David Pizzey
Sent: 14 July 2017 11:29
To: James Platt <James.Platt@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Cc: BMSDC Planning Mailbox <planning@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: 17/02760 Land To The South Of, Diss Road, Botesdale.

James

I have no objection in principle to this application as there appears to be little conflict between the development, based upon the Indicative Masterplan, and any significant trees/hedges on
or adjacent to the site. Any trees and sections of hedgerow that do require removal are unlikely to be of sufficient importance to warrant being a constraint.

If you are minded to recommend approval of the scheme we will require additional information including a Tree & Hedgerow Protection Plan in order to
help ensure protection measures for those being retained. Ideally this should be submitted as part of the application but can be dealt with under condition.

Regards

David

David Pizzey
Arboricultural Officer
Hadleigh office: 01473 826662
Needham Market office: 01449 724555
david.pizzey@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk
www.babergh.gov.uk and www.midsuffolk.gov.uk
Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils - Working Together

Place Services
Essex County Council
County Hall, Chelmsford
Essex, CM1 1QH

T: 0333 013 6840
www.placeservices.co.uk
@PlaceServices

Planning Services
Mid Suffolk District Council,
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich
IP1 2B

19/12/2017

For the attention of: Gemma Walker

Ref: DC/17/05666; Land to the south of Eye Airfield and east of the A140

Thank you for consulting us on the full planning application for the development of the 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. This letter sets out our consultation response regarding the landscape and landscape impact of the planning application and how the proposals relate and respond to the surrounding landscape setting and context of the site.

Recommendations
In terms of the likely visual impact, the proposals will have an impact on the rural setting of Yaxley village and the surrounding landscape. The main development constraint is the requirement to retain the natural landscape character and appearance, and mitigate the impact on the neighbouring settlements.

The following points highlight our key recommendations and comments for the submitted proposal:

1. A detailed landscape planting plan, landscape maintenance plan and specification, (which clearly sets out the existing and proposed planting), will need to be submitted, if the full application is approved. We recommend a landscape maintenance plan for the minimum of 3 years, to support plant establishment.

2. Further details of the proposed swale system will need to be provided; sections of the swale in the proposed location, and proposed planting alongside an implementation strategy is required to help understand how the proposed SuDs scheme addresses the outcomes of the drainage strategy.

3. Boundary treatment surrounding the large car park needs to be specified. Additional planting to improve the perimeter of the site will help soften the rural edge transition while protecting key views into the site. Some areas of the car park (such as the north side) have little or soft landscaping.

4. Finishes and materials for the proposed processing facility colour and texture should be informed by the outcome of the LVIA and be subject to planning conditions.

5. The site location plan and the proposed site plan fails to appropriately show an appropriate contextual setting of the site. The plans should show northern Yaxley which has residential properties facing the west part of the proposed development.

The proposal
The site comprises a disused military airfield; Eye Airfield. Part of the airfield still remains with the remnants of the concrete runways, taxiways and roads running through the site. The wider site area is currently used for industrial development. The site lies to the south of the airfield land. The north and north east parts of the site have already been developed for industrial and business use, where Oakmere Business Park is located.

The site comprises approximately 10.87 hectares of agricultural land. The proposed development is for the construction of a new facility including processing areas, chilled storage, freezer store, office and amenity areas.

The site is located at the north east edge of Yaxley village and lies just to the north of Castleton Way. The main landscape character influences for this site are the neighbouring settlements and farmland. The site is roughly rectangular in form, flat, open arable fields bounded by either runways or taxiways or fragmented hedgerows with mature trees and shelter belt planting that provide suitable boundaries to separate the development from the neighbouring settlements, however; there are breaks along the planting which provide exposed views into the sites.

Review on the submitted information
The submitted application includes a site location plan, a proposed site development plan, and a Landscape and visual impact assessment.

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 furthers enhances mature hedgerow or tree planting currently in place around the site.

Yours sincerely,

Roshni Patel, BSc (Hons), Pg Dip, MA
Junior Landscape Architect
Telephone: 03330322436
Email: roshni.patel@essex.gov.uk

Place Services provide landscape advice on behalf of Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils Please note: This letter is advisory and should only be considered as the opinion formed by specialist staff in relation to this particular matter.

Place Services
Essex County Council
County Hall, Chelmsford
Essex, CM1 1QH

T: 0333 013 6840
www.placeservices.co.uk
@PlaceServices

Planning Services
Mid Suffolk District Council,
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich
IP1 2B

13/03/2018

For the attention of: Gemma Walker

Ref: DC/17/05666; Land to the south of Eye Airfield and east of the A140

Thank you for reconsulting us on the full planning application for the development of the 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. This letter sets out our consultation response regarding the landscape impact of the planning application and how the proposal responds to the surrounding landscape context.

Recommendations
In terms of the likely visual impact, the proposals will have an impact on the rural setting of Yaxley village and the surrounding landscape. The main development constraint is the requirement to retain the natural landscape character and appearance, and mitigate the impact on the neighbouring settlements.

The following conditions (numbered) highlight our key comments and recommendations for the submitted proposal. If the full application is approved we will require submission of the below documents prior to construction as individual planning conditions:

1. A detailed landscape planting plan, landscape maintenance plan and specification, (which clearly sets out the existing and proposed planting). We recommend a landscape maintenance plan for the minimum of 3 years, to support plant establishment.

2. Further details of the proposed swale system will need to be provided; sections of the swale in the proposed location, and proposed planting alongside an implementation strategy is required to help understand how the proposed SuDs scheme addresses the outcomes of the drainage strategy.

3. Boundary treatment surrounding the large car park needs to be specified. Additional planting to improve the perimeter of the site will help soften the rural edge transition while protecting key views into the site. Some areas of the car park (such as the north side) have little or soft landscaping.

4. Finishes and materials for the proposed processing facility colour and texture should be informed by the outcome of the LVIA and be subject to planning conditions.

5. The site location plan and the proposed site plan fails to appropriately show an appropriate contextual setting of the site. The plans should show northern Yaxley which has residential properties facing the west part of the proposed development.

The proposal
The site comprises a disused military airfield; Eye Airfield. Part of the airfield still remains with the remnants of the concrete runways, taxiways and roads running through the site. The wider site area is currently used for industrial development. The site lies to the south of the airfield land. The north and north east parts of the site have already been developed for industrial and business use, where Oakmere Business Park is located.

The site comprises approximately 10.87 hectares of agricultural land. The proposed development is for the construction of a new facility including processing areas, chilled storage, freezer store, office and amenity areas.

The site is located at the north east edge of Yaxley village and lies just to the north of Castleton Way. The main landscape character influences for this site are the neighbouring settlements and farmland. The site is roughly rectangular in form, flat, open arable fields bounded by either runways or taxiways or fragmented hedgerows with mature trees and shelter belt planting that provide suitable boundaries to separate the development from the neighbouring settlements, however; there are breaks along the planting which provide exposed views into the sites.

Review on the submitted information
The submitted application includes a site location plan, a proposed site development plan, and a Landscape and visual impact assessment.

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 furthers enhances mature hedgerow or tree planting currently in place around the site.

Yours sincerely,

Roshni Patel, BSc (Hons), Pg Dip, MA
Junior Landscape Architect
Telephone: 03330322436
Email: roshni.patel@essex.gov.uk

Place Services provide landscape advice on behalf of Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils Please note: This letter is advisory and should only be considered as the opinion formed by specialist staff in relation to this particular matter.

Consultation Response Pro forma

1	**Application Number**	17/05666	
2	**Date of Response**	19/12/17	
3	**Responding Officer**	Name:	Hannah Bridges
		Job Title:	Waste Management Officer
		Responding on behalf of...	Waste Services
4	**Recommendation** (please delete those N/A) Note: This section must be completed before the response is sent. The recommendation should be based on the information submitted with the application.	No objection	
5	**Discussion** Please outline the reasons/rationale behind how you have formed the recommendation. Please refer to any guidance, policy or material considerations that have informed your recommendation.	Ensure that there is adequate provision for waste storage areas and containers for the waste generated from site operations, this should also include the general waste and recyclable waste produced by the staff.	
6	**Amendments, Clarification or Additional Information Required** (if holding objection) If concerns are raised, can they be overcome with changes? Please ensure any requests are proportionate		
7	**Recommended conditions**	To include waste storage areas for the general waste and recycling.	

Please note that this form can be submitted electronically on the Councils website. Comments submitted on the website will not be acknowledged but you can check whether they have been received by reviewing comments on the website under the application reference number. Please note that the completed form will be posted on the Councils website and available to view by the public.

Place Services
Essex County Council
County Hall, Chelmsford
Essex, CM1 1QH

T: 0333 013 6840
www.placeservices.co.uk

14 March 2018

Gemma Walker
Mid Suffolk District Council
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich IP1 2BX

By email only

Dear Gemma,

Thank you for requesting advice on this application from Place Services's ecological advice service. This service provides advice to planning officers to inform Mid Suffolk District Council planning decisions with regard to potential ecological impacts from development. Any additional information, queries or comments on this advice that the applicant or other interested parties may have, must be directed to the Planning Officer who will seek further advice from us where appropriate and necessary.

Application: DC/17/05666
Location: Land To The South Of Eye Airfield And East Of The A140
Proposal: 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.

Thank you for re-consulting Place Services on the above application.

Holding objection due to insufficient ecological information

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 Pl001f revised location plan (February 2018). This could be provided with and 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.

I look forward to working with the LPA and the applicant to provide the missing information to remove my holding objection.

Please contact me with any further queries.

Regards,

Hamish Jackson GradCIEEM BSc (Hons)
Junior Ecological Consultant
Place Services at Essex County Council
Hamish.Jackson@essex.gov.uk

Place Services provide ecological advice on behalf of Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils

Please note: This letter is advisory and should only be considered as the opinion formed by specialist staff in relation to this particular matter.

Place Services
Essex County Council
County Hall, Chelmsford
Essex, CM1 1QH

T: 0333 013 6840
www.placeservices.co.uk

05 December2017

Gemma Walker
Mid Suffolk District Council
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich IP1 2BX

By email only

Dear Gemma,

Application: DC/17/05666
Location: Land To The South Of Eye Airfield And East Of The A140
Proposal: 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.

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

An ecological appraisal has been submitted for the proposed application (FPCR Environment and Design, November 2017). This report includes sufficient information to assess the impacts of development on protected and priority species.

Recommendation:
The mitigation and enhancement measures identified in the ecological appraisal (FPCR Environment and Design, November 2017) should be secured and implemented in full. This is necessary to conserve protected and priority species. The External Lighting Plan (January 2017) within the planning documents should also be secured to reduce the impact to bats which may use the boundary hedgerows for foraging and commuting. It is also considered that a sensitive removal of the ash tree with moderate bat potential would be appropriate for this circumstance to avoid impacts on roosting bats.

Impacts will be minimised such that the proposal is acceptable subject to the conditions below based on BS42020:2013. In terms of biodiversity net gain, the enhancements proposed will contribute to this aim.

Submission for approval and implementation of the details below should be a condition of any planning consent.

CONDITION

I. **ACTION TO BE REQUIRED: COMPLIANCE WITH RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ECOLOGICAL REPORT**

"All ecological mitigation and enhancement measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the FPCR Environment and Design– Ecological Appraisal (November 2017) as already submitted with the planning application and agreed in principle with the local planning authority prior to determination".

Reason: To allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the UK Habitats Regulations, the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 as amended and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority habitats & species)

INFORMATIVE

I. FELLING OF A TREE WITH MODERATE BAT ROOST POTENTIAL

The applicant is reminded that all bat species are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, (as amended), and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. It is illegal to kill or injure bats, cause disturbance at their resting places or to block access to, damage or destroy their roost sites.

An Ash (*Fraxinous excelsior*) tree has been proposed to be removed due to the creation of the new production facility and has medium potential bat roosting features. This is predominantly due to three Woodpecker holes at c. 8m.

An emergence survey was conducted and found no bats utilising the tree as a roosting location. However, bats may still colonise the site in the intervening period before works occur. Consequently, as operations will directly disturb, remove or destroy timber with bat potential, I recommend conducting works in a sensitive manner.

Therefore, where possible, work should be carried out between late August and early October or between March and April. Workers should undertake a visual inspection prior to felling to examine for any signs of bats. During felling, where reasonably practicable, timber with bat roosting potential should not be directly sawn through. If timber is removed with bat roosting features then it should be left at the base of the tree for at least 48 hours. If bats are discovered then an individual holding a Natural England bat licence should be contacted and informed of the situation as soon as possible to advise on any further mitigation.

Please contact me with any further queries.

Regards,

Hamish Jackson BSc (Hons)
Junior Ecological Consultant
Place Services at Essex County Council
Hamish.Jackson@essex.gov.uk

Place Services provide ecological advice on behalf of Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils

Place Services
Essex County Council
County Hall, Chelmsford
Essex, CM1 1QH

T: 0333 013 6840
www.placeservices.co.uk

FAO: Planning Department,
Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council

Ref: DC/17/05666
Date: 07/02/2018

HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION ADVICE

Dear Sir/Madam,

DC/17/05666 - 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.
Land to the South of Eye Airfield and East of the A140

The proposal is of such a scale that it will have a significant impact upon the local landscape. Potentially this will include nearby Yaxley where there are several listed buildings, the closest being White House Farmhouse. Potentially this impact upon setting will be negative, i.e., because of the scale and nature of the proposed industrial buildings juxtaposed against the scale and character of a traditional village. Also the 24 hour lighting proposed, and the potential noise and smells generated by the industrial complex.

However, Yaxley would appear to be already well screened by existing planting in and around the village and also planting along the A140. There is also additional planting proposed to the periphery of the application site.

The Report from Cotswold Archaeology in response to this application (Section 5, page 30; The Setting of Heritage Assets) comments:

A number of Grade II Listed Buildings within Yaxley were identified during an initial review as being potentially susceptible to impact as a result of changes to their setting from the development of the Site (Fig. 8), the closest located c 260m from the western edge of the Site. However, the Site visit, and study area walkover, identified that due to the construction of the A140 and the presence of dense tree cover along the western site boundary creating a barrier between the Listed Buildings and the Site, and the existing industrial nature of the majority of the former airfield, there would be no potential for the proposed development to alter the setting of any of the designated assets within Yaxley, thereby having no potential to result in harm to their heritage significance. It was concluded on that basis that a detailed settings assessment would not be required in relation to any of the Listed Buildings to the west of the Site.

PTO

I generally concur with this statement.

I am also encouraged that issues of landscaping have been highlighted by Roshi Patel, Junior Landscape Architect, Place Services (19/12/2017). Provided the recommendations in this letter are addressed, then I see no reason to be concerned over the impact of this development upon nearby heritage assets in Yaxley.

I can confirm NO OBJECTION, subject to the above paragraph.

Yours Sincerely,

Paul Skeet

On behalf of

Tim Murphy
Historic Environment Manager
Place Services

Note: This letter is advisory and should only be considered as the opinion formed by specialist staff in relation to this particular matter.