

Committee Report

Item No: 5

Reference: DC/18/02327

Case Officer: Gemma Walker

Ward: Hadleigh North.

Ward Member/s: Cllr Tina Campbell. Cllr Siân Dawson.

RECOMMENDATION – GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS

Description of Development

Planning Application. Change of use of land to form a business park incorporating a mix of B1, B2 and B8 commercial and industrial units.

Location

Grazing Land South of Hadleigh Bowling Club, Stone Street, Hadleigh, Suffolk

Parish: Hadleigh

Expiry Date: 31/10/2018

Application Type: FUL - Full Planning Application

Development Type: Major Large Scale - Offices/R&D/light In

Applicant: G A Imports

Agent: KLH Architects Ltd

PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

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

The Acting Chief Planning Officer considers the application to be of a controversial nature.

Details of Previous Committee / Resolutions and any member site visit

None

PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Summary of Policies

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

CS02 - Settlement Pattern Policy

CS03 - Strategy for Growth and Development

CS12 - Design and Construction Standards

CS13 - Renewable / Low Carbon Energy

CS15 - Implementing Sustainable Development

CS17 - The Rural Economy

EM20 - Expansion/Extension of Existing Employment Uses

CR04 - Special Landscape Areas

Consultations and Representations

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

A: Summary of Consultations

Hadleigh Town Council

Refusal was recommended (Voting was unanimous)

The reason for refusal was that the development is on a special landscape area (SLA)

Concerns were also raised about the increase of traffic in the area and the impact on the junction with the A1071.

Environment Agency

Government guidance contained within the National Planning Practice Guidance (Water supply, wastewater and water quality - considerations for planning applications, paragraph 020) sets out a hierarchy of drainage options that must be considered and discounted in the following order:

- 1) Connection to the public sewer
- 2) Package sewage treatment plant (which can be offered to the Sewerage Undertaker for adoption)
- 3) Septic Tank

Foul drainage should be connected to the main sewer. Where this is not possible, under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010 any discharge of sewage or trade effluent made to either surface water or groundwater will need to be registered as an exempt discharge activity or hold a permit issued by us, in addition to planning permission. This applies to any discharge to inland freshwaters, coastal waters or relevant territorial waters.

Please note that the granting of planning permission does not guarantee the granting of an Environmental Permit. Upon receipt of a correctly filled in application form we will carry out an assessment. It can take up to 4 months before we are in a position to decide whether to grant a permit or not.

Domestic effluent discharged from a treatment plant/septic tank at 2 cubic metres or less to ground or 5 cubic metres or less to surface water in any 24 hour period must comply with General Binding Rules provided that no public foul sewer is available to serve the development and that the site is not within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone.

A soakaway used to serve a non-mains drainage system must be sited no less than 10 metres from the nearest watercourse, not less than 10 metres from any other foul soakaway and not less than 50 metres from the nearest potable water supply, spring or borehole.

Where the proposed development involves the connection of foul drainage to an existing non-mains drainage system, the applicant should ensure that it is in a good state of repair, regularly de-sludged and of sufficient capacity to deal with any potential increase in flow and loading which may occur as a result of the development.

Where the existing non-mains drainage system is covered by a permit to discharge then an application to vary the permit will need to be made to reflect the increase in volume being discharged. It can take up to 13 weeks before we decide whether to vary a permit.

Natural England

No comments to make.

Historic England

On the basis of the information available to date, we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.

Highways England

Offer no objection.

SCC Highways

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highway Authority recommends that any permission which that Planning Authority may give should include the conditions shown below:

Condition: Before the access is first used visibility splays shall be provided as shown on Drawing No. 3705-106 P01 with an X dimension of 2.4m and a Y dimension of 120m 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.

SCC Travel Plan

Thank you for consulting me in regards to the proposed mixed-use commercial development at land to the south of Hadleigh Bowling Club. I can confirm that I have no comment to make, as the development is too small to justify the implementation of a formal Travel Plan in accordance with national planning guidance.

SCC Flood and Water

Holding objection

Whilst infiltration testing has been carried out the applicant has failed to provide the corrections and information as our previous consultation reply.

SCC Fire and Rescue

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 firefighting, 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.

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.

Heritage

The Heritage Team considers the proposals would cause negligible harm to designated heritage assets through the development of the proposed site, within their setting. The issues of heritage concern relate to the potential impact of the proposal on the setting and significance of nearby listed buildings, including the Grade II Listed Stoneleigh and Primrose Cottage.

Having visited the site, it is evident that the industrial development proposals would have an impact within the setting of the listed buildings, eroding their wider rural setting. Stoneleigh, to the north west of the site, has suffered considerable alteration within its immediate setting and the proposal would merely amplify this situation. There would potentially be more impact on the setting of Primrose Cottage, to the east of the site, whose setting has been less degraded, evidenced by the largely rural environment in which it stands; with the river valley to the north and agricultural land to the south. The industrialisation of the site would therefore cause negligible harm to the wider setting of Primrose Cottage by eroding its rural context and the historic and isolated, linear development along Stone Street.

Should the LPA be minded to grant permission, the following condition should be applied:

- Details and manufacturer's literature of the facing and roofing materials.

Environmental Health Land Contamination

No objection

Environmental Health Air Quality

I have referred to the Environmental Protection UK (EPUK) Guidance, 2017 – Land Use Planning and Development Control: Planning for Air Quality, in assessing this application with regard to air quality. The data in the Transport Statement, Ian Booth, Consultant Engineer Ltd, February 2018, shows that the development would not meet the criteria in the EPUK Guidance for requiring an air quality assessment. Therefore, I have no objections to make with regard to this aspect of the application.

I note that the Transport Statement mentions that measures will be put in place to control dust and emissions from construction. The Construction Management Plan states that there will be control of dust with water suppression where possible or on-tool dust extraction equipment. If this Plan is to be formally agreed as part of the planning consent, I recommend the phrasing is amended slightly. Water suppression should be used to control dust emissions when necessary, rather than where possible.

As an aside from air quality, I note that the proposed means of foul drainage is via a package treatment plant. It would appear that this would have to be a substantial unit and I recommend the Environment Agency are specifically consulted on this matter to ensure that their requirements can be met.

Environmental Health Other Issues

I can confirm with respect to B 1 use I do not have any adverse comments to make. With respect to the B2 industrial and B8 storage and distribution use I note that hours of working are not yet known and no noise assessment of any likely impacts on noise sensitive premises has been made. Without this information I cannot advise you further on the suitability of this aspect of the proposed development. When the opening hours are known I would recommend that a noise impact assessment is carried out. The usual way of doing this is to submit an assessment in accordance with BS4142.

Should approval be granted I would, therefore, recommend the following conditions:

1. Prior to the commencement of the development the applicant is required to submit an assessment carried out in accordance with BS 4142 to show that noise from machinery and equipment, including any ventilation and extraction equipment, from the industrial and storage units will be unlikely to have an adverse impact on occupiers of any noise sensitive premises. The assessment shall include details of any mitigation measures to be implemented, for the approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Subject to the satisfactory submission of the above, I have no objections to the proposed development but would recommend appropriate conditions to mitigate against adverse impacts from lighting and also from noise during construction, as follow:

2. No means of external lighting shall be installed or attached to the commercial units except in accordance with details of an illumination scheme (to include luminaire types, position, height, aiming points, lighting levels and a polar illuminance diagram, based on the vertical plane to reflect impact on surrounding residents) which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be implemented and retained as approved.

3. The working hours during construction shall be restricted to 0730 hrs to 1800 hrs Mondays to Fridays and 0800 hrs and 1300 hrs on Saturdays. There shall be no working hours on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Additional Comments following Re-Consultation

The application is for B1, B2 or B8. I understand than occupier for part of the site imports and distributes laminated wood products and would be occupying all or part of the B8 area while there are no specific occupiers. The types of activities that could occupy those units can give rise to the following Concerns

- Noise from commercial and industrial units including from any fixed or mobile plant may cause loss of amenity or cause statutory nuisance
- Noise from vehicles including HDV's delivering and access and egressing the sit. This could be intensive with a B8 use and may cause loss of amenity or cause statutory nuisance
- Odours and fumes from industrial activities, may cause loss of amenity or cause statutory nuisance
- Smoke from fires may cause loss of amenity or cause statutory nuisance
- Light from external lighting may cause loss of amenity or cause statutory nuisance

There are no acoustic assessments provided for the import/distribution operation and Presumably due to the unknown occupant no acoustic, odour or fumes assessments for the rest of the proposed site. Additionally no hours have been proposed for the site to be open and for when they could receive deliveries. Lorry movements and loading plant at night in this area have a high potential for causing loss of amenity and disturbance. The design and access statement does state that there is no intention for night time works or opening to take place and it recognised that based on current projected business operation there are only likely to be 26 HGV's vising the site during day time hours.

Additionally it is noted that the foul drainage system is intended to be a private package sewage treatment plant.

I therefore have no objection in principle subject to the following conditions being applied should permission be granted;

- The use hereby permitted shall not OPERATE outside of the following times:
Weekdays: 07:300 to 18:00, Saturdays: 08:00 to 13:00, Sundays and Public Holidays: NONE

- No deliveries shall be received at, or despatched from, the site outside of the following times:
Weekdays: 07:30 to 18:00, Saturdays: 08:00 to 13:00, Sundays and Public Holidays: NONE
-

- Prior to the first use or occupation of each use within the development as hereby permitted, a competent person shall have ensured that the rating level of noise emitted from the site's plant, equipment and machinery shall not exceed 5dB(A) above the background levels determined at facades of noise-sensitive premises. The assessment shall have been made in accordance with the current version of British Standard 4142 and confirmation of the findings of the assessment shall have been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority and shall be adhered to thereafter.
- Where a permitted activity will generate fumes, smells, odours and/or dust and Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted. Control measures shall be installed in accordance with a scheme devised by a competent person for the control of fumes, smells, odours, and dust that shall have been previously submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The control measures shall thereafter be retained and maintained to the agreed specification and working order.
- No means of external lighting shall be installed or attached to the commercial units except in accordance with details of an illumination scheme (to include luminaire types, position, height, aiming points, lighting levels and a polar illuminance diagram, based on the vertical plane to reflect impact and an assessment of glare on surrounding residents) which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be implemented and retained as approved.
- There shall be no burning of wastes anywhere on the site as shown edged in red on the plans which are attached to and form part of this permission unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local planning Authority
- Full details of the proposed sewage treatment plant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme as approved shall be implemented and fully operational prior to the occupation of the development and retained as such thereafter

Landscaping

No objection subject to conditions for landscaping scheme and management plan to be agreed.

Ecology

We are satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available for determination. This provides certainty for the LPA of the likely impacts on Protected and Priority species/habitats and, with appropriate mitigation measures secured, the development can be made acceptable. We support the reasonable biodiversity enhancements, which should also be secured by a condition of any consent.

Arboricultural Officer

The trees proposed for removal as part of this application are of insufficient amenity value to warrant being a constraint. Suitable replacement planting should be subject to agreement under condition.

Economic Development

The Ipswich Economic Area Sector Needs assessment (Sept 17) identifies the need for modern, quality accommodation for business and professional services within out of town and semi-rural locations that benefit from strong connectivity and proximity to key settlements. There is a good level of occupation on the existing industrial areas in the town, and for the future growth of Hadleigh as a key town to be sustainable, we would look to attract and achieve commercial growth in the immediate and outlying areas.

This site is well connected and is adjacent to existing compatible uses.

We would support and recommend approval for this application

Thank you for this re-consultation. In addition to my earlier response I would like to note that:

The Ipswich Economic Area Assessment has identified that Babergh has a high amount of rural employment and diverse commercial property needs across the District, and that for small firms a key challenge is finding suitable urban industrial sites unconstrained by amenity issues such as residential.

This site is unusual in that whilst not urban, it is well connected to the road network and is immediately adjacent to compatible uses. In effect it will form part of a cluster of similar business uses at the site and so should operate effectively from this location.

<https://www.babergh.gov.uk/assets/Strategic-Planning/Current-Evidence-Base/Ipswich-Economic-Area-Sector-Needs-Assessment-Sept-2017.pdf>

Hadleigh Society

Comments 29/8/18

Inadequacy of landscape proposal and inability to accommodate any meaningful landscaping to ameliorate the congestion of ugly buildings and vehicle dominated hard surface environment of the proposed industrial trading estate.

Even with landscape amendments the scheme is inadequate and unsympathetic to its surroundings as well as continuing to represent unsustainable development.

Comments 1/8/18

Proposal extremely insensitively located, has few, if any, sustainability attributes, is disruptive to adjoining recreational facilities, and lacks any understanding in use of good design principles in creating a rural business park or provisions for enhancing the landscape.

The Society objects on the basis of landscape, ecology of the site and surroundings, amenities and enjoyment of Hadleigh Bowls Club, lack of sustainable modes of transport, lack of energy conservation provisions, lack of sustainable foul and surface water drainage, lack of use of brownfield land or coherent rural location, and poor design.

B: Representations

- Traffic
- Noise generation
- Industrial development will erode the small market town and rural landscape
- Loss of landscape and farmland
- Impact on the bowling club
- Impact on Special Landscape Area
- Not sustainable development
- Impact on ecology
- Impact on existing industrial estates with empty units
- Impact on drainage
- Light pollution

PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

1. The Site and Surroundings

1.1 The application site is 2.61ha and is currently open agricultural land. The site is situated to the south of the A1141, close to its junction with the A1071.

- 1.2 Between the A1141 and the northern boundary of part of the site is Hadleigh Bowls Club, which shares its access with Supreme Pet Foods, to the East of the site. To the south of the site is open land.
- 1.3 The A1141 is situated at the bottom of the river valley, and the buildings in the locality are predominantly situated immediately adjacent to the road, as the land slopes upwards to the south, such that the application site is somewhat higher than adjacent land.
- 1.4 The application site is situated within the Special Landscape Area.

2. The Proposal

- 2.1 The proposal is for the change of use of land to form a business park incorporating a mix of B1, B2 and B8 commercial and industrial units.
- 2.2 The proposal is for 2,780 square metres of floorspace, divided into 275sqm of B1(a) office, 545sq m B1(c) Light Industrial, 945 sq m B2 General Industrial and 1015sq m B8 Storage or distribution.
- 2.3 The neighbouring Supreme Petfoods has an existing access from the A1141, also shared by Hadleigh Bowling Club and existing businesses at Stone Street Court. The proposal is to utilise this access from the A1141 to further provide access to the proposed business park.
- 2.4 The proposal would create four B1 office units within one building at the front (north) of the site, to the rear of which would be two B2 and two B8 units, situated along the western boundary of the site. Immediately to the rear of the Bowls Club would be seven B1 units, grouped as one building and a further building within B2 use.
- 2.5 The proposed buildings are a mix of single storey and two-storey. The B1 units proposed to the entrance to the site and adjacent to the Bowls Club would be single storey, whilst the B2 and B8 units to the rear would be two-storey. However the proposed sections indicate that the buildings would be set into the slope, such that the overall height of the buildings does not increase towards the north of the site, up the slope.
- 2.6 The materials proposed are colour coated metal sheeting, incorporating vertical and horizontal lines to reflect the use of timber boarding seen in the locality.

3. The Principle Of Development

- 3.1 The NPPF at paragraph 84 states that “Planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads and exploits any opportunities to make a location more sustainable (for example by improving the scope for access on foot, by cycling or by public transport).”
 - 3.2 With regards to the Local Plan, the application site is outside of the defined Built Up Area Boundary for the town of Hadleigh, as such the site is considered to be countryside. Furthermore, the application site is within the Special Landscape Area.
 - 3.3 Whilst Core Strategy Policy CS2 states that in the countryside development will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances subject to a proven justifiable need, Core Strategy Policy CS3 goes on to provide further policy for proposed employment development, stating that “Employment and housing growth will be accommodated within Babergh's existing settlement pattern and in new mixed and balanced communities on the edges of the towns...”
-

- 3.4 The Core Strategy adopted in 2014 expressly anticipated, and stated within the document, that the District settlement boundaries would be reviewed and sites allocated for development following the adoption of the Core Strategy. The Local Development Scheme (LDS) produced in 2012 advised that a new combined LDS would commence in autumn 2012 and stated it was not possible to provide an up to date programme for site specific allocations. It is noted that in the original LDS in 2007 it was anticipated that the Site Allocations document would be adopted within 6 months of the Core Strategy having been adopted. This has not to date happened. The current LDS, published in July 2018, now indicates that the Joint Local Plan, including site allocations, will be adopted in February 2020.
- 3.5 The exceptional circumstances test at Policy CS2 applies to all land outside the settlement boundary. This blanket approach is not consistent with the NPPF, which favours a more balanced approach to decision-making. The NPPF does contain a not dissimilar exceptional circumstances test, set out at paragraph 79, however it is only engaged where development is isolated. For the reasons set out in this report, the development is not isolated. Paragraph 79 of the NPPF is not engaged.
- 3.6 Having regard to the material delay in the review of settlement boundaries and in the allocation of sites, and the absence of a balanced approach as favoured by the NPPF, the statutory weight to be attached to Policy CS2 is reduced. The fact that the site is outside the settlement boundary is therefore not a determinative factor upon which the application turns.
- 3.7 The presumption in favour of sustainable development and the need for a balanced approach to decision making are key threads to Policy CS1, CS11 and CS15 of the Core Strategy. Unlike Policy CS2, these policies are consistent with the NPPF, carry full statutory weight and provide the principal assessment framework applying to the subject application
- 3.8 Furthermore Core Strategy CS3 states that “Proposals for employment uses that will contribute to the local economy and increase the sustainability of Core Villages, Hinterland Villages and the rural economy will be promoted and supported where appropriate in scale, character and nature to their locality.”
- 3.9 The location of the site within the Special Landscape Area does not in principle preclude development, the requirement being for a proposal to maintain or enhance the special landscape qualities, and be designed and sited so as to harmonise with the landscape setting.
- 3.10 In the light of the above policies and the requirements of the NPPF it is not considered that the principle of the proposal is unacceptable, subject to consideration of the impacts of the proposal as detailed in the relevant policies.

4. Site Access, Parking and Highway Safety Considerations

- 4.1 The proposal would utilise the existing access to the site, shared by Hadleigh Bowls Club, Supreme Petfoods and Stone Street Court Businesses. This provides access to the A1141 and to the A1071.
 - 4.2 The application proposal includes 73 parking spaces and 42 cycle spaces as well as loading space. This is in excess of the requirements of the Suffolk Guidance for Parking and as such the proposal is not considered to result in harm in this respect, subject to conditions to secure this.
 - 4.3 Suffolk County Council Highways have assessed the proposal and raise no objection, subject to conditions.
-

4.4 In accordance with paragraph 84 of the NPPF the proposal is therefore not considered to have an unacceptable impact on local roads. Furthermore the provision of additional cycle parking facilities over and above the requirements of the Suffolk Guidance for Parking is further considered to comply with paragraph 84 in respect of exploiting opportunities to make the site more sustainable.

5. Design and Layout

5.1 The proposal is for 5 separate buildings, providing a total of 16 units. To the front of the site a B1 office unit divided up into 4 units (units 6-9) is proposed, behind this a B2 building providing 2 units (units 3 & 4), to the rear again a B8 building providing 2 units (units 1 & 2). To the south-eastern part of the site, to the rear of the Bowls Club a further B2 building is proposed, providing 1 unit (unit 5), and a further B1 building divided into 7 units (Units 10-16).

Units 1 and 2 (B8 use) are a two storey building with roller shutter doors.

Units 3 and 4 (B2 use) are again a two-storey building with roller shutter doors.

Unit 5 (B2 use) is also a two storey building with roller shutter doors.

Units 6 to 9 (B1 use) are a single storey building.

Units 10 to 16 (B1 use) are a single storey building.

5.2 The design and appearance of the buildings is somewhat utilitarian, but also utilises materials and design to reflect a barn style, not considered to be out of keeping with the locality. Indeed the design and materials are not dissimilar to the relatively new bowls club building (B/09/00600).

5.3 The proposed layout proposes a B1 office building fronting onto the A1141, effectively between the Bowls Club and Supreme Petfoods. The other buildings would be situated to the rear of this, or to the rear of the Bowls Club building. This combined with the topography of the site and use of the levels ensures that the proposed buildings would not project into the landscape. The result of this design and layout, and the landscaping details, agreed with our Landscape Consultant, is such that the proposal is not considered to be unacceptable in this respect. It is considered that the proposal would harmonise with the landscape, as required by Local Plan Policy CR04.

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

6.1 The application site forms part of a field located between Hadleigh Bowls Club and the site of Supreme Petfoods, and which extends to the rear (south) of the Bowls Club. The field slopes up the valley sides from north-west to south-east, with open countryside between the site and the A1071. The application site is within the Special Landscape Area designation.

6.2 Local Plan Policy CR04 states that development proposals in Special Landscape Areas will only be permitted where they maintain or enhance the special landscaped qualities of the area, identified in the relevant landscape appraisal, and are designed and sited so as to harmonise with the landscape setting.

6.3 Following advice from our Landscape Consultant the application was amended and additional details provided. Following this the advice from our landscape consultant is that with the mitigation proposed, and existing vegetation the views to the development will be filtered and limited. The roof lines will be visible and therefore material choice will be critical with regards to the landscape impact.

6.4 In the light of this, subject to conditions for the landscaping scheme, management of the landscaping and agreement of the facing and roofing materials the proposal is considered to maintain the special landscape qualities of the area and as such is not considered to be contrary to Local Plan Policy CR04 to consider refusal in this respect.

6.5 With regards to ecology, our Ecological Consultant has reviewed the information provided and confirmed that impacts will be minimised such that the proposal is acceptable in this regard, subject to conditions to secure the recommendations from the ecological appraisal and biodiversity enhancement works.

7. Heritage Issues

7.1 The Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a duty on the local planning authority to “*have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses*”. To the north of the application site is the Grade II listed Stoneleigh, and to the South, also Grade II Listed, Primrose Cottage.

7.2 Furthermore the NPPF not only identifies protecting and enhancing the historic environment as an objective of sustainable development but at paragraph 193 states “*when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.*”

7.3 The Heritage Team considers the proposals would cause negligible harm to designated heritage assets through the development of the proposed site, within their setting. The issues of heritage concern relate to the potential impact of the proposal on the setting and significance of nearby listed buildings, including the Grade II Listed Stoneleigh and Primrose Cottage.

7.4 Overall Heritage consider that Stoneleigh to the north west of the site has undergone considerable alteration within its setting already, although the proposal would amplify this. Heritage further consider that there would be somewhat more impact on the setting of Primrose Cottage given the more rural environment in which it stands. As such the industrialisation of the site would cause negligible harm to the wider setting of Primrose Cottage by eroding its rural context and the historic and isolated, linear development along Stone Street. Having identified the harm as negligible the Heritage Team do not object to the proposal, subject to conditions in respect of the materials.

7.5 Paragraph 196 of the NPPF advises that where a proposal will cause less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Given the negligible level of harm identified and that the proposal would offer public benefits with regards to employment in an area where a need has been identified for such employment uses, including by a specific company looking to relocate it is considered that there are public benefits which would outweigh this low level of harm.

8. Impact on Residential Amenity

8.1 The application site is adjoined by Hadleigh Bowls Club and Supreme Petfoods and Stone Street Court businesses. Whilst there are properties along Stone Street (A1141) these are well removed from the application site itself, such that in respect of privacy and overlooking the proposal is not considered to have an unacceptable impact.

8.2 The proposal will nonetheless result in an increase in traffic movements along Stone Street, and this has been raised by neighbours in their responses as a concern. Suffolk County Council and Highways England raise no objection to the proposal in respect of highway safety. Furthermore conditions can control the hours of operation including deliveries, which would ensure that the impact of this is reasonably controlled, such that the proposal is not considered to be unacceptable in this respect.

- 8.3 Members of Hadleigh Bowling Club have objected to this proposal with concerns about several issues, including the overlooking of the Bowls Club, that the proposed buildings will dominate and over-shadow the Bowls Club, noise and activity associated with a business park will disturb the quiet and tranquil environment of the Bowls Club, especially when silence is required during competitive matches, lighting of the proposed use will cause visual harm and disturbance to the Bowls Club and that drainage may affect the bowling green. Whilst the Local Plan and Core Strategy policies require protection of residential amenity there is no such requirement to protect other amenity, nonetheless the areas of concern raised by the Bowls Club are considered below:
- 8.4 With regards to the potential for overlooking the nearest proposed buildings are the two B1 business units, which are both single storey. Furthermore the buildings are at least 13m from the boundary and at least 25m from the club building, or bowls green, whichever is closer. In the light of this the proposal is not considered to result in overlooking or the loss of privacy to the Bowls Club.
- 8.5 Whilst the proposed buildings are situated to the South of the Bowls Club given the single storey nature of the two adjacent buildings and the separation distances as outlined above the proposal is further not considered to result in over-shadowing of the Bowls Club.
- 8.6 As outlined above one the of the concerns raised in respect of the Bowls Club is noise, whilst it is appreciated that the application site is at the moment agricultural land the area is nonetheless also home to Supreme Petfoods and Stone Street Court, both of which utilise the access for the proposal and Hadleigh Bowls Club, such that there is already a certain level of background noise. The proposal may bring this somewhat closer, but as recommended by our Environmental Health Team conditions can control the hours of operation and deliveries, as well as the noise generation, with a noise assessment a requirement by way of condition. As such the proposal is not considered to risk harm to amenity in respect of the noise generated.
- 8.7 Concern has also been raised in respect of lighting of the application site, with the Bowls Club permission having been the subject of conditions in respect of lighting itself, this proposal is no different and lighting would be subject to control by means of condition, and indeed with respect to hours of operation of the lighting. As such the proposal is not considered to have an unacceptable impact in this respect.
- 8.8 Concerns in respect of the drainage of the site and impact of this on the Bowls Club and in particular the green have been raised. This matter remains outstanding, and is dealt with in the relevant section in this report, however in respect of the Bowls Club concern and amenity it should be noted that any application proposal is required to control surface water run-off, such that the proposal is not considered to risk harm in this regard, subject to the details and recommendation in the surface water drainage part of this report.

9. Sustainable Design and Construction

- 9.1 No information has been provided within the application to detail the provision of sustainability measures to comply with Core Strategy Policies CS12, CS13 or CS15. These policies require, amongst other things, the following:
- All new non-residential developments will be expected to achieve, as a minimum, the BREEAM excellent standard or equivalent.
 - All new development will be required to minimise dependence on fossil fuels and make the fullest contribution to the mitigation of climate change through adopting a sustainable approach to energy use.
-

- Minimise energy demand of the site through appropriate layout and orientation and the use of building methods, materials and construction techniques that optimise energy efficiency and are resilient to climate change.

9.2 Whilst no information is provided in this respect it is considered that the development of the site could achieve these requirements, and that the details for this could be adequately controlled by means of condition. As such it is not considered that the proposal is unacceptable in this regard to consider refusal on this basis.

10. Surface Water Drainage

10.1 Following consultation with SCC Flood and Water Team additional information has been provided by the applicant. Nonetheless SCC have confirmed that although infiltration testing has been carried out the applicant has not provided corrections and information to finalise the FRA. However, subject to this information being provided prior to the grant of planning permission, subject to the approval of Planning Committee this is not a reason to refuse the proposal or to delay its consideration by the Committee. Accordingly, the recommendation in this respect is to seek the information required by SCC prior to issuing the decision, or to refuse the application on appropriate grounds if the information is not provided to the satisfaction of SCC Flood and Water Team.

PART FOUR – CONCLUSION

11. Planning Balance and Conclusion

11.1 In light of the requirements of paragraph 84 of the NPPF and given that the proposal does not have adverse impacts to outweigh the benefits and is not contrary to Local Plan or Core Strategy Policies the proposal is considered to be acceptable and accordingly the recommendation is for approval, subject to an acceptable drainage scheme being agreed.

RECOMMENDATION

(1) That subject to an acceptable drainage scheme being provided to the satisfaction of the Local Lead Flood Authority, that authority be delegated to the Acting Chief Planning Officer to grant planning permission, subject to conditions as summarised below and those as may be deemed necessary:

- Standard time limit
 - Approved Plans (Plans submitted that form this application)
 - Phasing Condition (To allow phasing of the development and allows spreading of payments under CIL)
 - Landscaping scheme
 - Landscape management plan
 - Facing and roofing materials to be agreed.
 - Fire hydrants to be agreed
 - Construction management plan including construction working hours restriction
 - Levels
 - Ecological mitigation measures
 - Biodiversity enhancement
 - Working hours and delivery hours restrictions
 - Noise assessment
-

- Control of fumes, smells, odour and dust
- External lighting
- No burning of waste
- Sewage treatment plant to be agreed
- Visibility splay
- Provision of parking including cycle parking, electric vehicle charging and turning space
- Energy efficiency measures
- BREEAM details

(2) And the following informative notes as summarised and those as may be deemed necessary by the Acting Chief Planning Officer:

- Pro active working statement
- SCC Highways notes
- Support for sustainable development principles

(3) That in the event of the drainage scheme referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured within 6 months that the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to refuse the application on appropriate grounds.