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Background:

The application is reported to Planning Committee as it is considered to have district-wide significance. The Eastern Relief Road is required to facilitate 68 hectares of General Employment land (Extension to Suffolk Business Park) and further housing growth on the Moreton Hall Estate (500 homes). The housing is one of the five directions of growth for Bury St Edmunds and the Suffolk Business Park Extension forms part of the strategic employment allocation for the Borough up to and beyond 2031. The employment land is considered to have regional significance. The principal of both of these were agreed when the Core Strategy was adopted in December 2010.

The alignment of the road was also set out in the “Suffolk Business Park Extension Masterplan” adopted June 2010. The Masterplan set the broad principals and the alignment of the road. A previous application was approved by the council earlier this year and the alignment of that application followed the route in the Masterplan. However the route of the previous application crossed land outside of the applicants’ control. The route of this application goes further north than the previous route and avoids Woodlands Road which is a privately owned unadopted track.

This application sets out all other matters such as heritage, landscaping, footpaths and cycleways, ecology, and sustainable drainage. The proposal is considered to comply with the relevant policies of the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework and is considered to be acceptable in all other material respects. The application is recommended for approval.

Application Details:

1. The proposed road would head east from the roundabout on the junction of Skyliner Way and Lady Miriam Way and links into the northern part of Junction 45 on the A14. The proposal includes five new roundabouts. The first roundabout (A) would serve the proposed Football Club and secondary school and act as an entrance into the future employment land to the south. The second roundabout (B) would serve the Rougham Tower Museum and again the future employment land to the south. The third roundabout (C) would serve the Rougham Airfield and act as a main entrance for public events and shows. Additionally it would serve the Rougham Industrial Estate and would link into Fred Castle Way to the south. The fourth roundabout (D) would link the new road with Sow Lane. The fifth roundabout (E) would replace two existing T junctions that link onto Sow Lane from General Castle Way and junction 45 of the A14.

2. The proposal also seeks to introduce a cycle path on the south side of the road along its entire length, save for a small break at the head of Woodlands Road which is discussed at length below. The road will also be supported by a footpath on the northern side from Lady Miriam Way to roundabout D. Landscaping is proposed as is sustainable drainage in the form of Swales along the length of the road. The eastern part of the road between roundabout D and E will largely be a separated dual carriageway so as to retain significant trees. One lane will be created by utilising and amending large parts of the current Sow Lane.
3. Junction 45 is proposed to be significantly altered in the same way as previously approved. The slip road eastbound off will be lengthened and the radii will be significantly less sharp. Currently the slip road ends by reaching a T Junction onto Sow Lane. Under the proposal the slip road would end by joining a new roundabout. East bound on slip road will be accessed by a roundabout and this slip road will be extended. West bound off and west bound on will have their slip roads extended however the radii serving them will remain unaltered and they will continue to start and end at the current T junction. However this Junction will have traffic lights introduced on to it which will control vehicles coming off and on the slip road. The proposal also includes the provision of a new car park that would serve the existing Rougham Tower Museum.

4. Much of the above proposal is as previously approved. The road will be identical between Lady Miriam way and roundabout C. All of the improvements to junction 45 described above are as previously approved. Roundabout E and much of Sow Lane north of roundabout E is the same as previously approved. What differs is that Roundabout D is further north east than previously approved and the road is slightly longer. This route avoids land outside of the applicants’ control. The scheme which now results in some additional loss of woodland on the eastern side of Sow Lane proposes mitigation in the form of two new woodland areas north and south of roundabout D.

**Amendments**

5. The application has been amended once since its original submission. Objection was received which highlighted that when travelling towards roundabout D that forward visibility was substandard in respect of highways design and safety. The applicant submitted amended plans which sought to address this issue and the Highway Authority have stated that taking into account the likely speed of the approach roads and the mitigation provided with the scheme, a design that is ‘one-step’ below Design Manual for Roads and bridges (DMRB) standard is acceptable. The amended route was supported by a revised ecology, noise and air quality reports.

**Site Details:**

6. The route of the road goes over existing arable land, south of the Rougham Tower Museum, north of the Rougham Industrial Estate, incorporates Sow Lane and links down to junction 45 of the A14. The site has constraints with protected species in the form of bats and badgers. The site and wider site has protected trees and landscape implications. The Rougham Tower and radar rooms are grade II listed Buildings. To the west of the site is the Moreton Hall Housing estate and the Suffolk Business Park. North of the site is the proposed location of the new Bury Town Community Football Club, a new secondary school and further housing. In addition the existing Rougham Airfield is located to the north of the site. The south of the site is proposed employment land in the form of the proposed Suffolk Business Park Extension. Beyond this is the A14 trunk road.

**Application Supporting Material:**
7. Information submitted with the application as follows:

- Full set of General arrangement plans
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Transport Assessment
- Planning Statement
- Ecology Assessment and Mitigation Strategy
- Heritage Statement
- Noise assessment
- Air Quality Assessment

**Relevant Planning History:**

8. Application DC/13/0036/FUL (Planning Application - (i) Construction of relief road from the junction off Skyliner Way/Lady Miriam Way to Sow Lane/A14 Junction 45 & associated works & improvements to junction 45 (ii) Provision of parking area for Rougham Tower Museum as amended by reports and plans submitted on the 19th December 2013 which changed the junction layout, SUDS lighting and landscaping and as amended by an amended ecological assessment and mitigation strategy rec 17.2.14) was approved by members following consideration by DC Committee in January 2014. The “Suffolk Business Park Extension Masterplan” was adopted June 2010 and acts as informal planning guidance. This is available on the council’s website.

**Consultations:**

9. **Ecology and Landscape Officer:** No objection subject to conditions requiring 1) mitigation, management and monitoring strategy for bats to be submitted to, and agreed in writing with the LPA and then implemented 2) Mitigation, management and monitoring strategy for badgers to be submitted and implemented. 3) Implementation of the recommendations of; the ecological Assessment and Mitigation Strategy (June 2014) Badger Survey and Mitigation Strategy (June 2014) and Bat Survey (26 June 2014) in full. 4) Arboricultural method statement to be implemented in full including tree protection and arboricultural supervision. 5) Implementation of the landscaping scheme before the end of the first planting season after the road has been completed.

10. **Conservation Officer:** No objection no conditions recommended.

11. **Land Contamination Officer:** No objection and no recommendation of conditions. An advisory note is requested to be submitted to any approval notice that states that if during the development contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified then the Environmental Team should be contacted as soon as possible. The developer is reminded that it is their responsibility for the safe development of the site.

12. **Environmental Health Officer: (Air Quality)** No objection to the scheme. No recommendations of conditions

13. **Environmental Health Officer: (Noise and vibration)** No objection to the scheme. Recommends a condition which requires a scheme to control noise and vibration during the construction phase to be submitted to and approved
by the local planning authority prior to works commencing and the approved
scheme to be implemented.

14. **Suffolk County Council: (Air Quality):** No objection

15. **Suffolk County Council: (Noise):** No objection

16. **SCC Archaeology Service:** No objection subject to conditions which require a
   1) Written Scheme of Investigation to be agreed in writing 2) the site
   investigation and post investigation assessment to be 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 Condition 1 and the provision made for analysis, publication and
   dissemination of results and archive deposition.

17. **Sustainable Urban Drainage Officer:** No objection.

18. **Minerals and Waste:** No objection. The County Council as Minerals Planning
   Authority requires no further geological information in respect of the
   proposed development. This is as the application comprises a relatively small
   footprint, from which mineral extraction would be impractical, and as the
   County Council is not currently under-resourced in permitted mineral
   reserves.

19. **Public Rights of Way Officer:** No objection as the development does not
   directly affect any existing public rights of way.

20. **SCC Highway Authority:** No objection subject to two conditions being
    attached which require 1) the road to be constructed in general accordance
    with the amended plans 2) Full detailed drawings of the road to be submitted
    to agreed in writing by the LPA.

21. **Highways Agency:** No objection subject to conditions that seek plans to be
    approved which show greater details of the junction improvements and that
    the work to the junction shall be completed and open to traffic by 1\textsuperscript{st} June
    2018.

22. **National Grid:** Note for the developer.

23. **Anglian Water:** No comments received.

24. **Natural England:** No objection or recommendation of conditions

25. **Suffolk Wildlife Trust:** No objection subject to a condition which requires the
    recommendations of the supporting ecological reports to be implemented in
    full
26. **Environment Agency:** No objection subject to three conditions being attached which states that 1) No development approved shall take place until a Remediation Strategy has been agreed. The approved strategy is then followed 2) If unsuspected contamination is found then work ceases until a remediation strategy has been approved in writing with the LPA. The approved strategy is then followed. 3) The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) Ref CCE/C281/FRA-02 produced by Cannon Consulting Engineers, dated February 2014.

**Representations:**

27. **Rushbrooke With Rougham Parish Council:** The Parish Council is happy to support it subject to the approval of Suffolk Highways.

They state that they would "like to draw attention to the safety of both cycle and pedestrian users at the proposed crossing point with Woodlands road, in your first plan the carriageway between roundabouts D and E would appear to be of new construction thus giving greater visibility to both pedestrian and cycle users at the crossing with woodlands road. In the revised plan it would appear the new carriageway construction stops before roundabout D thus causing a "Pinchpoint" at the junction with Woodlands road where the proposed crossing is for the cycle path users, this is a potential area of danger to both users of the cycle path and other road users. Therefore we would ask you to consider this and the possible revision of the above in your revised plan."

28. **Bury St Edmunds Town Council:** No objection based on information received. The town council appreciates and supports the improvements to merge and diverge.

29. **Neighbours:** Objection has been received from a number of business’s on the Rougham Industrial Trading Estate. They include East Barton Properties Ltd, Thomas Ridley Foodservice; HRP Holdings Ltd, JW Engineering, Geosense Ltd, MGS Ltd. Additionally objection has been received from a planning consultant on behalf of Rougham Industrial Trading Association Ltd. The summarised reasons for objection are:

- The proposed route increases the potential for diverting ERR traffic through Rougham Industrial Estate as the industrial estate provides a shorter route through to Junction 45 by250m;
- The shared footway/cycleway on Sow Lane is discontinuous with pedestrians and cyclists having to use the vehicular carriageway for 20m. This is clearly unsafe, does not accord with policy and is unacceptable on a new road scheme;
- There is no assessment of the potential for traffic to divert through the Rougham Industrial Estate;
- The forward visibility on Sow Lane northbound carriageway to the roundabout is obstructed by vegetation and is not contained within the red line of the planning application. This is a highway safety issue and cannot be resolved within the current application;
- There is no sensitivity testing of the network using different flow regimes or traffic distribution.
- General Castle Way between Roundabouts C and E should be upgraded.
- A cycle path should extend along Sow Lane and link into National Cycle Route 51 to the north.
Objection has also been received from 20 Kendall Close, Gristoft, The Wallow Mount Road, Mount Barn Mount Road, some surrounding residential properties. The summarised reasons for objection are:

- Increase noise from traffic
- Noise during construction
- The additional 500 homes will cause an increase in the amount of traffic in the surrounding area.
- Sow Lane is very busy and should be a 30mph zone.
- Increase traffic along Mount Road
- Construction traffic
- Mount Road is very busy and should be a 40mph zone

**Policies:** The following policies of the Replacement St Edmundsbury Borough Local Plan 2016 and the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2010 have been taken into account in the consideration of this application:

30. Replacement St Edmundsbury Borough Local Plan 2016

- BSE3 Strategic Site – Suffolk Business Park, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds
- BSE13 Bury St Edmunds Eastern Relief Road
- HC9 Sites and features of Archaeological Importance
- Policy NE2 Protected Species
- Policy NE3 Protection of the Landscape
- Policy NE4 Natural Resources
- Policy NE5 Environmental Quality
- Policy HC1 Alterations and Extensions to listed buildings and Development within their Curtilage
- Policy NE1 Impact of Development on sites of biodiversity and Geological Importance

31. St Edmundsbury Core Strategy December 2010

- CS1 (St Edmundsbury Spatial Strategy)
- CS2 (Sustainable Development)
- CS3 (Design and Local Distinctiveness) (as supported by SPD 'Development Design and Impact')
- CS7 (Sustainable Transport)
- CS9 (Employment and Local Economy)
- CS11 (Bury St Edmunds Strategic Growth)

“Suffolk Business Park Extension Masterplan” adopted June 2010

**Other Planning Policy**


33. The Submission Draft Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031 document has been through its examination in public and the Inspectors Report was published on the 14th July 2014. It is anticipated that the Vision documents will be adopted by the council at full council on the 23 September 2014. The following policies are relevant to the consideration of the application:

- Policy BV13 Strategic Site – Extension to Suffolk Business Park of the Bury Vision 2031 Submission document.
34. Department for Transport Circular 02/2013 - Strategic Road Network and the delivery of sustainable development

Officer Comment:

35. The issues to be considered in the determination of this application are:

- Principle of development;
- Landscaping;
- Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDS);
- Highway Matters;
- Cycling and walking provision;
- Archaeology;
- Lighting;
- Ecology;
- Heritage Matters;
- Air Quality and Contamination;

Principle of development

36. Policy BSE13 of the St Edmundsbury Replacement Local Plan 2016 sets out that a Relief Road linking Bedingfeld Way and A14 Rookery Crossroads will be constructed. The Policy continues that the road will not be completed until the grade separated junction at the A14 Rookery Crossroads is opened. Since the Replacement Local Plan was adopted in June 2006 a grade separated junction has been completed and has been fully open to traffic since March 2006. In addition Skyliner Way and Lady Miriam Way have been completed and extend the local highway network further east than Bedingfeld Way.

37. Policy BSE3 of the St Edmundsbury Replacement Local Plan 2016 covers the Strategic Site of the Suffolk Business Park Extension. The policy allocates 68.28 hectares of employment (excluding the Rougham Industrial Estate Employment Area) land for employment uses (Use Classes B1 and B8). Prior to the commencement of employment development on the Suffolk Business Park Extension a relief road should be completed and available for development.

38. Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy identifies which strategic areas of housing growth for Bury St Edmunds. Part ii of that policy relates to houses at Moreton Hall and states that the additional housing will not be permitted until the Eastern Relief Road is completed.

39. The Suffolk Business Park Extension Masterplan was adopted in June 2010 and acts as informal Planning Guidance for the site. The Masterplan set out the alignment of the road which was initially set shown in the Local Plan and the Masterplan seeks to advance the layout of the road in a greater detail.

40. During the last application there was significant discussion with the Highway Agency concerning the works to junction 45 of the A14 to ensure that the alignment of the amended junction accorded with relevant standards and was therefore safe. The agreed junction works differ significantly from those shown in the Masterplan but are considered necessary and acceptable. Whilst the junction works remain identical in this application the overall route is
different. The route after roundabout C swings further north and avoids Woodlands Route before connecting into Sow Lane. The applicant has said that this route avoids land which the developer does not control. Although the route is longer than that previously shown in the Masterplan it is considered that this is not unacceptable. The roads function is to provide access to land that will form the Suffolk Business Park Extension and provide an attractive and practical route for those who live on the Moreton Hall estate and wish to travel east from Bury St Edmunds and who will then not be required to use Junction 44 of the A14. The proposed route and its new alignment are considered by officers to be acceptable regardless of the alignment of the route being different from that shown in the adopted Masterplan.

41. The above sets out that the principle of an Eastern Relief Road is well defined and set out in the Local Plan. Given the above it is clear that this proposed road is fundamental to the delivery of housing and jobs that underpins the adopted Local Plan. Without the road it is considered that the Local Plan would be significantly and fundamentally undermined. The NPPF has a set of Core Principles and it advocates sustainable economic development. It states that planning should "proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. It is considered by officers that the principle of the road is acceptable and helps deliver the jobs and homes that are essential to the Local Plan.

Landscaping

42. Policy NE3 of the Replacement Local Plan states that Development will be permitted only where: a) it does not have an adverse impact on features of wildlife, semi-natural habitat, historic features, landscape and amenity value, and protects them during construction; b) it includes the retention and new planting of trees, hedgerows and woodland; and c) Suitable compensatory provision is made in the event of unavoidable loss.

43. The construction of a road within agricultural land to the east of Bury St Edmunds will undoubtedly have an impact on the character and visual amenity of the countryside. Design of the road has sought to retain existing landscape features including woodland blocks, tree lines and existing trees in particular at Sow Lane. The main features of the design and landscape mitigation were developed as part of the master plan for this road and the current design within this planning application reflects the master plan.

44. The proposal is to provide a hedge to the south of the road which will form the basic landscaping for any employment development in the future. The hedge will be managed to give a tidy appearance to the development land beyond and can easily be adapted where necessary to provide a screening function. The hedge will be supplemented by avenue tree planting.

45. There are a number of trees on the site protected by TPO346 (2002). These trees are located to the north and west of the existing Rougham Business Park. There are many other important trees within the site which are not protected including those on Sow Lane. This is because these trees have never been threatened in the past.

46. This road design does result in the loss of more trees than the previously approved scheme as the road protrudes into woodland on the eastern side of Sow Lane opposite the Head of Woodlands Road. The application has sought
to minimise impact on trees and this constraint has driven the design of the new road at Sow lane to ensure that the existing trees are retained as much as possible. It will be necessary to remove some significant trees to accommodate the road. However, there will be mitigation with the landscaping scheme which includes the planting of an estimated 165 large trees, 60 of which will be oaks. In addition 24000m² of woodland is proposed as part of the scheme. This is in contrast to the previous scheme would proposed 12000m² of woodland as mitigation.

47. It is considered by officers that the proposed scheme accords with policy in that it does not have an adverse impact on the landscape, results in the loss of only the minimum amount of trees and proposes significant and compensatory provision of landscaping.

Sustainable Urban Drainage

48. Policy CS2 of the adopted Core Strategy requires development to incorporate flood prevention and risk management measures such as Sustainable Urban Drainage. The design of the road incorporate swales and other measures to ensure that the Sustainable Urban Drainage is achieved and that surface water runoff from the road is appropriately managed. It is therefore considered by officers that the road accords with Policy CS2 in that the scheme incorporates SUDS.

Highway Matters

49. Junction 45 is now a grade separated junction following improvements a few years ago. However the current layout is proposed to be upgraded in precisely the same way as the previously approved scheme. The proposed junction alterations include:

- Extension of the eastbound parallel diverge by 110m. This will facilitate traffic leaving the A14 to decelerate within the slip road and not in the nearside lane of the A14.
- Extension of the westbound parallel diverge by 110m. Benefit is as stated for the eastbound diverge
- Provision of an extended westbound merge taper to a higher design standard than exists currently. This will make joining the A14 in the direction of Bury St Edmunds easier in peak periods by virtue of merging traffic having a longer distance over which to accelerate and merge. This slip road will be extended by 86 metres.
- Provision of an extended eastbound merge taper by approximately 65m and relaxation to the tight bend on the approach to the slip road. The levels are to be adjusted and this will improve visibility of A14 traffic to those merging to travel towards Ipswich.
- Provision of a roundabout on the north side of J45 connecting Sow Lane, the ERR, the A14 slip road and General Castle Way for the Rougham Trading Estate.
- Provision of traffic signal control at the junction of Sow Lane with the Westbound slip road on the south side of J45.

50. In the broader sense the Department for Transport Circular 2/2013 highlights how the Highways Agency will work with Local Planning Authorities to ensure that the plan led system is followed in the pursuit of sustainable economic
development that does not have a detrimental impact on the wider strategic highway network, such as the A14.

51. Policy CS3 (Design and Local Distinctiveness) (as supported by SPD 'Development Design and Impact') states that development should not adversely impact on the highway network, in respect of movement of traffic and road safety.

52. There is no change to the previously approved scheme regarding Junction 45 amendments. The Highways Agency support the scheme subject to conditions that seek to ensure that the road and junction improvements are carried out in the proper manner and fully accord with standards.

53. Objection has been received regarding cycle and walking provision. These have broadly followed a similar theme whereby it is stated that at the head of Woodlands Road pedestrians and cyclist will be required to use the vehicular carriageway for 20 metres. This is incorrect and misleading. The proposal includes a shared cycle and footway which is 3.5 metres wide on the southern side of the road. At the point where the road passes the head of Woodlands Road the shared cycle and footway ceases but turns into a footway only which at its narrowest point will be 1.8 metre wide. Pedestrians will not be required to join the vehicular carriageway of the eastern relief road. Cyclist will be asked to dismount and walk for a distance of 35 metres. As the ERR is some 2km long it is not considered that this break will in any way create and safety issues for either pedestrians or cyclist. Appendix A of this report is a 1:250 plan that shows the proposal and how the cycle footway arrangement would work at the head of Woodlands Road.

54. Suffolk County Council have undertaken a review of the issues raised within the letter of objection raised by RITA. RITA’s objections were broadly

- The proposed route increases the potential for diverting ERR traffic through Rougham Industrial Estate as the industrial estate provides a shorter route through to Junction 45 by 250m;

- The shared footway/cycleway on Sow Lane is discontinuous with pedestrians and cyclists having to use the vehicular carriageway for 20m. This is clearly unsafe, does not accord with policy and is unacceptable on a new road scheme;

- There is no assessment of the potential for traffic to divert through the Rougham Industrial Estate;

- The forward visibility on Sow Lane northbound carriageway to the roundabout is obstructed by vegetation and is not contained within the red line of the planning application. This is a highway safety issue and cannot be resolved within the current application;

- There is no sensitivity testing of the network using different flow regimes or traffic distribution.

55. The Highway Authority has considered these points and have concluded that:

- The route through the industrial estate would be via General Castle Way which is adopted highway and Woodlands Road which is not adopted
highway. The owners of Woodlands Road will be able to control access should they so wish. The route through the industrial state, should it be left open by the owners of Woodlands Road, whilst shorter, is unlikely to be a route which attracts many users off the newly constructed relief road. The main route will be clearly signed and will be of significantly better construction, designed for through traffic. It is unlikely that the shorter route would be attractive to people who do not have reason to visit the industrial estate, given the regular heavy traffic manoeuvring within the estate.

- Suffolk County Council have sought clarification to show the exact pedestrian / cycle provision that could be achieved at this location. A 1.8m path can be achieved across the access within the land in the control of the applicant and/or adopted maintainable highway. This is satisfactory for such a short section of path, especially across an access. This point is also addressed above.

- The forward visibility on the approaches to the roundabout has been thoroughly reviewed. Taking into account the likely speed of the approach roads and the mitigation provided with the scheme, a one-step below DMRB standard has been accepted by the Highway Authority at the northbound and southbound approaches to the roundabout. It is noted that the southbound approach forward visibility is an additional point made by CTP to those comments previously received and summarised in the covering letter. The assessment considered the safety of all road users and concludes that the design is acceptable in Highways terms.

- It is considered very unlikely that traffic will divert through the estate. A gateway is to be provided which will make it clear that the estate is an industrial estate. An assessment is therefore not required. If members of RITA continue to be worried about rat running, the connection from the Eastern Relief Road into the estate need not be provided. This would remove the benefit to the estate resulting from increased connectivity and would not be done without considerable consultation.

- The Transport Assessment has been carried out in a robust manner; taking into account maximum levels of growth and development nearby and worst case distributions. This allows a level of confidence that variations to flow regimes and distributions would not cause harm to highway network, without the explicit need to model different scenarios. Suffolk County Council are confident that no additional work is required.

56. Given the above officers are of the opinion that the proposal accords with National planning guidance and local plan policies in that all aspects of the road will help create safe route for motorists, pedestrians and cyclist with the significant benefit that junction 45 will be greatly improved and made safer in itself.

Cycling and walking provision

57. In addition to the specific points raised above concerning one particular part of the route officers have considered the wider proposal. Policy CS7 of the adopted Core Strategy states that all proposals for development will be required to provide for travel by a range of means of transport other than the
private car in accordance with a stated hierarchy. The proposed road will serve a large area of employment uses and as such is required to serve large commercial lorries and smaller trucks and cars. The road will have a joint cycleway and footpath along its entire length on the southern edge and a footpath on the on the northern edge. These non motorised routes will allow future employees on the Suffolk Business Park Extension to travel to work by means other than the private car. It will act as a significant piece of infrastructure to the town’s cycleway network and is considered to be a significant benefit of the proposal.

58. Objection was received concerning the northern part of Sow Lane which would link Mount Round to the proposed road. This proposed road will in itself not generate traffic as would be the case with other commercial or residential schemes. Large scale commercial development on the Suffolk Business Park will be subject to Traffic Assessments and at those points the Local Planning Authority will have to assess if it is reasonable and necessary to require that cycle link. Its omission at this stage is not considered to warrant refusal of the proposed road. Given the above it is therefore considered by officers that the proposed development accords with Policies CS7 by virtue of the propose cycleway and footway infrastructure.

Archaeology

59. The route of the proposed relief road and associated works cross an area of high archaeological potential, as defined by information held by the County Historic Environment Record (HER). 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. It is considered by officers that the scheme would not have a detrimental impact on archaeological features with the recommended conditions attached.

Ecology

60. In accordance with Policy NE1 and NE2 of the St Edmundsbury Borough Local Plan, development should not have an adverse impact on nature conservation or protected species.

61. An ecological report has been submitted to support the application. Work is done to standard methodology and by qualified persons.

62. One of the issues relating to bats is lighting. This is particularly sensitive along the Sow Lane stretch. The need for lighting along this section has been reviewed and as a result removed reducing the potential of conflict with both bats and retention of trees.

63. Natural England has not commented on bats associated with the new scheme requiring the Local Planning Authority to assess this impact using Natural England’s standing advice (Natural England letters of 13.3.14 and 24.6.14).

64. In respect of the impact of the scheme on tree T60 and associated bat roosts (which was assessed as part of the original scheme SE/13/0036/FUL and is still relevant), Natural England confirmed (letter of 17 September 2013) that they were satisfied that the proposed mitigation would maintain the
population of bats identified in the survey. The consideration for the Local Planning Authority therefore is whether consent would offend against Article 12(1) of the Habitats Directive and in doing so must decide if the application would be likely to receive a licence.

65. The key principles of licensing are:
   - There is a genuine need and a ‘purpose’ for the proposed activity.
   - There are no satisfactory alternatives to delivering and meeting the need in the way proposed.
   - The licensed action will allow the need to be met.
   - That the proposals are proportionate.
   - That there will be no adverse effect on the conservation status of the species concerned.

66. Natural England confirmed that they are satisfied that point 5 can be met in respect to loss of roosts associated with T60. Briefly with regard to the further points and considering the information currently available: there is an established need for the road to deliver employment opportunities in BSE; the route of the road has been designed to minimise impacts and there is no reasonable alternative which would avoid impacts on T60; the proposals are proportionate and will allow the need to be met. In respect to the impact on tree T60 NE recommended a condition relating to the need for a mitigation and monitoring strategy.

67. In respect of the additional impact on woodland south of Battles Green. Impact on bats (as reported in the two ecological reports) has been assessed against NE standing advice and is associated with loss of foraging. Proposals are included to mitigate this impact.

68. The impact on badgers has been assessed against the ‘Natural England Standing Advice.’ There are predicted to be impacts on badgers as a result of the proposals. The submission includes a preliminary mitigation plan, which will need further development prior to implementation. This will need to include long term management to ensure protection of badgers.

69. A condition will be required to secure the mitigation and long term management for the protection of badgers

Heritage Matters

70. One of the Core Principles of the National Planning Policy Framework states that that planning should conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations. The airfield control tower and radar room are Listed Grade II buildings. These buildings were constructed during WWII when Rougham Airfield was a USAAF airfield. These buildings are an important reminder of the history of the area in wartime and of the sacrifice of many airmen, in particular crew members of the USAAF bomber groups.

71. The alignment of the relief road where it is closest to the control tower was given particular consideration to seek to minimise impact on the Listed buildings at the Masterplan stage. The amended route is the same until roundabout C and as such the roads relationship to the control tower does not change to that of the scheme previously approved. Landscaping and
bunding is proposed to provide screening from the south. The Conservation Officer has not objected. Particular attention has been paid to protecting the setting of the tower including introducing appropriate planting and bunding as before. Given the above officers are satisfied that the scheme accords with both national and local plan policies and that the scheme would not significantly harm the Rough Tower Museum which is a designated heritage asset.

Air Quality and Contamination

72. Local Plan policies require that ground and surface water are not detrimentally impacted. Additionally policies require that development does not contaminate air or land. Environmental Health Officers have raised no objection to the scheme and are satisfied that the submitted reports adequately demonstrate that the road will not cause harm to the natural environment. Officers are therefore satisfied that the scheme accords with Policies NE4 and NE5 subject to conditions which require mitigation and protection measures to be carried out.

Conclusion:

73. In conclusion, the principle and detail of the development is considered to be acceptable and in compliance with relevant development plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework. Therefore this application is recommended for approval subject to the following conditions.

Recommendation:

It is RECOMMENDED that planning permission be Approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.

2. Before development commences details of a mitigation and monitoring strategy for bats shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall be implemented and operated as approved and in accordance with the approved details.

3. Before development commences details of a mitigation and monitoring strategy for badgers shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall be implemented and operated as approved and in accordance with the approved details.

4. All ecological measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in ecological Assessment and Mitigation Strategy (June 2014) as already submitted with the planning application and agreed in principle with the local planning authority.

5. No development shall commence until an Arboricultural Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Statement should include details of the following: 
   1. Measures for the protection of those trees and hedges on the application site that are to be retained,
2. Details of all construction measures within the 'Root Protection Area' (defined by a radius of dbh x 12 where dbh is the diameter of the trunk measured at a height of 1.5m above ground level) of those trees on the application site which are to be retained specifying the position, depth, and method of construction/installation/excavation of service trenches, building foundations, hardstandings, roads and footpaths,

3. A schedule of proposed surgery works to be undertaken to those trees and hedges on the application site which are to be retained.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Method Statement unless the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority is obtained for any variation.

5. All planting comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting season following the commencement of the development (or within such extended period as may first be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority). Any planting removed, dying or becoming seriously damaged or diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced within the first available planting season thereafter with planting of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent for any variation.

6. No development shall take place within the 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.

7. 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, including recording of the
   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.

8. The road shall not be used as a public highway 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 Condition 7 and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition.

9. No development shall be commenced until such time as a scheme for improvements to the East and Westbound slip roads at Junction 45 Sow Lane interchange, in general conformity with the arrangements shown in outline on Mott Macdonald Bury St Edmunds Eastern Relief Road General Arrangement Revised slip road option 2 Drawing MMD-309352-C-SK00-SR-002, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority will
agree the details following consultation with the Highway Authority and Highways Agency.
The scheme shall include drawings and documents detailing the following:-
(i) The interface of the improvement works with the existing highway alignment and carriageway markings including lane destinations,
(ii) Full construction details relating to the highway improvements, to include details of any modifications to existing or proposed structures with supporting analysis,
(iii) Full signage and lighting details and lighting details where applicable,
(iv) Confirmation of full compliance with Departmental Standards (DMRB) and Policies (or approved relaxations/ departures from standards),
(v) Evidence that the scheme is deliverable within the land in the control of either the Highway Authority or the applicant, notwithstanding that this may require a reasonable departure from normal standards
(vi) An independent Stage 2 Road Safety Audit (taking account of any Stage 1 Road Safety Audit recommendations) carried out in accordance with Departmental Standards (DMRB) and Advice Notes.

10.Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority the works described in condition 9 shall be completed and opened to traffic by 1st June 2018.

11.The Relief Road shall be constructed in general accordance with the amended plans submitted with this application.

12.Before the commencement of the Relief Road, full detailed drawings of the road, cyclepaths and footways shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

13.No development approved by this planning permission shall take place until a Remediation Strategy that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority:

1. A Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) including a Conceptual Site Model (CSM) of the site indicating potential sources, pathways and receptors, including those off site.
2. The results of a site investigation based on (1) and a detailed risk assessment, including a revised CSM.
3. Based on the risk assessment in (2) an options appraisal and Remediation Strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken. The strategy shall include a plan providing details of how the remediation works shall be judged to be complete and arrangements for contingency actions. The plan shall also detail a long term monitoring and maintenance plan as necessary.
4. No occupation of any part of the permitted development shall take place until a Verification Report demonstrating completion of works set out in the Remediation Strategy in (3). The long term monitoring and maintenance plan in (3) shall be updated and be implemented as approved.

14.If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written
approval from the Local Planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

15. The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) Ref CCE/C281/FRA-02 produced by Cannon Consulting Engineers, dated February 2014 and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:
   1. Provision of a surface water drainage scheme that safely attenuates and infiltrates all the surface water runoff to ground without increasing the risk of flooding on or off site.
   2. Infiltration systems shall only be used where it can be demonstrated that they will not pose a risk to groundwater quality.
   The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

16. Before any development work hereby permitted is commenced, a comprehensive construction and site management programme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The programme shall include the following details:
   
   (a) site set-up and general arrangements for storing plant (including cranes), materials, machinery and equipment, offices and other facilities and contractors vehicle parking, loading, unloading and vehicle turning areas;

   (b) noise method statements and noise levels for each construction activity including any piling and excavation operations;

   (c) dust, dirt and vibration method statements and arrangements;

   (d) site lighting.

Documents:

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online:

http://planning.stedmundsbury.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=N1AI5JPDIIH500

Alternatively, hard copies are also available to view at Planning and Regulatory Services, West Suffolk House, Western Way, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk, IP33 3YU

Case Officer: Peter White   Tel. No. 01284757357
Application: DC/14/0328/FUL

Location: Proposed Eastern Relief Road, Lady Miriam Way, Bury St Edmunds
End of Cycleway tactile paving.
"Cyclists Please dismount." sign.

Distance between signs 35m

- Edge of existing sow Lane
- Existing Highway Boundary

Dropped Kerb crossing

3.5m wide segregated cycleway/footway reducing to 1.8m (min) footway.