



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

DEV/SE/17/031

WORKING PAPER 1

Special Development Control Committee 19 July 2017

Planning Application DC/17/0521/FUL - Land North of Hollow Road Farm, Hollow Road, Fornham St Martin

Date: 17 March 2017 **Expiry Date:** 16 June 2017
Registered: **EOT:** 26 July 2017

Case Officer: Charles Judson **Recommendation:** Approve

Parish: Fornham St. **Ward:** Fornham
Martin Cum St.
Genevieve

Proposal: Creation of municipal operational hub comprising waste transfer station, household waste recycling centre (including reuse building), fleet depot (including offices), public realm maintenance depot and associated infrastructure including accesses, internal roads, parking, weighbridges, landscaping scheme and shared use path to connect existing footway on Barton Hill to proposed accesses

Site: Land North of Hollow Road Farm, Hollow Road, Fornham St Martin

Applicant: Mr Mark Walsh, Forest Heath District Council, St Edmundsbury Borough Council and Suffolk County Council

Synopsis:

Application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and associated matters.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Committee determine the attached application and associated matters.

CONTACT CASE OFFICER:

Charles Judson

Email: Charles.judson@westsuffolk.gov.uk

Telephone: 01638 719267

Background:

This application is referred to the Development Control Committee because the application is a Major Development and the Parish Council object, and because the applicant is the Council.

Proposal:

1. Full planning permission is sought for the creation of municipal operational hub comprising waste transfer station (WTS), household waste recycling centre (HWRC) (including reuse building), fleet depot (including offices), public realm maintenance depot and associated infrastructure accesses, internal roads, parking, weighbridges, landscaping scheme and shared use path to connect existing footway on Barton Hill to proposed accesses.
2. The purpose of the WTS is to receive residual, organic, dry recyclable and green waste to be sorted and bulked prior to onward transportation to the Energy from Waste facility at Great Blakenham or to reprocessing or composting facilities. The WTS includes a bailing facility to receive materials such as cardboard and plastic film and bale them for more efficient handling and onward transportation. The WTS and bailing facility would be of a clad steel portal frame construction. The WTS would have a length of 84.1m, width of 32.8m and height of 12.5m. The bailing facility would have a length of 25m, width of 13m and height of 5.5m. Also proposed as part of the WTS are external open bays, skips and container bays for the storage of wood, glass, hard plastic, hazardous waste (which includes TVs and computers, fluorescent tubes, gas bottles, batteries and used engine oil) and tyres. Whilst the WTS would not cater for asbestos, facilities are proposed should any asbestos containing material be discovered at the site.
3. The purpose of the HWRC is to provide facilities for members of the public and businesses to deposit waste such as domestic rubbish, glass, cardboard, green waste, plastics, wood, paper, metal, electrical

items, textiles, plasterboard and furniture within 40 No. 31m³ skips. In addition to the HWRC it is proposed to provide a reuse building where reusable recycled items can be resold to the public. The reuse building would have a length of 9m, width of 18m and height of 3.4m and be of clad steel portal frame construction.

4. The purpose of the fleet depot facilities is to provide a building for fleet maintenance with offices and welfare facilities, a depot for vehicles and equipment associated with the Councils' street scene and environment services and a stabling area comprised of external parking for 46 heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) and 24 light goods vehicles (LGVs). The fleet depot would have a length of 70m, width of 25m and height of 10.12m. The street scene building would have a length of 36m, maximum width of 39.4m and height of 6m. Both buildings would be of clad steel portal frame construction.
5. To support the development it is necessary to provide associated facilities including 2 No points of vehicular access on to the public highway, road widening and the provision of shared use footpath/cycleway, weighbridges, portakabins, landscaping and sustainable urban drainage features.
6. It is estimated that 106,496 tonnes of waste would pass through the WTS including 607 tonnes of hazardous waste by the year 2038/39.
7. The application has been amended since submission to include amendments to the surface water drainage scheme and landscaping scheme and to provide additional information regrading fuel storage and pollution prevention.

Application Supporting Material:

8. Information submitted with the application as follows:
 - Application Forms
 - Location Plan
 - Floorplans and Elevations
 - Propose Site Plans
 - Ecology Report
 - Archaeological Statement and Brief for Excavation
 - Ground Investigation Report
 - Land Quality Assessment
 - Landscape Management Plan
 - Bat Roost Potential Survey
 - Lighting Strategy
 - Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal
 - Noise Assessment
 - Lorry Management Plan
 - Statement of Community Involvement
 - Design and Access Statement
 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment
 - Lighting Layout Plan

- CCTV Location Plan
- Footpath Plans
- Existing Topography Plan
- Fencing and Kerbing Plan
- Site Sections
- Finished Levels Plan
- Transport Assessment
- Suds Drainage Proforma
- Flood Exceedance Plan
- Access Options Assessment Report
- Sustainability Assessment
- Odour Management Report
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Travel Plan
- Air Quality Assessment
- Landscaping Plan
- Drainage Layout
- Drainage Statement
- Infiltration Trench Section
- Planning Statement

Site Details:

9. The site is 6.06 hectares in area and roughly rectangular in shape with arms extending to the east and west to incorporate areas of the highway where works within the highway are proposed. It is located to the north-east of Bury St Edmunds within the parish of Fornham St Martin Cum St Genevieve. The site is bounded to the north by the B1106 Fornham Road and to the west by the A134. To the south is Hollow Road Farm with a variety of agricultural buildings and industrial and commercial premises.
10. The site was last used for arable agriculture and has an existing point of access to its north-east corner with an access road heading south to serve the farm building complex. Levels fall approximately 13m from the north-east corner to the south-west corner. Land outside of the site to the south is at a lower level.
11. To the northern boundary the site is predominantly open to the highway verge with a mature group of trees at its north-west corner which continues along the west boundary of the site where a mature landscaped belt slopes down to the A134. A landscaped bund exists along the southern boundary of the site and a mature hedgerow sits on the western site boundary.

Planning History:

12. The following application relates to the application site:

DC/17/0123/EIASCR. EIA not required for proposed West Suffolk Operational Hub

The following applications relate to land immediately adjacent to the site:

E/78/3101/P Conversion of existing farm building to office accommodation. Approved

E/83/2249/P Use of an area for earthworks facilities including temporary storage of topsoil and the disposal of soft materials off 143 Bury Link Road. Approved

E/85/2605/P. Change of use of building from general agricultural to agrochemical store. Approved

E/87/1362/P Conversion of existing garage to additional office accommodation. Approved

E/95/2752/P Change of use from agricultural buildings and workshops to contractor's workshop and yard with ancillary office accommodation for servicing/repairs and parking of Heavy Goods Vehicles. Approved

SE/00/3307/P Waste transfer and treatment station. Approved

SE/02/3282/P Outline Planning Application - (i) General purpose agricultural storage building and (ii) vehicular access. Submission of details in Dec 2002. Approved

SE/02/3995/P Submission of details – Erection of agricultural storage building and construction of vehicular access. Approved

SE/03/2496/P Outline Planning Application – Two agricultural buildings as supported by drawing received 7th July 2003 indicating means of access to the site and by letter dated 7th August 2003. Approved

SE/04/1420/P Change if use of ground floor of farmhouse to offices (class B1) and erection of workshop building. Approved

SE/05/1080/P Submission of details – Erection of attached agricultural storage building. Approved

SE/05/0196 Submission of Details - Erection of agricultural building. Approved

SE/07/1455 Erection of agricultural building for the storage of crops. Approved

SE/11/0380 Erection of agricultural building. Approved

SE/13/0006/A G1 - Determination in Respect of Agricultural Permitted Development – Installation of solar PV system on 5 no. agricultural buildings. Approved

DC/15/1538/CMW County Matter Planning Application (Minerals and

Waste) - rationalisation of land through the demolition and reorganisation of a number of buildings, the extension to a workshop and the change of use of land to allow to relocation of a recycling facility and the distribution of aggregates. Approved

DC/15/2505/FUL Construction of agricultural building. Approved.

DC/16/0632/FUL Vegetable store adjoining building and 2.5m high earth bund. Approved

DC/16/0934/HAZ Application for Hazardous Substance Consent - Storage of a maximum of 30 tonnes of liquid petroleum gas. Approved

DC/16/2189/FUL – Agricultural Storage Building. Approved

DC/16/2721/FUL B2 General Industrial Office/Workshop Building (demolition of existing farm Buildings. Approved

Consultations:

13. SEBC Conservation Officer:

The proposed development does not involve physical alteration to a heritage asset however has the potential to impact on the setting of a number of listed buildings, a conservation area and scheduled monuments. For the purpose of this consultation consideration has been given the potential impact on the setting of listed buildings and the conservation area within the 2km radius as identified in the landscape and visual assessment.

Given the location, topography and intervening development, the proposed development is not considered to impact on the nearby conservation areas. The heritage assets most likely affected are those towards the southern end of Fornham St Martin. However, even here the buildings are located outside the 1km radius and views of the site are likely to be limited and seen in context with the sugar beet factory and other intervening development.

Based on the information provided, whilst glimpses of the site may be possible from the heritage assets located towards the southern end of Fornham St Martin, the longer wider views currently enjoyed are currently interrupted by intervening development. It is therefore considered glimpses of the proposed development which may be experienced are unlikely to cause harm to the setting of the heritage assets affected. **I therefore have no objections.**

14. SEBC Development Implementation and Management Officer:

All the requirements of a Travel Plan as requested by the County Council can be secured by a planning condition, indeed we are guided to do so where possible (NPPF Para 203). The only exception is the monitoring fee, which is not Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) compliant from the

outset, because it acknowledges there may only be a possibility of failure, not a certainty for this requirement. The applicant may choose not to pay this and therefore, it cannot be agreed that it is necessary to grant planning permission and therefore it will not be requested via s106 or be CIL compliant. If the applicant agrees to pay the monitoring fee (and therefore agrees that it is necessary) we can secure via s106 and it will be CIL compliant on the agreed basis that it is necessary.

15.Environment Agency (Original comments):

We object to this application as submitted because the proposed development would pose an unacceptable risk of pollution of groundwater and the water environment. We recommend that planning permission should be refused on this basis. To overcome our objection further information should be provided including details of the proposed fuel storage and distribution system and an assessment of the resultant risks to the environment; composition of the street sweepings bay or a revised drainage plan to contain and remove water from the street sweepings for treatment or by revising the street sweepings storage arrangements to prevent mixing with surface water.

This operation will require an environmental permit. The operations will involve processing more than 100,000 tonnes of waste per year, for which there is no standard rules permit. As such, the applicant will need to apply for a bespoke permit in due course to ensure issue before operations begin. The applicants have already approached us for, and have been provided with, pre-permit application advice.

Environment Agency (on amendments received 25th May 2017):

Further to our letter of objection dated 3rd April 2017 we have received additional information from the applicant. The submitted details regarding the proposed fuel storage tank considered acceptable. The revised street sweepings bay drainage plans show that they will drain to a contained tank. This proposal is considered acceptable. Sufficient information has been provided to enable us to withdraw our objection 1 ground water and contaminated land (new fuel storage tanks) and our objection 2 pollution prevention (surface water drainage from sweepings bay). **Our objections are withdrawn** subject to comments, and conditions regarding previously unidentified contamination, surface water drainage and the need for a construction environment management plan.

16.SEBC Environment Officer:

Contaminated Land:

We agree with the conclusions of the submitted Land Quality Assessment report that the site presents no unacceptable risks to either human health or to groundwater or surface water receptors, for the proposed commercial end use. **We do therefore not object** to the development or require any specific planning conditions in relation to this proposal.

However, should the proposal be approved, we would recommend an advisory note in the case of unexpected contamination.

Air Quality:

We note in the Lorry Management Plan that lorries operating from the proposed facility will be prevented from using the B1106 (Fornham St Martin) to reach Bury St Edmunds due to weight restrictions on that road. Lorry movements will distribute along the Suffolk strategic lorry route to reach their collection areas. Therefore there will be no impact in terms of air quality from additional lorry movements to residential properties in the immediate area. It should be noted that lorry movements along the A143 to Great Barton and beyond would be unchanged from the existing movements starting from the existing Olding Road Depot.

This Service would normally expect a full detailed air quality assessment if the thresholds as specified in the Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning For Air Quality document, published by Environmental Protection UK and the Institute of Air Quality Management, dated January 2017 are met. These thresholds are additional movements of 500 Light Duty Vehicles (LDV) or 100 Heavy Duty Vehicles (HDV) at relevant receptor locations. From reviewing the documents, it is extremely unlikely that any of these thresholds will be met and therefore the simple screening exercise undertaken would appear appropriate. However, the threshold is decreased in or adjacent to an AQMA to 100 additional LDV movements. The transport assessment considers that an additional 128 movements will occur on the A143 in Great Barton, where an AQMA is proposed (but not yet in place), which is marginally above the threshold of 100 additional movements. However, given that this is only a marginal exceedance, represents an increase of only 1% on the AADT and would likely consist of movements outside of the peak hours, this is not considered a material factor and we are satisfied no further work is required in this instance.

To provide enhancements points for electric vehicle charging should be provided.

Sustainability Statement:

This Service has assessed the Sustainability Statement 6.0 150317 (March 2017) and is generally satisfied with the principles identified and the proposed sustainability measures that will be adopted to manage energy and water use in the development.

17.SCC Highway Authority:

No objection subject to conditions.

In further correspondence the Highway Authority have confirmed that:

They would only expect to model an industrial development such as this to the date of opening (2019). In this case the approach has been robust

as the developer has modelled beyond the year of opening (2022).

The Transport Assessment used Temprow growth rates. The Temprow growth rates are based on historical Department for Transport data projected into the future and includes traffic growth resulting from all sources including allocated developments. In this case we are accepting that these are realistic values and on the basis that this site is not a residential or industrial site but for local service vehicles or household waste trips that are already on the network. From pre application conversations we have had with the applicant, it is our understanding that the main vehicle movements will be out of the peak traffic movement hours. The traffic generated from this site is unusual in that it can be more closely controlled than residential or commercial sites with minimal extra traffic in peak times. To formalise this we have recommended a planning condition of an operational movement plan to be agreed by the Planning Authority before first use.

The junction of the A14 and A143 is maintained in part by SCC and in part by Highways England (HE). HE maintain the slip roads and SCC the gyratory and roads into Bury St Eds. From local observations traffic using this junction tend to queue in the direction of the town centre, sometimes affecting the A14 off slips. This is considered to be a result of the lack of junction capacity nearer the town centre. This area is subject to review and there are a number of proposed junction improvements that are being considered for implementation by SCC in the short term to address these issues. We note that HE did not raise any objections regarding the effects of this application on the junction. For these reasons this junction was not included in the scope for the Transport Assessment. The A14 / A143 roundabout is being addressed as part of the Bury Radial Routes scheme with improvements being funded by five large developments in the Bury St Edmunds area. It is likely that the junction will have been modified, if not before the WSOH is open then shortly after. The traffic generated by the WSOH is a far smaller proportion to that from the residential developments which generate the need for the mitigation at the roundabout. Table 8-8 in the TA shows a small but not significant increase in the Ratio to Flow Capacity when the development traffic is added the base and projected growth. The NPPF paragraph 32 states that an impact has to be severe in order to refuse an application. And this application does not represent a severe impact upon the highway network.

The traffic effects on the B1106 Barton Hill junction were modelled over the same timescale as the other junctions ie 2022 (TA table 8-7). This junction is currently operating at overcapacity in the pm peak. The TA shows this junction demonstrates a slight reduction in traffic queues. The data presented in the TA shows that the development does not have a severe impact on this junction and thus it is difficult to argue that this development should contribute to any mitigation.

The layout is considered to provide suitable emergency access and is acceptable in highway terms. I note that Suffolk Fire and Rescue have not raised this as an issue in their response.

The timings of the traffic surveys undertaken in support of the TA are acceptable as the applicant has gathered all the data and provided just the highest peak hour ranges as stated in the TA as is usual in TA's.

The ability to achieve visibility on Fornham Road has been considered and will be conditioned. 4.5m x 215m is considered acceptable.

A Stage 1 Safety Audit has been undertaken which addresses safety issues.

18.Highways England:

No objection. The Transport Assessment is satisfactory. It would have been preferable for the A14 junction to have included in the scope of the Transport Assessment from the outset but having undertaken my own checks it became clear that the scale of any impacts of the development on the A14 were unlikely to be severe in this instance.

19.Historic England:

The site does not lie within or contain any designated heritage assets; however there are a number of designated heritage assets within the wider landscape, including the grade II* listed Church of St Martin c. 1km to the northwest. It is our view that any adverse impact from the development upon the setting of this church would be minimal and would not result in harm to its significance. We therefore have **no objection** on heritage grounds. We would recommend consultation with the Local Planning Authority Conservation Officers regarding the impact on any grade II listed buildings and with the Archaeological Officers on the impact upon the non-designated archaeology within the site itself.

20.SEBC Landscape and Ecology Officer (on amended plans received 5 July 2017):

Trees:

The loss of the mature Oak tree in the north east corner will have an adverse landscape and ecological impact. The mitigation offered is a replacement tree to the south east within the agricultural field. A better solution would be to move the access to the west to retain the tree however section 5 of the Development Access Options Assessment March 2017 is noted. The loss of trees from Barton Hill is significant and would have an adverse effect on visual amenity and ecology. The provision of the footpath is welcomed and the benefits of this new facility would potentially outweigh the effects of loss of the trees however mitigation is required in the form of 4-5 replacement trees. A revised tree protection plan should be submitted for the location and design of tree protection fencing and implemented.

Ecology:

The ecology report confirms that risks to protected species to be relatively

low but recommendations should be implemented through. The lighting layout shows the effect of the lighting does not extend beyond the site boundaries but does extend into the tree belt however the height of the vegetation (12m) relative to the height of the light posts (10m) will screen and further reduce light levels. It has been confirmed that there will be no additional lighting to Barton Hill or Fornham Road which is welcomed. The loss of trees and the effects of lighting represent a short-term disbenefit of the scheme. The landscape scheme is the mitigation.

Visual Assessment:

It is noted that the proposed development will be visible from a number of locations but the most significant effects would be from Fornham Road. The design of the scheme has utilised the landform and existing site features to minimise impacts, and other mitigation in the form of landscape planting is proposed. However it will take a number of years (up to 15) for the soft landscaping to mature sufficient to totally screen or soften the effects of the development. The nocturnal character of the landscape has been considered and the lighting strategy is noted and whilst the site is characterised as being a *rural environmental zone* and that there is the potential for ecological effects, the focus is on providing lighting for the safe operation and security of the facility.

Landscape Plan:

New trees must be at least 5m from any proposed street light. It is also recommended that root barriers are used where trees are located close to roads or footways. The location of CCTV's should also be consistent with tree positions to ensure there is no future conflict. It is noted that the new landscape plan is consistent with these principals.

The main landscape buffer to the site has now been reduced in width and located to the north of the proposed infiltration trench. The infiltration trench has been re-designed so that it sits alongside the landscaping and a 3m easement has been agreed to be the appropriate. A root barrier would also be included so that the landscaping will not impede the operation of the drainage trench and so that the infrastructure can be maintained as and when required. The landscape drawing should be clear about this easement prior to the planning permission being granted. Details of the final mound profiles should be approved once they are designed to ensure that the landscape treatment can be adequately maintained.

The hedge to the east of the proposed site should be strengthened with additional planting and some trees. I note that the hedge is at least now shown as retained although no additional planting, other than the one oak tree, is included.

The number of trees within the woodland planting matrix should be reduced to reflect the location on the edge of the access roads and adjacent to lighting and

SuDs:

The previous issues where the drainage plan showed a drainage infiltration trench within the site landscape area has been resolved.

Conclusion:

Whilst the application will have an impact on the character of the landscape and will be visible from places in the surrounding landscape and from Bury St Edmunds, the design of the proposals has had regard to location, scale, design and materials. The scheme will not unduly affect the setting of adjacent settlements and the effect on the nocturnal landscape has also been considered. A number of trees are to be lost as a result of the proposals in particular a number of mature oak trees adjacent to the site and on Barton Hill. **These will have an effect on amenity but some mitigation is proposed.**

21. Natural England:

Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on designated sites and has **no objection**.

Local planning authorities are responsible for ensuring that they have sufficient detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) information to apply the requirements of the NPPF.

We advise you to refer to standing advice to understand impact on protected species.

You should consider the impacts of the proposed development on any local wildlife or geodiversity sites, in line with paragraph 113 of the NPPF and any relevant development plan policy. There may also be opportunities to enhance local sites and improve their connectivity.

You should consider any impacts on ancient woodland and veteran trees in line with paragraph 118 of the NPPF.

Development provides opportunities to secure a net gain for nature and local communities, as outlined in paragraphs 9, 109 and 152 of the NPPF. We advise you to follow the mitigation hierarchy as set out in paragraph 118 of the NPPF and firstly consider what existing environmental features on and around the site can be retained or enhanced or what new features could be incorporated into the development proposal. Where onsite measures are not possible, you may wish to consider off site measures, including sites for biodiversity offsetting.

22. SEBC Planning Policy Officer:

The proposal should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The relevant policy and material considerations in relation to the principle of the development on the site are summarised below:

- A waste site for this combination of uses is not allocated in the development plan
- The proposal will also give rise to loss of countryside which is considered in response to DM5 and BV26.
- The proposal does not fully meet the requirements of policy DM7 Sustainable design however non-compliance is considered acceptable given the function and nature of the WTS. Some 10% of the site's energy requirements will be met by on site solar panels
- Article 32 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 allows local planning authorities to depart from development plan policy where material considerations indicate that the plan should not be followed.
- The proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the highway network and will improve sustainable transport links to the town.
- The site lies outside the settlement boundary but relates well to the urban area with the proposed development making best use of the topography and being seen against the backdrop of the sugar beet factory in views from the countryside to the north.
- The site lies in an urban fringe / edge of settlement location with reasonable accessibility. Public transport links are limited, but due to the nature of the site most trips will be by private vehicle. The proposed site layout plan shows a new shared use path to Barton Hill which will improve accessibility and pedestrian / cycle access to the site.
- The proposal is acceptable under the policies of the SCC Waste Core Strategy and Development Management Policies.
- The site is part of the strategic green infrastructure network (BV26) around Bury St Edmunds, the integrity and connectivity of which should be maintained, protected and enhanced. Planning permission for development that would harm the Green Infrastructure network will only be granted if it can incorporate measures that avoid the harm arising or sufficiently mitigate its effects. Although new mitigation planting is planned the proposed loss of the A grade Oak, the prominent landscape feature of the site and existing planting along Barton Hill is a negative of the scheme.
- The operational need for and benefits of the proposed WSOH have been adequately demonstrated in the reports and studies supporting the application.
- The applicants have carried out sufficient consultation in line with para 66 of the NPPF.
- It has been demonstrated that the application will not increase the risk of flooding on or off the site.
- Levels of odour, light, soil and noise pollution will be minimal and have been demonstrated to be acceptable.
- The scheme will not have an adverse effect on any historic asset or its setting
- Biodiversity will not be adversely impacted by development and the landscaping scheme is likely to lead to increased biodiversity in the immediate area.

Taking into account the above, on balance, **the proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle** in terms of satisfactorily addressing planning policy and other material considerations. The economic, social and environmental benefits of the proposal outweigh any harm identified and justify a departure the development plan. However matters related to details of the proposal, including the retention of important landscape features, planting and drainage will need to be addressed by condition on any consent.

23. SEBC Public Health and Housing:

No objection. The development has the potential to give rise to noise impacts due to its construction, operation, and from visiting traffic especially heavy vehicles accessing the site. The submitted report demonstrates that during the construction no significant impacts are expected. During Phase 3 of the construction there is a potential for "minor" increases in traffic noise on Fornham Road. The assessment of the operational noise at the proposed site shows that during peak normal operational hours no significant impacts are expected. There is a potential for "minor" increases in traffic noise on Fornham Road during operation. Conditions are suggested regarding the need to employ best practice during construction, hours of construction, the burning of waste, security lighting, the routing of traffic, hours of operation and the use of reversing alarms. The details contained in the noise assessment should be implemented.

No objection on odour grounds subject to the details contained in the Odour Management Plan being implemented.

24. SCC Archaeology:

The site is in an area of archaeological potential for Prehistoric, Roman and Medieval occupation. The application is supported by an Archaeological Statement following pre application geophysical surveys and trenched evaluation. The results of these investigations have revealed significant archaeological remains that span from at least the Middle Iron Age to the Roman period with features focussed in the eastern field. Groundworks associated with the proposed development would have the potential to damage or destroy significant archaeological remains. **There are no grounds to consider refusal** of permission in order to achieve preservation in situ of any heritage assets but two conditions will be required to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset.

25. SCC Flood and Water Engineer (following amended plans received 23 May 2017):

SCC Flood and Water Management have reviewed the amended drainage documents and **we can now remove our initial holding objection.** However further monitoring of groundwater levels will be required onsite, thus SCC are minded to provide approval subject to conditions.

26. SCC Suffolk Fire and Rescue:

The Fire Authority request that adequate provision is made for fire hydrants by the imposition of a suitable planning condition.

27. SCC Travel Plan Officer:

There has been some sustainable measures identified to help mitigate the impact that the employees of the site will have on the local highway infrastructure. However, the location of the site is quite remote and will be very difficult to encourage most the employees to utilise sustainable alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle travel. Also the Travel Plan will not be able to influence the travel habits of visitors, due to the main purpose of the site.

The Travel Plan did identify that the existing bus services that serve the stops on Barton Hill are not suitable for most employees that will be working on the site, so the only realistic sustainable transport options are cycling and car sharing. Walking may also be possible if there are any employees that live in the North-west Bury St Edmunds area, due to the proposed footway link that connects Barton Hill to the site.

There have also been some strong measures identified to encourage cycling on site, such as providing suitable storage, showers and changing facilities to encourage employees to cycle to the site. The car sharing measures identified are also sufficient and will help encourage employees to car share. These measures, if implemented in full may provide some suitable alternatives to single-occupancy car travel and highway mitigation for a remote location.

A legal agreement would ideally be required to secure the Travel Plan and required for the monitoring fee. The use of planning conditions, in addition to securing a Section 106 or Unilateral Undertaking may also be considered as an option to effectively secure the Travel Plan.

Full comments made by consultees can be found on the Council's website using the link at the end of this report.

Representations:

28. Bury St Edmunds Town Council: **No objection** based on information received.

29. Fornham All Saints: **Object**. Attention is drawn to the transport appraisal submitted by Great Barton Parish Council, Fornham St Martin cum Genevieve and Fornham All Saints which will be submitted with the response from Great Barton Parish Council. Application fails to appropriately forecast traffic impacts of growth. Traffic congestion is a major concern and with the effect that additional hub traffic will have on an 'already dangerous' roundabout at the A143 Fornham Road junction on Barton Hill where vehicles speeds are 70mph and visibility

is low and where traffic is already congested or high in volume. Concerned at conflict with policy BV14 which identifies employment land and why Hollow Road Farm has been chosen when it is not allocated for employment/industrial uses. Pleased to see that the application will go before Secretary of State for determination. The Parish Council acknowledges improvements to the layout with additional safety features.

30. Fornham St Martin Cum St Genevieve Parish Council: **Unanimous objection.** The infringement of existing Borough policies (SEBC Green Infrastructure Strategy; Core Strategy CS11 and Bury Vision BV14) is fundamentally wrong.

Traffic and infrastructure is a major concern and the application has a lack of detailed plans and appropriate traffic density forecasting. The creation of a ghost lane at the entrances is insufficient provision and such facilities usually have independent road access routes. Average speed on Fornham Road is 55mph. The forecasting of the traffic impact should be undertaken to 2039 not 2022 as has been done. Concerned that no provision is made for improving the A134/Barton Hill/Fornham Road roundabout where traffic speeds are 70mph and visibility is restricted with 4 accidents in the last year. The Parish Council also feel it extremely unlikely that residents will use the footpath and crossing the A134 will be dangerous. We acknowledge the improvements to the layout of the site.

Concerns raised unanimously regarding air quality due to diesel fumes and from the odour/gases from the waste impacting on residents and workers health. Also a fire risk from the site which associates itself with the aquifer which provides drinking water. Noise pollution needs to be addressed on the western boundary.

The financial report and business plan have not been updated since spring 2015 and the Parish Council expect an update on the financials going forward.

31. Great Barton Parish Council: **Objection.** There are significant safety factors with the co-location of services onto one site. A transport/traffic appraisal has been commissioned by Great Barton Parish Council, Fornham St Martin Cum St Genevieve Parish Council and Fornham All Saints Parish Council. The Planning Statement does not contain feedback from the Council meeting of 6th June 2016. The impacts on the countryside and loss of prime arable land is not acceptable and exacerbated by the removal of 2 oak trees. The landscaping on the western boundary will not provide sound attenuation in the Autumn/Winter and use of tip hook skips and hours of operation needs reconsideration. The layout should be revised to separate the traffic to HWRC and reuse building and egress onto A134 allowing the public ingress to be relocated and a slip road for exiting operational vehicles. The site is susceptible to flooding and no mention of back up to vertical pumps. Contamination of principal aquifer must be avoided. The centrally placed lighting tower in the WTS yard will

have safety implications especially with reversing HGVs. The centrally located car park should be re-located. The WTS should be a drive-through facility. Why is active management of odour now not being proposed? Opening hours to HWRC should be reconsidered. An Environmental Assessment should be undertaken due to presence of principle aquifer and scope of ground investigations is incomplete/insufficient. The development conflicts with Borough policies (SEBC Green Infrastructure Strategy; Core Strategy CS11 and Bury Vision BV14). The application considers the need for the Secretary of State to determine this proposal as a matter of necessity.

A Transport Appraisal has been submitted which states that the cumulative impact of committed development (including allocations) should be considered which has not been done by the applicants. The A14/A134 junction should be analysed up to 2027 in accordance with Highways England guidance as there will be a material impact on this junction and congestion already exists. The Rougham Hill site is better located for access and the proposal would therefore lead to an increase in vehicles and an increase in the distances people travel contrary to sustainability objectives. The B1106/Barton Hill junction exceeds capacity significantly and will continue to do so. No safety audits have been undertaken of visibility. The site is poorly served by buses especially when compared to Rougham Hill/Fornham Road limiting options for staff and contrary to sustainability objectives

32. Ixworth and Ixworth Thorpe Parish Council: **No comment** as the application is not within this Parish.
33. Ward Member (Councillor Rebecca Hopfensperger): No comments received
34. Letters of representation raising either **objections or comments** have been received from the following 93 addresses:
- Oak House, 12 Gleneagles Close, Fornham St Martin, Suffolk IP28 6XA
 - Three Oaks, Mill road, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2RU
 - The Crooked House, Bury Road, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2TS
 - 5 Dunwich Place, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2TJ
 - 19 Ord Road, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 1TB
 - Cadogan House, Fornham Road, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2SG (2 letters)
 - 9 Birkdale Court, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk, IP28 6XF
 - The Agents House, Fornham Park, IP28 6TT
 - 19 Barton Hill, Bury St. Edmunds, IP31 1SN
 - 26 Barton Hill, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 1SN

- Fornham Grange, School Lane, Fornham St Martin IP31 1SP
- Sunningdale, 3 Mooreland Drive, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2PN
- 18 Turnberry Drive, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP28 6TP (2 letters):
- 20 Barton Hill, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, IP31 1SN
- 25 Barton Hill, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, IP31 1SN
- 31 Conyers Way, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, IP31 2SW
- 5 Turnberry Drive, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP28 6TP
- 61 Glebe Close, Thetford, IP24 2LN (2 letters)
- 8 Dunwich Place, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2TJ
- Crabtrees, Pakenham Road, Great Barton, IP31 2PF
- Knutsford, Ixworth Road, Great Barton, IP31 2PT (2 letters)
- 11 Gilstrap Road, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 1TD
- Barcaple House, School Lane, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 1SP
- 1 Bunbury Avenue, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, IP31 2SZ (2 letters):
- 1 Parklands Green, Fornham St Genevieve, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk IP28 6UH (2 letters)
- 16 Culford Road, Ingham, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 1NP
- 48 Conyers Way, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds IP31 2SW (2 letters)
- Little Farm, West Stow Road, Culford, IP28 6DY
- Sharon, Livermere Road, Conyers Green, Bury St. Edmunds, IP31 2QG
- 21 Anglesey Place, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2TW
- 31 Conyers Way, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, IP31 2SW (2 letters)
- 4 Oak Grove, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 1TH
- 41 Spring Terrace, Spring Lane, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP33 3AP (three letters)
- 47 Juniper Road, Bury St. Edmunds, IP32 7PT
- 5 Martin Mews, Haverhill, Suffolk CB9 7FU (2 letters)
- 60 Raynham Road, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP32 6EA (2 letters)
- 9 St Marys Square, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP33 2AJ (on Behalf of Bury Society)
- Fur House, Rectory Meadow, Fornham All Saints, Suffolk IP28 6JR
- Puttocks Bottom, Livermere Road, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2QE (2 letters)
- The Willows, Livermere Road, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2QE (2 letters)
- 18 Conyers Way, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2RL
- Park Croft, The Park, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2SU:
- 12 Woodland Place, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31

- 2TG
- 24 Barton Hill, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 1SN
- 5 Dairy Drive, Fornham All Saints, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP28 6LN
- 7 Russell Baron Road, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, IP31 1TA
- 1 Orchard Way, Badwell Ash, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 3JL (2 letters)
- Meadowcroft, 1 Diomed Drive, Hall Park, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2TF (2 letters)
- 1 Ord Road, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 1TB
- 18 Bell Meadow, Bury St. Edmunds, IP32 6AU
- 5 St. Andrews Drive, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP28 6TR
- 9 Chester Place, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds IP31 2TL (2 letters)
- Ardamane, Livermere Road, Great Barton, IP31 2QE
- 24 Diomed Drive, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, IP31 2TD:
- Barton House, The Park, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2SU
- 13 Barton Hill, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, IP31 1SN
- 2 School Cottages, School Lane, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 1SP
- 38 The Coppice, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2TT (2 letters)
- 4 Oak Grove, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 1THL (two letters)
- 5 Barton Hill, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 1SN
- 7 Gilstrap Road, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, IP31 ITA
- 8 Russell Baron Road, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, IP31 1TA
- 9 Russell Baron Road, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, IP31 1TA (2 letters):
- Colton House, Fornham Road, Great Barton, IP31 2SD (2 letters)
- Crown House, School Lane, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2RQ (2 letters)
- Park House, 9 Woodland Place, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2TG
- 14 Barton Hill, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, IP31 1SN
- Cherry Trees, 10 Diomed Drive, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2TD (two letters)
- 22 Grove Park, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP33 3BG
- 1 Diomed Drive, Hall Park, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2TF
- 18 The Coppice, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, IP31 2TT
- 44 Conyers Way, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, IP31 2SW
- Colton Cottage, Fornham Road, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2SD
- Holly House, Cox Lane, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk

- IP31 2NS
- The Oakeries, Fornham Road, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2SE
 - 13 Barton Hill, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, IP31 1SN
 - 16 Kytson Road, Fornham St. Martin, IP31 ITF
 - 18 Russell Baron Road, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 1TA
 - 12 Conyers Way, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, IP31 2RL (2 letters)
 - 12 Gilstrap Road, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, IP31 1TD
 - The Hollies, The Park, great Baron, AP31 2SX
 - 5 Manners Road, Fornham St. Martin, IP31 1TE (2 letters)
 - 17 Barton Hill, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds, IP31 1SN (2 letters)
 - 24 Bell Meadow, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP32 6AU
 - 26 Church Walks, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP33 1NJ (sent on behalf of Suffolk West Action Group (SWAG)) (2 letters)
 - 24 Barton Hill, Fornham St. Martin, Bury St. Edmunds Suffolk IP31 1SN
 - 6 Garden Close, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2SY
 - Derby House, 13 Diomed Drive, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds
 - Cherry Trees, The Park Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2SU
 - Vicarage Farm House, Vicarage Farm Lane, Great Barton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP31 2QF
 - Westfield House, Compiegne Way, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP32 7BD
 - Yew Tree Cottage, Fornham Road, Great Barton, Suffolk IP31 2SG
 - Kingsbury Hill Wood, Fornham St. Genevieve, IP28 6DZ
 - Genevieve Farms, Fornham St Genevieve, Bury St Edmunds

One letter of **support** was received from the following address:

- Two Oaks, East Barton Road, Great Barton Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, IP31 2QY

In addition Fornham St Martin Cum St Genevieve Parish Council have provided comments from 52 addresses received by them at a drop in session they hosted for residents who were invited to record their attendance together with comments.

In addition, representations have been received from the following organisations:

- Suffolk Preservation Society, Little Hall Market Place, Lavenham, Suffolk, CO10 9QZ
- Hengrave Belt Amenity Group, P O Box 222, Bury St. Edmunds, IP28 6EE
- Lark Valley Gravel Group, P O Box 222, Bury St. Edmunds, IP28 6EE

35. The representations made comment on the following issues:

Transport:

- Increased traffic and congestion
- Highway safety concerns
- Inadequate Transport Assessment and failure to account for future development and assess relevant junctions such as A14 junction 43 where there are existing issues
- Poor visibility on local highway network
- Highway improvements need to be provided (road widening, roundabout access to site, visibility improvements)
- Local highway network unsuitable for volume and type of traffic
- Uncontrolled crossing on 70mph road is unsafe
- Barton Hill roundabout unsafe
- Area already heavily congested
- Local roads will be used as short cuts
- Conflict between public and operational vehicles
- Weight restrictions already being breached and are hard to police and enforce
- Increased risk to school children
- Local area is liable to traffic accidents
- The development will impact on delivery of policies in the Rural Vision including RV6 (Leisure, recreation and tourism at Park Farm, Ingham) which rely on the highway network.

Environment:

- Increased pollution and impact on air quality
- Impact on health
- Impact on countryside
- Loss of prime agricultural land
- Increased noise
- Increased nuisance
- Increased vibration
- Site will create odour issues
- Increased light pollution
- Site is too close to housing
- Adverse impact on residential amenity
- Discarded litter will impact countryside
- Visual impact on landscape
- Buildings poorly designed with regard to surroundings
- Site should be reordered to move buildings further from residential Properties
- Will breach human rights in respect of peace and safety
- Fire risk
- Waste will be on site 48hrs (not 24hrs as previously advised)
- FRA does not cover A134/A143 roundabout
- Loss of wildlife on agricultural land
- Impact on water quality/principle aquifer
- Impact of vermin
- Litter will be dumped on nearby roads
- Too close to food producing land

- Roads are prone to flooding due to high water table
- Impact of hazardous waste
- Loss of trees
- Site safety/inappropriate layout
- Insufficient tree planting as mitigation

Principle:

- Conflicts with Green Infrastructure Strategy, the Core Strategy and Vision 2031
- Precedent for further industrial development in the area
- HWRC should remain at Rougham Hill
- Depot and WTS should be on a site close/directly accessible to A14 on an established industrial area
- Too close to Bury town
- Insufficient evidence of the benefits of the proposal
- Rougham Hill would be a better site and is better located in terms of access
- Existing site are more accessible and will reduce travel distances
- Site is larger than is necessary to cater for development proposed

Other issues:

- Impact on property values
- Will make selling property more difficult
- Financial case for the proposal has not been provided
- Costs have been underestimated
- Proposed footpath will be unused and is unnecessary
- Opening times are unsuitable
- Inappropriate use of public money
- Visitors to Bury will decrease
- Site will attract large birds
- Applicant has failed to respond to letters

36. The letter of support raised the following issues:

- The Rougham Hill site is unsuitable with hundreds of housing being built near Rushbrooke Lane accessing junction 44
- The site has good access from the north and to the A14 junction 43.
- Few houses within the site and commercial and agricultural adjacent land uses.

Full comments made by Parish Councils, residents and other contributors can be found on the Council's website using the link at the end of this report.

Policy: The St Edmundsbury Core Strategy (2010), Bury Vision 2031 (2014), Rural Vision 2031 (2014), Joint Development Management Policies Document (2015), Local Plan Policies Map – Bury St Edmunds Inset 1 (2015), Suffolk County Council Waste Core Strategy including Suffolk Minerals and Waste Development Framework Proposals Map and Development Management Policies (2011) have been taken into account in the consideration of this application including the following policies:

37. St Edmundsbury Core Strategy (2010)

- Policy CS1 – St Edmundsbury Spatial Strategy
- Policy CS2 – Sustainable Development
- Policy CS3 – Design and Local Distinctiveness
- Policy CS4 – Settlement Hierarchy and Identity Zones
- Policy CS7 – Sustainable Transport
- Policy CS8 – Strategic Transport Improvements
- Policy CS9 – Employment and the Local Economy
- Policy CS11 – Bury St Edmunds Strategic Growth
- Policy CS13 – Rural Areas

38. Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031 (2014)

- Policy BV1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy BV14 – General Employment Areas – Bury St Edmunds
- Policy BV16 – British Sugar Site – Areas North of Compiègne Way
- Policy BV26 – Green Infrastructure in Bury St Edmunds

39. Rural Vision 2031 (2014)

- a) Policy RV1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- b) Policy RV4 – Rural Employment Areas
- c) Policy RV9 – Green Infrastructure in the Rural Areas

40. Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015

- a) Policy DM1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- b) Policy DM2 – Creating Places – Development principles and Local Distinctiveness
- c) Policy DM5 – Development in the Countryside
- d) Policy DM6 – Flooding and Sustainable Drainage
- e) Policy DM7 – Sustainable design and Construction
- f) Policy DM11 – Protected Species
- g) Policy DM12 – Mitigation, Enhancement, Management and Monitoring of Biodiversity
- h) Policy DM13 – Landscape Features
- i) Policy DM14 – Protecting and Enhancing Natural resources, Minimising Pollution and Safeguarding from Hazards
- j) Policy DM15 – Listed Buildings
- k) Policy DM17 – Conservation Areas
- l) Policy DM20 – Archaeology
- m) Policy DM45 – Transport Assessments and Travel Plans
- n) Policy DM46 – Parking Standards

41. Local Plan Policies Inset map 2015

- The site is identified as Countryside (CS4, DM5)

42. Suffolk Minerals and Waste Development Framework proposals Map 2011

- The site is not allocated or safeguarded

43. Suffolk County Council Waste Core Strategy including Development Management Policies

- Policy WCS1 – The Spatial Waste Planning Strategy for Suffolk
- Policy WCS2 – Management of Sub-regional Apportionment
- Policy WCS3 – Provision for the Recycling and Composting of Waste
- Policy WDM2 – General Considerations relevant to All Waste Management Facilities
- Policy WDM5 – General Waste Management Facilities
- Policy WDM7 – Waste Transfer Stations, Materials Recycling Facilities, End of Life Vehicle Facilities and Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment Recovery Facilities
- Policy WDM8 – Household Waste Recycling Centres
- Policy WDM18 – Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation
- Policy WDM19 - Design of Waste Management Facilities

Other Relevant Policy and Guidance Includes:

- 44.National Planning Policy Framework (2012)
- 45.National Planning Policy for Waste (2014)
- 46.Waste Management Plan for England (2013)
- 47.Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2014)
- 48.Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment
- 49.St Edmundsbury Green infrastructure Strategy (2009)
- 50.Bury Vision Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2014)

Officer Comment and Evaluation:

- 51.The main issues to be considered in the determination of the application are:
- The applicant’s case
 - Principle of development
 - Highway safety and impact on highway network
 - Landscape/visual impact
 - Noise, odour and air quality
 - Sustainable Drainage and protection of groundwater
 - Impact on residential amenity and adjacent land uses
 - Ecology
 - Heritage assets
 - Residential amenity
 - Travel Planning
 - Sustainable Construction

The Applicants Case

52. The application is a joint submission by Suffolk County Council, St Edmundsbury Borough Council and Forest Heath District Council (hereafter referred to as ‘the Applicant’). The Suffolk Waste Partnership (SWP) is a strategic partnership comprising the County Council and district and borough councils within Suffolk and has identified the need for a network of waste transfer stations to serve the Energy from Waste facility at Great Blakenham which uses waste left over after recycling to generate electricity. A report produced by the SWP in 2011 concluded that a waste transfer station needed to be located in or near to Bury St Edmunds. The existing waste transfer

facilities serving West Suffolk are located in Red Lodge, Thetford and Haverhill. These are located to the west of the area and the majority of waste they handle comes from the east. Furthermore, the majority of waste that they handle is destined for facilities to the east of Suffolk. Initially Suffolk County Council sought to establish this new waste transfer station at Rougham Hill, Bury St Edmunds, where an existing household waste recycling centre was located. A planning application was therefore submitted and subsequently approved by Suffolk County Council in 2013 in response to this identified need. This permission is extant having been lawfully implemented.

53. In addition to the need for a new waste transfer station identified by the SWP, Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council (the West Suffolk Councils) have also identified a need to address what they consider to be deficiencies with their existing depot facilities and an inability of existing facilities to expand to meet future demands. There are currently three Council waste and street scene depots in West Suffolk. These are located at Olding Road in Bury St Edmunds, at Holborn Avenue in Mildenhall and at Homefield Road in Haverhill. The proposal would result in the closure of the Olding Road and Holborn Avenue facilities. The applicants have identified that the Olding Road depot is a building constructed over 50 years ago and in need of modernisation with associated costs and ongoing maintenance costs and that its size, location and age present operational difficulties. The applicants have also advised that the site at Holborn Avenue, whilst a relatively new facility has limited room to expand to address future waste generation and has underutilised office based facilities following the relocation of administrative functions to Bury St Edmunds.

54. Since the granting of the permission for the waste transfer station at Rougham Hill, the applicants have explored the opportunity to co-locate waste management facilities and associated services on a single site which has led to the submission of this planning application. The applicants consider that the co-location of facilities is the most appropriate option and have undertaken an assessment of 5 options:

- Option 1: Do nothing
- Option 2: Implement Rougham Hill planning permission and leave depots where they are
- Option 3: Implement Rougham Hill planning permission and relocate and merge depot facilities
- Option 4: Co-locate all facilities on new site
- Option 5: Co-locate waste transfer station and depots on a new site and leave Household Waste Recycling Centre at Rougham Hill.

Their assessment of these options covers 24 criteria (including issues such as cost, access, travel distances, planning status, adjacent land uses, commercial opportunity and sustainability) and applied a score of between -2 to +2 for each of the 24 criteria. This assessment results in the following scores for each of the above options:

- Option 1: -16
- Option 2: +6
- Option 3: +16
- Option 4: +20
- Option 5: +14

55. Through this process the applicants identified that Option 4 (co-locate all facilities on a new site) was considered to be the option with the highest score and they have therefore sought to identify suitable sites for the location of such a facility. Through a process of site selection the applicants did not identify any allocated or previously developed sites that they considered suitable and they therefore sought to identify a suitable and available greenfield site on which to deliver the proposed development at which point the application site was identified. Through a public engagement exercise which was undertaken by the applicants the proposal attracted a significant level of interest and in response to this the Councils re-assessed previously considered sites or assessed new sites proposed by the public, the outcome being that they still regarded the application site as the most suitable to deliver their proposals. The Councils formalised and presented their options and site assessment work by producing an Identification of Potential Options and Sites Report (IAPOS Report) referred to in the submitted Planning Statement.

56. In support of co-locating facilities the applicants have identified a number of benefits which they consider would materialise and these include an improved ability to meet future demand for waste services; improved efficiency; reduced costs of delivering services; the release of existing sites for redevelopment to alternate uses; an improvement in the quality of service for the public; the provision of facilities not currently available (such as the resale building); economic benefits associated with construction; improved working conditions for staff; improved building standards; and a reduction in waste miles and the planting of new trees and hedgerows.

Principle of Development

57. S38(6) of the 2004 Planning Act states that applications for planning permission shall be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material planning considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF is a material consideration which 'may indicate otherwise', although the Courts have re-affirmed the primacy of the Development Plan in Development Control decisions and departures from the plan should only be made in exceptional circumstances.

58. Accordingly, the provisions of paragraph 14 of the NPPF, including the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' and the 'tilted balance' in favour of a grant of planning permission (unless the identified harm would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits) applies.

59. This presumption in favour of sustainable development is further reinforced by advice relating to decision-taking. Paragraph 186 of the

Framework requires Local Planning Authorities to "approach decision taking in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development". Paragraph 187 states that Local Planning Authorities "should look for solutions rather than problems, and decision takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible".

60. This section of the report discusses whether the development proposed by this planning application can be considered acceptable in principle in the light of extant national and local planning policies. The report then goes on to analyse other relevant material planning considerations (including site specific considerations) before concluding by balancing the proposals benefits against its dis-benefits.
61. With reference to the Bury St Edmunds Local Plan Policies Map (Inset 1) and policy CS4 of the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy (CS) the site is located within the Countryside for the purposes of planning policy. Policy CS13 of the CS states that development outside of settlement limits (and therefore within the Countryside) will be strictly controlled, with a priority on protecting and enhancing the character, appearance, historic qualities and biodiversity of the countryside whilst promoting sustainable diversification of the rural economy and that policies in the Joint Development Management Policies Document (JDMPD) and Rural Vision 2031(RV) will set out detailed uses which are appropriate in rural areas.
62. There are no relevant policies in the Bury Vision and Rural Vision 2031 which are directly relevant to the proposed development but these do designate areas where employment uses (B1, B2 and B8) would be acceptable in principle. The site is not allocated for such uses in either of these documents. The site is however adjacent to existing commercial operations at Hollow Road Farm to the south which is immediately adjacent to allocation BV16 which is an area protected in the Bury Vision for uses in connection with the operation and growth of the British Sugar Site.
63. Policy DM5 of the JDMPD states that areas designated as countryside will be protected from unsustainable development. A new or extended building will be permitted, in accordance with other policies within the JDMPD, where it is for:
- a) Purposes directly related to agriculture or forestry
 - b) Affordable Housing for local needs in accordance with other policy
 - c) Development relating to equine related activities
 - d) Essential small scale facilities for outdoor sport or recreation or other uses which preserved the openness, appearance and character of the countryside, leisure activities, and new tourism facilities
 - e) A dwelling for a key worker in accordance with DM26
 - f) Small scale residential development in accordance with DM27
 - g) The replacement of an existing dwelling.

Or proposals for economic growth that recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, will not result in the loss of the best agricultural land and with no adverse impact.

On the basis that the proposal does not comply with criteria a - g above and is not a conventional commercial proposal for economic growth it is considered that the development conflicts with policy DM5. However, it should be noted that waste proposals are usually a County matter and dealt with by policies in the Waste Plan and the proposal is for a combination of uses which would not be allocated by the Borough Council. The development would also result in the loss of countryside which, although not strictly contrary to BV26, would be contrary to the overarching objectives of this policy which seeks to maintain, protect and enhance green infrastructure.

64. Policy WCS1 of the Waste Core Strategy states that preference will be given for waste management facilities in accordance with the Key Diagram (which illustrates opportunities and constraints) where individual sites are well related to the Suffolk Lorry Route Network, centres of population and sources of waste and do not have adverse impacts upon features of environmental importance or endanger human health. The site is located adjacent to the A134 which is a Strategic Lorry Route in the Suffolk Lorry Route Network and could therefore be regarded, in principle, as having good access to this network. The environmental and health impacts will be explored in this report.

65. Policy WCS2 states that proposals for new waste management development or an extension of existing waste development will only be permitted where there is a demonstrated need. The Suffolk Waste Partnership identified in 2011 that there was need for a new WTS in the Bury St Edmunds area however an extant permission now exists for such a facility at Rougham Hill where there is also a HWRC. Furthermore, the proposal seeks to replace depot and associated facilities that already exist. The applicant has identified that from an operational perspective it is their ambition to co-locate these facilities and that the proposal would have operational benefits which cannot be realised on sites other than the application site, including at Rougham Hill and have demonstrated that there are no existing, allocated or previously developed sites which are capable of accommodating the proposed development as a whole.

66. Policy WCS3 states that applications for the provision for the recycling and composting of waste will be determined by reference to the appropriate criteria based policies. When considering the need for such facilities it is necessary to take into account the capacity of existing recycling and composting facilities and proposed facilities that have planning permission or are the subject of a current planning application. As stated previously an existing HWRC exists at Rougham Hill, however it is the applicants case that the proposed HWRC would provide public benefits not available at Rougham Hill by providing an 'at grade facility' and by allowing the formation of a re-sale building.

Officers are of the opinion that these matters are a benefit of the proposal to be weighed in the planning balance.

67. Whilst the proposal seeks permission for facilities which either currently exist or are subject to extant permission, officers consider that the applicants have adequately demonstrated that there are no suitable or available sites on which to co-locate these facilities and that applicant has established that there is a need for the development proposed that cannot be fulfilled by other sites.
68. Policy WDM2 sets out a number of general considerations for all waste management development including matters such as landscape impact, highway impact, pollution control, compatibility with other land uses and other such considerations. This report will consider these relevant issues in subsequent paragraphs.
69. Policy WDM5 sets out the locations which, in principle are considered suitable for general waste management facilities. Suffolk County Council have however confirmed to officers that this policy is only relevant for small scale proposals and is not applicable to development of the scale proposed which incorporates a number of different waste management facilities. The locations identified, which are relevant for policies WDM7 and WDM8 below, include land within or adjacent to agricultural buildings which is applicable to the application site given the proximity to Hollow Road Farm. This policy also confirms that proposal must comply with the general considerations in WDM2 and that regard needs to be given to need, the capacity of existing facilities and proposed facilities that have planning permission.
70. Policies WDM7 and WDM8 state that waste transfer stations and household waste recycling centres will be acceptable within purpose designed or suitably adapted facilities on land within the uses identified within Policy WDM5. On the basis that the site is adjacent to existing agricultural buildings the location of the site for a WTS and HWRC (but not the depot and associated facilities as these are not relevant to these policies) is deemed to comply with the criteria of WDM5 and the proposals are to be within buildings and be served by infrastructure which is purposefully designed for the intended uses in accordance with WDM7 and WDM8. In addition, the development, as a whole, could not be accommodated on existing sites or sites with planning permission.
71. Representations have expressed concern that the provision of such facilities was not included in the production of the St Edmundsbury Development Plan however the development is for a combination of uses which incorporate both County and Borough functions and accordingly the plan is silent for such a combination of uses. Furthermore, the applicants have identified that the desire to co-locate services has emerged in part in response to the One Public Estate Programme which seeks to create economic growth, deliver more integrated customer focussed services and generate efficiencies. The One Public Estate programme began in 2013 and the applicants did not start to formally consider the options for the delivery of the

development until 2014 by which point the Core Strategy, Bury Vision and Rural Vision were either adopted or significantly advanced and accordingly these documents did not seek to address the need for the proposed development.

72. Whilst the development is therefore contrary to DM5, the development plan is considered to be silent in respect of the development proposed given the combination of uses and the presumption in favour of sustainable development in paragraph 14 of the NPPF applies and permission should be granted unless the identified harm would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

73. The site is located close to the Suffolk Strategic Lorry Network and adjacent to existing agricultural buildings where in principle a WTS and HWRC could be acceptable in accordance with WDM7 and WDM8 of the Suffolk County Council Waste Core Strategy. Whilst regard must also be given to need and the existence of an extant permission for a WTS and an existing HWRC at Rougham Hill the applicant has provided information to demonstrate that co-locating facilities as proposed in this application would have material benefits and that there are no other suitable or available sites to deliver this development. Officers are of the opinion that the benefits of the proposal, which include the provision of a facility which ensures the applicants can provide waste services to cater for a growing population; the provision of improved public facilities and the provision of facilities which currently do not exist; benefits from releasing land for alternative development and the economic benefits and job creation through the construction programme are a material consideration. Furthermore, a significant amount of work has been undertaken by the applicant in the preparation of their application to identify, appraise and consider the advantages and disadvantages associated with other sites which they and others have identified. Officers consider that this site selection process is comprehensive and that the application site represents the most appropriate location which would meet the applicant's operational requirements. Representations however have disputed the benefits which co-location of facilities on this site would generate and have also identified other sites that they consider to be more suitable.

74. The proposal would result in the loss of 6 hectares of Grade 2 (Very Good) agricultural land however this amount of loss is considered to be significant.

75. On the basis that the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies officers are of the opinion that the development is acceptable in principle unless any identified harm would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The remainder of this report will analyse relevant planning considerations before concluding by balancing the proposals benefits against the dis-benefits.

Highway safety and impact on highway network

76. The application site would be served by two points of vehicular access to the northern boundary onto Fordham Road. The westernmost access (the 'public access') would serve the HWRC and associated reuse building and the easternmost access (the 'operational access') would serve the WTS, bailing facility, fleet depot and staff parking as well as providing continued access to Hollow Road Farm to the south of the site. This division of access has been devised to separate the public and on site operations. The operational access would be in the location of the existing agricultural access to the north-east of the site. The public access would be located 96m to the west of the operational access and 300m to the east of the A134 roundabout.
77. Both the public and operational access would be served by separate ghost island right hand turn lanes within the public highway and the existing road would need to be widened and realigned to facilitate this. Egress from both junctions would be to the left only (towards the A134 roundabout), controlled by an engineered design and on site signage.
78. Vehicles using the operational access would circulate in a clockwise direction with road markings and direction signs used to direct users through the site to their intended destination. The fleet maintenance workshop would have doors to its south and north elevations to allow vehicles to drive through from the south whilst access to the WTS would loop around the south and west of the building before gaining access into the main yard to the west with access into the building on its north elevation.
79. Vehicles using the public access serving the HWRC and reuse building would circulate in a clockwise direction. This road would split into two to provide increased capacity for queuing vehicles before reaching the parking facilities for the HWRC and reuse building where it would reduce back to a single lane and where a total of 45 spaces are proposed. The public would leave the site via a road parallel to the northern site boundary where a recirculation lane will be provided for the public and staff to re-enter the site.
80. Off site, in addition to the road widening and ghost right hand turn lanes, it is proposed to provide a shared use path for cycles and pedestrians to the north of the site which would be continued to the west of the A134 along the south of Barton Hill to provide connection to the existing footpath provision and bus stop.
81. Submitted with the application is a design and access statement which details the rationale behind the proposed layout, a junction assessment report which analyses a number of different options for providing access into the site and a Transport Assessment (TA) to identify the potential transport implications arising from the development.
82. The scope and methodology of the TA has been agreed with the Highway Authority who, subject to conditions, raise no objections to

the development proposed. In response to the application local Parish Councils commissioned a transport consultant to prepare a report on the TA and the transport impacts of the development. The content of the Parish Council transport report has been discussed with the Highway Authority who maintain that the scope and conclusions of the TA are acceptable.

83. The TA has calculated that the proposed development on an average 18hr day over 5 weekdays would result in 1538 trips associated with the HWRC, 44 trips associated with the WTS, 286 trips associated with the depot and 328 staff trips resulting in a total of 2196 trips. For an average day over 7 days the proposal would result in 1660 trips associated with the HWRC, 44 trips associated with the WTS, 206 associated with the depot, 142 staff trips resulting in a total of 2052. These figures have been calculated using a combination of existing traffic survey data from the Rougham Hill HWRC and using the applicant's knowledge of operational activities and staffing levels that would transfer to this site. Whilst these trips would be new to the area, they are trips which would already be using the highway network to access existing facilities elsewhere which would be relocated to the application site.

84. To assess the impact of the development on the local highway network the TA analysed the following junctions:

- a) A134 / Fornham Road / Barton Hill Roundabout;
- b) B1106 / Barton Hill Priority Junction;
- c) A134 / A143 Roundabout; and
- d) A143 / Fornham Road Priority Junction.

The scope of the TA has been subject to objections from Parish Councils and residents on the basis that the A14/A134 junction was not assessed where capacity issues have been identified at this junction. The Highway Authority have responded that they are aware of issues with this junction and there are a number of proposed junction improvements that are being considered for implementation by Suffolk County Council in the short term to address these issues but remain of the opinion that this junction does not need to be assessed for consideration of the transport implications of this development. Furthermore, Highways England, who are responsible for the A14 have no objections to the application and have stated that they have undertaken their own checks and are satisfied that the scale of any impacts of the development on the A14 are unlikely to be severe in this instance. Given the lack of objection from both the Highway Authority and Highways England who consider the TA to be acceptable, officers are of the opinion that the level of information provided is acceptable in respect of the junctions which have been assessed.

85. The TA has identified that greatest impact in terms of traffic numbers is expected to be on the western section of Fornham Road between the site accesses and the A134/Fornham Road/Barton Hill roundabout. This is due to it being the primary route to the site and because of the

left hand turn egress arrangements.

86. The TA has analysed the capacity of the proposed public and operational accesses and concludes that sufficient capacity will exist. Visibility splays at these junctions will be 4.5m x 215m, which, whilst below the standards of 9m x 215m as set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), are considered acceptable by the Highway Authority as a reduced distance back from the highway edge will ensure that vehicles leaving the site will keep speeds low and result in a safer access arrangement on this 60mph stretch of carriageway.
87. The capacity of the junctions on the A134/Fornham Road/Barton Hill roundabout has been assessed in the TA and considers it to be sufficient to accommodate the traffic flows resulting from the proposed development. Furthermore, visibility at the junctions onto this roundabout have been assessed and the TA considers they comply with the DMRB standards. Visibility at these junctions could be improved through the removal of vegetation to increase visibility further but the DMRB cautions against providing excessive visibility at roundabout junctions with high speed approaches. Such measures could be secured through a Section 278 agreement with the Highway Authority.
88. The junction between the B1106 and Barton Hill is currently operating at above capacity resulting in queuing and delays. The TA identifies that the development would have a minor positive impact on the capacity of this junction. Parish Councils have identified that the existing capacity issues with this junction suggest that the local highway network is unsuitable for the development however bearing in mind the positive (albeit very minor) impact the development would have on this junction it is not considered that the proposal is unacceptable in this regard and mitigation at this junction cannot be required as it would not be necessary to make the development acceptable.
89. The TA identifies that the A134/A143 roundabout junctions and the A143/Fornham Road priority junction would both operate within capacity and can therefore accommodate the traffic flows resulting from this development.
90. This analysis in the TA identifies that the local highway network has sufficient capacity to accommodate the development without resulting in adverse impact. However, the analyses undertaken in the TA measures the impact at the opening year (2019) and the design year (2022) and the TA has been subject to criticism in representations made on the application that the impact has not been assessed over the lifetime of the development. The Highway Authority have responded that modelling usually to the first opening of a development (anticipated to be 2019) and rise with background growth. In this case the modelling goes beyond the opening of the site (to 2022) and they therefore consider the TA can be regarded as robust. Representations have also questioned whether the TA has adequately assessed the cumulative impact of committed and allocated development in the area

however the Highway Authority has advised that the TA has used Tempro growth rates which are based on historical Department for Transport data projected into the future and includes traffic growth resulting from all sources including allocated developments. In this case they are accepting that these are realistic values and that the TA therefore adequately considers the impact of future growth in the area.

91. Officers are therefore of the opinion that the TA which has been submitted in support of the application is appropriate to the scale of the development and has adequately assessed the likely extent of transport implications in accordance with policy DM45 of the JDMPD.
92. Concern has been expressed in representations regarding the impact of HGVs serving the site on residential amenity. The closest residential properties are located on Barton Hill to the west of the site, and to the east of the site approaching and within Great Barton. The Transport Assessment concludes that the majority of traffic resulting from the development would be distributed onto principal routes that form part of the Suffolk Lorry Route Network with the increase in traffic on Barton Hill to the west and Fornham Road to the east expected to be 76 and 264 vehicles respectively on an average day and limited to cars driven by members of the public or staff. This represents a 1.2% and 12.5% increase in vehicles. To the south of the B1106 is a 7.5 tonne weight restriction restricting the use of this route by HGVs travelling to and from Bury St Edmunds and operational vehicles will be restricted from using Fornham Road to the east as it is proposed that they will be electronically tagged and required to access and egress the development site to the west via the Suffolk Lorry Route Network.
93. Representations have also raised concerns regarding the safety implications of allowing additional traffic, which will also include a significant level of HGVs, onto the A134/Fornham Road/Barton Hill roundabout. As stated earlier in this report, the visibility at the junctions onto this roundabout have been identified as acceptable. Furthermore, the TA has investigated the accident record in this area over a period of 5 years. This analysis has revealed that a total of 18 incidents resulting in 22 casualties, of which 0 were 'fatal', 4 were 'serious', and 18 resulted in 'slight' injuries. Of the 'serious' accidents, one occurred due to poor weather conditions when the road surface was icy. The other two 'serious' accidents were as a result of human error. None of these accidents occurred at the A134 / Fornham Road / Barton Hill roundabout and the Highway Authority have raised no objection to the accident data provided. Concern has also been raised in representations about the provision of an uncontrolled pedestrian and cycle crossing to the south of the A134 / Fornham Road / Barton Hill roundabout to link the proposed new shared use path given the volume of traffic, proximity to the roundabout and permitted vehicle speeds on this section of the highway network. The Highway Authority have advised that the safety of this crossing, has been included in a Stage 1 Safety Audit and that further safety audits of the scheme would be required under the provisions of a Section 278 agreement which would relate to the construction and subsequent adoption of the

highway improvements. The Highway Authority have confirmed that the results of the safety audit indicate that the proposal is acceptable in principle and any further safety measures which may be required as a result of further safety audit would be dealt with through the section 278 agreement.

94. In support of the application a Lorry Management Plan (LMP) has been submitted which identifies that: HGVs associated with the site will make use of the Suffolk Lorry Route Network; HGVs will adopt a right in, left out approach to access and egress and the use of the B1106 between Barton Hill and the A1101 junction will be avoided were there is a 7.5 tonne weight restriction. The LMP states that the annual average weekday number of HGVs visiting the site will be 107 with a lower figure of 83 for the annual average daily figure to account for the anticipated lower volume of HGVs at the weekend when the depot would not be operational (other than around bank holidays). The LMP states that these HGV prediction figures are based on the expected use of the site by the year 2039 rather than the highway design year of 2022. Whilst the LMP would seek to make use of the Suffolk Lorry Route Network, it should be noted that refuse vehicles will need to use residential roads as part of their household waste collection services. To review and monitor the routing of HGV that form part of the West Suffolk Council fleet electronic monitoring tags will be used and drivers will be instructed to follow the route strategy.
95. The Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2015 is the adopted framework for the consideration of parking provision. Given the range of uses and nature of uses which are being proposed the proposed development does not fall within any one category of these standards however the most relevant are those standards relating to civic amenity sites, offices, shops and general industrial uses which relate the amount of floorspace proposed to establish parking requirements. The development proposes 45 public spaces for the HWRC and resale building in addition to capacity for 60 vehicles to stack within the site. Furthermore, 125 staff parking spaces, 8 motorcycle spaces and parking for 10 bicycles is proposed. The Highway Authority have raised no objections to the level of parking proposed and officers consider the level of parking to be acceptable and in accordance with policy DM46 of the JDMPD.
96. The proposed development would clearly increase the volume of traffic on this part of the highway network and include HGVs however there is no evidence to suggest that the development would result in conditions detrimental to highway safety and in this respect the proposal is considered to comply with policy DM2(l) of the JDMPD. Furthermore paragraph 32 of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of the development are severe. The concerns raised in representations by residents and Parish Councils are noted and have been considered but it is not considered that the proposal is unacceptable in terms of highway safety or the satisfactory functioning of the highway network.

Landscape/visual impact

97. The application site is an undeveloped agricultural field. To the south of the site are existing commercial and agricultural buildings and to the north and east are undeveloped agricultural fields. To the west is the A134 beyond which is an agricultural field.

98. The introduction of large buildings of a commercial/industrial nature and of the scale proposed in addition to the associated infrastructure will alter the character and appearance of the application site and result in a permanent change to the landscape. In support of the application the applicants have submitted a landscape and visual appraisal, an arboricultural impact assessment and a proposed landscaping scheme.

99. The Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment identifies the site as Plateau Estates Farmland which is characterised by the following features:

Flat landscape of light loams and sandy soil

Large scale rectilinear field patterns

Network of tree belts and coverts

18th-19th and 20th century landscaped parks

The site is considered in the applicant's appraisal to be reflective of these characteristics but is also located in a fringe location with views towards industrial land to the south, including the sugar beet factory and Bury St Edmunds beyond which impact upon the setting of the site.

100. The applicant's appraisal identifies that the most significant visual impact would be from Fornham Road to the north of the site (which is identified as a 'green corridor' in the Green Infrastructure Strategy 2009) where there would be a moderate impact with medium-low significance in both year 1 and year 15 of the development. Buildings and activity would be noticeable from this viewpoint but the agricultural and commercial buildings to the immediate south and sugar beet factory further to the south would lessen the change. From other viewpoints the impact has been assessed as either slight or negligible.

101. To mitigate or lessen the impact of the development the proposal has been designed to work within the existing rectilinear field pattern, the largest buildings have been proposed to the lowest part of the site and in close proximity to the agricultural and commercial buildings to the south and have been designed to be of a simple form. Furthermore a comprehensive landscaping scheme has been proposed.

102. The landscaping scheme proposes the establishment of woodland planting to the south of the site, the retention of an existing planted embankment to the A134 and additional planting to the west of the site, the establishment of woodland planting to the north west of the

site and the introduction of profiled bunds with native shrubs and a mix of trees to the north of the site and the retention of an existing hedge and tree planting to the east of the site. Within the site, where opportunities present pockets of soft landscaping will also be provided. It is considered that the proposed soft landscaping of the site would contribute significantly towards reducing the visual impact on the development. The landscape and Ecology officer raised concern regarding the provision of the landscaping along the northern boundary and the location of a proposed infiltration trench. Amendments to the drainage and landscape plan were submitted to alter the shape of the infiltration trench to provide a 3m easement between the edge of the trench and the start of the landscaping and this is considered sufficient to ensure that the drainage trench will remain functional and allow the landscaping to mature. New fencing would be proposed within the site and towards the boundaries to provide appropriate site security. A condition should be imposed to require details of the mound profiles on the northern boundary in the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that the landscaping can be adequately maintained.

103. In addition to the proposed planting the development also proposes the removal of a number of existing landscaping features. These are shown on the applicants Tree Protection Plan within their Arboricultural Impact Assessment. This identifies the need to fell one category A Oak to the north-east corner to provide the proposed operational access; a category B Oak to the north boundary to facilitate in road widening; the part removal of a category B group to the north-west of the site to provide the shared path and the removal of one Category B Oak, a category B group and 3 category C Oaks to provide the shared path to the south of Barton Hill. A hedge to the east of the site, previously shown to be removed is now to be retained but with a new field access and amended Tree Protection Plan would be required to reflect this.

104. The Landscape and Ecology Officer has advised that the loss of the category A Oak to the north east of the site will have an adverse landscape impact. The tree is needed to be removed due to the position of the proposed operational access. The applicants have submitted a detailed summary of the options for providing access to the site to explore whether it would be feasible to reconfigure the access arrangements to enable the retention of this tree in a document titled Options Assessment Junction Arrangement. This analysis identifies that relocating the operational access further to the west would have implications in terms of meeting appropriate highway standards and would impact on the operational capacity of the site are not therefore considered acceptable feasible solutions by the applicant. This explanation is accepted by officers and by way of mitigation the scheme proposes the planting of replacement trees throughout the site in addition to a replacement Oak adjacent to the Category A tree to be removed. This tree would be located outside of the application site however the adjacent landowner has provided confirmation to the applicant that they have no objections to this. The details of this replacement Oak can therefore be secured by condition. The removal

of trees to the south of Barton Hill to facilitate the footpath will also have an adverse landscape impact and to provide mitigation a condition is required to secure the planting of 5 oak trees. Subject to the delivery of replacement planting in accordance with the submitted landscaping scheme and for a scheme to replace the trees to be lost of Barton Hill it is considered that the proposed planting will mitigate the loss of existing trees and provide mitigation for the visual impact of the development.

105. The tree protection plan is not at a scale that can accurately be implemented on site to ensure that the existing retained trees are adequately protected. The tree protection fencing suggested in the report is not the recommended default specification in BS5837:2012 which is considered to be the most appropriate and effective in protecting trees. It is necessary that updated details for the location and design of the tree protection fencing are conditioned.
106. For operational, safety and security purposes it will be necessary for the site to be illuminated and a lighting strategy and plan have been submitted in support of the application. The strategy identifies that for the purposes of lighting the site will be split into 2 areas – the operational area would be lit between 05:30 and 22:30 and the public area would be light between 05:30 and 20:30. Outside of these hours some lighting will still be required for safety and security reasons but at a lower level. It is considered that appropriate consideration has been given to avoid the overspill of lighting outside of the application site as identified on the submitted lighting plan to ensure the impact on landscape, amenity, ecology and the nocturnal character is limited.
107. The proposed buildings are to be constructed of portal frames with steel cladding. The main buildings would be of a light grey colour which is considered to be visually recessive and would help the buildings blend with the skyline with detailing to the frames of openings. Photovoltaic panels are proposed to the south facing roofslope of the WTS to improve the sustainability of the building and details of these would need to be submitted for approval secured by condition.
108. On balance, it is recognised that the development will impact on the character of the application site through an introduction of buildings and associated infrastructure and an intensification in use. Furthermore, the loss of mature landscaping features will have a negative impact. However the landscape appraisal identifies that the landscape impact would not be significant and whilst the site is in the countryside it is immediately adjacent to existing commercial development and large agricultural buildings and the presence of the sugar beet factory reduces the visual isolation of this site. Mitigation is proposed in the form of replacement landscaping and whilst this will take a number of years to fully mature, it will significantly soften the impact of the development in the long term. The Landscape and Ecology Officer does not object and officers are satisfied that the overall visual impact would be acceptable and in accordance with policy

DM2 (with particular regard to criteria (a) and (g)) and policy DM13 of the JDMPD; policy CS3 of the CS and WDM2 (d).

Noise, Odour and Air Quality

109. The proposed development has the potential to result in noise, odour and air quality impacts and to assess these issues the applicants have submitted a Noise Impact Assessment, Odour Management Plan and Air Quality Assessment.
110. A noise survey has been undertaken at 4 locations around the application site to evaluate existing noise levels in the area. Noise associated with existing noise traffic has been identified as the dominant noise source in the area. The noise assessment has considered the noise implications resulting from the construction of the development, road traffic noise and operational noise. The nearest noise sensitive receptors have been identified as Hall Farm, Barton Stud, Westfield farm, 11 Ord Road and 4 Oak Grove the later being the closest sensitive receptor at approximately 315m from the application site.
111. The applicant's assessment has identified that the noise impacts during construction resulting from on site work and construction traffic would be negligible or neutral on all identified residential receptors. With regard to operational noise, the applicant's assessment has identified that there would be a minor impact at Hall Farm and 11 Ord Road but that operational noise from the development would not exceed 5dB above the measured background noise levels. Furthermore, noise impacts from the operational traffic has been assessed as being negligible on all roads with the exception of Fordham Road where a minor impact is anticipated.
112. Given the lack of significant noise impact resulting from the development there are no specific mitigation measures proposed however to limit any impact resulting from the minor impact identified on Fornham Road traffic will be routed on to the main roads, A134 and A143.
113. Public Health and Housing have commented that they have no objections to the development on noise grounds and requested a number of conditions to protect the amenity of the area. A condition for the control of construction hours can be conditioned however a lighting scheme has already been submitted and is considered acceptable so a condition is not required. Opening and operational hours and details of vehicle routing can be secured by condition. Vibration has also been considered in the Noise Assessment Report and no significant impact is anticipated.
114. To assess odour an Odour Management Plan has been produced by the applicants to identify how odour issues would be managed at the proposed development. The development has the potential to generate odour from the breakdown of putrescible waste. The

application states that such waste would be removed from the WTS within 48 hours of it first being brought to site. Representations have advised that this length of time has increased from 24 hours when the applicant undertook pre-application public consultation.

115. Potential sources of odour from the development include the depositing, storage and handling of residual waste from household waste collections, green garden waste and from street sweepings and from the queuing of and stabling of vehicles.
116. The applicant has advised that the deposit and handling of residual and green garden waste delivered to the WTS would take place within the WTS building. This building would have a passive ventilation system with vents within the roof. Representations have identified stated that when the applicant undertook pre-application engagement it was suggested that an active system would be used however notwithstanding the revised details submitted as part of the application Public Health and Housing raise no objections.
117. An assessment has been undertaken of prevailing winds in the area which are predominantly from the west to the south west. The application states that there are no schools, hospitals or care homes within 500m of the site and the nearest residential dwelling is 315m to the west on where there are residential dwellings on Barton Hill. A range of commercial and agricultural buildings are located immediately to the south of the site.
118. The applicants Odour Management Plan considers that due to the distance to nearest residential dwellings, the prevailing wind direction and the proposed management arrangements for the handling of waste within the WTS the likelihood of odour nuisance is considered to be low. The Odour Management Plan provides a methodology of working practices which will be employed for the acceptance, handling and storage of waste to minimise any odour implications including such as a 'first in first out procedure' and a contingency plan should manage situations should odour issues arise. Public Health and Housing have raised no objection in respect of odour and it is considered that the impact of odour is not likely to be significant and appropriate consideration has been given to its management and control. There are no specific conditions required other than for the development to be carried out in accordance with the Odour Management Plan.
119. An Air Quality Assessment has been submitted with the application to assess the existing air quality in the area and consider the impact of the development during construction and operation on air quality. This report analyses the impact of construction dust and operational odour and traffic emissions. This is to read in conjunction with the submitted Lorry Management Plan which would route lorries operating from the site along the Suffolk Strategic Lorry Network.
120. With regard to construction impacts, the report identifies that the proposed earthworks and construction should be classified as 'large' in

terms of dust emissions magnitude and the sensitivity of the surrounding area to these activities has been classified as 'low' for dust soiling and human health impacts with a resultant expected dust impact being recoded as 'low'. With regard to the operational impacts, odour issues have been discussed in preceding paragraphs. In terms of traffic impacts, the report identifies an expected negligible change in annual mean concentrations of Nitrogen Dioxide NO₂ and Particulate Matter (PM₁₀) at the residential receptor at Ord Road.

121. The Environmental Health Officer has therefore raised no objections in respect of impacts on air quality but to provide opportunities to provide enhancements it has been requested that a condition is imposed to secure 10 No electric vehicle charging points within the site to serve the staff parking area, fleet parking and visitor parking.

122. The Environment Agency have also confirmed that the site will be subject to an environmental Permit which will be based on conditions for controlling odour, noise, vibrations, and emissions not covered by limits (e.g. dust). This is a process separate from the planning regime and will be for the applicant to agree with the Environment Agency.

123. The application is therefore considered to comply with policies DM2 and DM14 and WDM2 in respect of noise, odour, vibration and air quality with no evidence to suggest that the proposal would have an adverse impact on residential amenity.

Sustainable Drainage and Protection of Groundwater

124. Policy DM6 of the JDMPD requires proposals for all new development to show how on-site drainage will be managed so as not to cause or exacerbate flooding elsewhere. Policy DM14 does not permit development where there would be an adverse impact on, inter alia, surface and groundwater quality.

125. The application is supported by a Flood Risk Assessment, Drainage Statement and Drainage Plan and ground investigation works have been undertaken by the applicant. Amended drainage plans have been submitted following a holding objection by the Flood and Water Engineer and additional information was provided to address the objections of the Highway Authority.

126. A Principal Aquifer underlies the application site which has high permeability and provides a high level of water storage. The overlying soils at the site are classified as having a high leaching potential, meaning they can readily transmit a wide variety of pollutants to the groundwater. The site is also located within zone 2 of a groundwater Source Protection Zone which are areas around groundwater-sourced public water supplies where contamination could risk the water supply. The site is therefore highly vulnerable to pollution. The Environment Agency Flood Risk Maps identify that the site is located within Flood Zone 1, where there is the lowest probability of flooding.

127. As amended, it is proposed for water to be managed on site, through a combination of an infiltration trench to the north of the site, an attenuation feature under the HWRC parking area, a soakaway in the vehicle stabling area and permeable paving under the staff car park.
128. The strategy proposes that surface water will be collected by a network of gullies and linear drains and conveyed to the infiltration features in a network of pipes. Ground conditions are such that the soakaways need to be located towards the north of the site. Due to the ground levels, the surface water will need to be pumped to the soakaway locations. The Flood and Water Engineer has removed their holding objection following receipt of amended information and is satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated that the surface water drainage strategy is acceptable in principle. However, they have advised that further monitoring of groundwater levels will be required on site and have requested that a condition is imposed should planning permission be granted to require a scheme for surface water drainage to be submitted for approval, including details of further infiltration testing and groundwater monitoring. They have also requested a condition regarding the need for a management and maintenance plan to ensure the surface water drainage features are effective for the lifetime of the development. Subject to these conditions it is considered that the development complies with policy DM6 and WDM2.
129. The Environment Agency raised an objection to the application on the basis that insufficient information had been submitted to demonstrate that the risk to the water environment from proposed fuel storage had been fully considered and risks adequately mitigated. They also objected on the grounds that the management of water from street sweeping bays was unacceptable as street sweepings may contain high levels of heavy metals, oils and other contaminants and may have a high leachable organic content. In response to these objections the applicant has submitted additional information to detail the arrangements for fuel storage and the drainage design has been amended to ensure that street sweepings drain into a cess tank preventing infiltration of potentially contaminated water. On this basis the Environment Agency have withdrawn their objection subject to conditions regarding the need for a remediation scheme should contamination not previously identified be found; a scheme for surface water disposal and for a construction environment management plan to include a pollution risk assessment and mitigation methods. On this basis it is considered that the development would have an acceptable impact on groundwater in accordance with policy DM14 and WDM2.

Ecology

130. The application is supported by a preliminary ecological assessment that provides an assessment of the habitats and presence of protected species (badgers, bats, reptiles, great crested newts and birds) at the application site. This report confirms that the risks to protected species are considered to be relatively low, but contains

some recommendations that would need to be implemented during the construction of the development which can be conditioned. The Councils Landscape and Ecology Officer and Natural England both have no objections on the grounds of ecology. The impact of the development on ecology is therefore considered to be acceptable and in accordance with DM11 and DM12 and WDM2. Opportunities for the enhancement of biodiversity are considered to be delivered through the proposed landscaping scheme.

Heritage Assets

131. The application site does not lie within or contain any designated heritage assets. Historic England have identified that there are a number of designated heritage assets within the wider landscape including the grade II* listed Church of St Martin approximately 1km to the north-west. Historic England have taken the view that any impact on the setting of this church would be minimal and would not result in harm to its significance. They have also advised that there could be a greater chance of impact upon the setting of the grade II listed building to the south of Fornham St Martin but this is for the Local Planning Authority to consider. The Councils Conservation Officer has considered the potential impact on the setting of listed buildings and conservation areas within 2km of the site. Given the location, topography and intervening development, the proposed development is not considered to impact on the nearby conservation areas. They have advised that the heritage assets most likely affected are those towards the southern end of Fornham St Martin but consider that with regard to the distances, limited views of the site and the intervening land uses the proposal would not likely cause harm to the setting of these heritage assets. The Conservation Officer therefore has no objections and it is considered that the proposal would comply with policies DM15 and DM17 and WDM2.

132. Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service have advised that the site is in an area of archaeological potential for Prehistoric, Roman and Medieval occupation. The application is supported by an Archaeological Statement following pre application geophysical surveys and trenched evaluation. The results of these investigations have revealed significant archaeological remains that span from at least the Middle Iron Age to the Roman period with features focussed in the eastern field. Groundworks associated with the proposed development would have the potential to damage or destroy significant archaeological remains. The Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service have advised that there are no grounds to consider refusal of permission in order to achieve preservation in situ of any heritage assets but two conditions will be required to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset. Subject to these conditions it is considered that the development would comply with policy DM20 and WDM2.

Residential Amenity

133. The application site is located approximately 350m from the closest residential dwelling and it is considered that the above analysis has identified a lack of harm on residential amenity in matters including noise, odour, traffic and lighting. Given the distance to residential properties, the scale of buildings proposed would not result in overshadowing or overlooking of neighbouring property. Furthermore, it is not considered that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact in terms of the health and safety of the public. The opening and operational hours for which consent is being sought are:

HWRC

Public opening hours

- 09:00 – 17:00 (Monday – Wednesday, Friday – Sunday)
- 09:00 – 19:00 (Thursday)
- Closed on Christmas Day and New Year's Day

Operational hours

- 06:00 – 20:00 (7 days a week)
- Closed on Christmas Day and New Year's Day

WTS (operational hours only)

- 05:30 – 22:30 (7 days a week)
- Closed on Christmas Day and New Year's Day

Depot (operational hours only)

- 06:00 – 20.00 (Monday – Friday)
- 06:00 – 20:00 (Saturday – for street cleaning services, vehicle and equipment maintenance, minimal trade waste activities and waste services 'Saturday catch-up' following bank holidays)
- 06:00 – 20:00 (Sunday - for street cleaning services only)

It is not considered that these proposed opening hours give rise to any adverse impact and are therefore considered acceptable and should be conditioned. It is also considered necessary to condition the amount of waste (106,496 tonnes of which 607 tonnes can be hazardous) which can be managed at the WTS to ensure that the permission reflects the scope of the planning application. In addition to residential amenity, it is not considered that the proposal would conflict with the adjacent agricultural and commercial/industrial land uses. The proposal would therefore comply with DM2 and WDM2.

Travel Planning

134. There is a requirement in planning policy to reduce reliance on the private car and for developments to promote more sustainable forms of transportation. In response to this requirement the applicants have submitted a Travel Plan. Given the nature of the HWRC, it is likely that

visitors would have to be reliant on the private car to use this service. Furthermore, the site is poorly served by pedestrian infrastructure so improve accessibility a new shared path would be provided to the north of the site to continue onto Barton Hill to provide a complete connection to the existing bus stop. Bus services are however limited and would operate outside of times suitable to make this a viable option for most staff. The site is considered to be within a reasonable cycling distance of Bury St Edmunds which may make this a viable option for some staff.

135. The submitted Travel Plan seeks to mitigate against transport impacts, promote the uptake of alternative modes of transport and influence travel behaviour of staff. Provision is made for cycle parking on site and showers for staff to use. Maps of cycle networks will be provided to staff and the health benefits of cycling will be promoted. Furthermore, the purchase of bicycles will be promoted and a strategy to assist in car sharing will be adopted. The promotion of walking to the site would also be encouraged. It is accepted that the use of the HWRC by the public will be largely by car however the Travel Plan does provide good opportunities to promote sustainable transport amongst the staff and is considered necessary to improve the sustainability of the development. The applicants have confirmed that the Travel Plan will be implemented in full and accordingly a contribution towards its monitoring and associated legal agreement is not considered necessary as it can be adequately secured by condition. The application is therefore considered to comply with policy DM45 of the JDMPD.

Sustainable Construction

136. Policy DM7 of the JDMPD requires all proposals for new development to adhere to broad principles of sustainable design and construction and optimise energy efficiency. All non-residential development over 1000 square metres will be required to achieve a BREEAM Excellent standard or equivalent unless it can be demonstrated that it is not possible to meet such a standard. The applicants have submitted a sustainability statement in response to this requirement. This statements sets out that it is not the applicant's intention to meet BREEAM Excellent standard on the basis that the buildings proposed are not suitable for assessment against these standards. Officers accept that the nature of the proposal does not readily allow for assessment against BREEAM. Furthermore, the applicants have demonstrated that principles of sustainable construction will be incorporated into the development though measures such as sustainable procurement, the incorporation of energy efficiency construction measures and photovoltaic panels to reduce emissions and the provision of cycle parking and showers. Overall it is therefore considered that adequate regard has been given to sustainable design and construction in accordance with the principles of policy DM7.

Conclusion:

137. In conclusion, the site is classified as countryside in the St Edmundsbury Development Plan and not allocated for the use proposed. This would conflict with DM5 of the JDMPD. The application also proposes a combination of uses not catered for in the Suffolk Waste Core Strategy so whilst the WTS and HWRC are in a location which in principle could be acceptable under WDM7 and WDM8, the depot and associated facilities do not comply with these policies. S38(6) of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act states that decisions on planning applications must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF is a material consideration and paragraph 14 states that "where the development plan is silent planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted".
138. This presumption in favour of sustainable development is further reinforced by advice relating to decision-taking. Paragraph 186 of the Framework requires Local Planning Authorities to "approach decision taking in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development". Paragraph 187 states that Local Planning Authorities "should look for solutions rather than problems, and decision takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible".
139. The combination of uses proposed is not allocated in the development plan being a combination of County Council and Borough Council services and therefore the Plan is considered to be silent and the presumption in favour of sustainable development under paragraph 14 of the NPPF applies.
140. The development would result in the loss of countryside which is considered to conflict with DM5 and BV26 and the proposal does not fully meet the requirements of policy DM7 Sustainable design however non-compliance is considered acceptable given the function and nature of the WTS. The development will also impact on the character and appearance of the area and the loss of existing trees, including a Category A Oak is considered a disbenefit.
141. However, whilst located in the countryside the site is considered to be well related to the urban area being adjacent to commercial development and seen against the backdrop of the sugar beet factory. The application process has established that there would be no significant harm on issues including highway safety and the satisfactory functioning of the local highway network; protection of groundwater and prevention of flooding; noise, odour and air quality; impact on residential amenity and adjacent land uses; ecology and heritage. Furthermore, the applicant has identified that there are no other suitable and available sites for the proposed development.

142. The development would result in a number of economic, social and environmental benefits which have underpinned the applicants decision to co-locate services. These benefits include ensuring the applicant can meet future demand for waste services; improved efficiency; reduced costs of services; the release of existing sites for redevelopment to alternate uses; an improvement in the quality of service for the public; the provision of facilities not currently available (such as the resale building); economic benefits associated with construction; improved working conditions for members of staff; improved building standards; a reduction in waste miles and the planting of new trees and hedgerows.

143. Taking into account the above, on balance, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle in terms of satisfactorily addressing planning policy and other material considerations. Taken collectively, the economic, social and environmental benefits of the proposal outweigh any harm identified and justify a departure the development plan. However matters related to details of the proposal, including the retention of important landscape features, planting and drainage will need to be addressed by condition on any consent.

Recommendation:

144. It is recommended that planning permission be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun no later than 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the following approved plans and documents:

Ecology Report prepared by SWT Trading Ltd dated February 2017

Landscape Management Plan dated March 2017

Lighting Strategy dated March 2017

Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-XX-DR-E-7030 P02 – Lighting Layout

Noise Assessment Report dated March 2017

Arboricultural Impact Assessment by A T Coombes Associates

Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-E-7033 P01 - CCTV Locations

Dwg No 512919-ATH-WSOH-PL-DR-7018 P02 – HWRC Portakabin Plan

Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-7017 P01 – Weighbridge Office Portakabin Elevations

Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-7016 P02 - Weighbridge Office Portakabin Plans

Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-C-7015 P10 Footway Sheet 5 of 5

Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-C-7014 P01 Footway Sheet 4 of 5

Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-C-7013 P01 Footway Sheet 3 of 5
Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-C-7012 P01 Footway Sheet 2 of 5
Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-C-7001 P01 Footway Sheet 1 of 5
Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-7008 P03 Fencing and Kerbing
Plan
Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-C-7006 P02 Sections
Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-C-7005 P03 Sections
Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-7004 P02 Finished Levels
Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PLA-DR-C-7003 P03 Proposed Site
Layout Sheet 2 of 2
Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-C-7002 P05 Proposed Site Layout
Sheet 1 of 2
Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-C-7001 P03 Planning Boundary
Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-C-7000 P03 Site Location Plan
Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-A-7044 P02 refuse Buildings GA
Roof Plan and Elevations
Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-A-7043 P02 Landscape Stores GA
roof Plan and Elevations
Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-A-7042 P03 WTS and Bailing
Facility Elevations
Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-A-7040 P03 WTS and Bailing
Facility GA and Roof Plan
Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-A-7045 P02 waste Collection
Vehicle Maintenance Workshop and Office Elevation
Sustainability Statement Dated March 2017
Odour Management Plan dated March 2017
Air Quality Assessment dated March 2017
Travel Plan dated March 2017
Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-7019 P03 HWRC Portakabin
Elevations
Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-A-7046 P02 waste Collection
vehicle Maintenance Workshop and Office GA and Roof Plan
Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-L-7050 P9 Landscape Proposals
Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-D-7100 P6 Drainage Layout
Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-SK-D-7100 P02 Infiltration Trench
indicative Section
Drainage Statement (Rev 4.0) dated May 2017
Applicant's response to Environment Agency received 25 May 2017

Reason: To define the scope and extent of this permission.

3. Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted, the new vehicular access shall be laid out and completed in all respects in accordance with Drawing No. 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-C-7002 Rev P05. Thereafter the access shall be retained in the specified 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 in accordance with policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015

4. Prior to the commencement of development details of site access to be used during the construction of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The access shall thereafter be implemented in full in accordance with the approved details.

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 in accordance with DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015. A pre-commencement condition is necessary as the details relate to the construction of the development.

5. Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted, a signing strategy plan to provide details of signage to and from the site shall be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall thereafter be implemented in full in accordance with the approved details.

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 in accordance with DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

6. No development shall commence on the footpaths shown on Drawing No.'s 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-C-7011 Rev P01, 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-C-7012 Rev P01, 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-C-7013 Rev P01, 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-C-7014 Rev P01 and 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-C-7015 Rev P01 until details of footpaths, (including layout, gradients, surfacing and means of surface water drainage and delivery) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority

Reason: To ensure that the development is designed and constructed to an appropriate specification and made available for use at an appropriate time in the interests of highway safety and sustainability in accordance with DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

7. All HGV traffic movements to and from the site over the duration of the construction period shall be subject to a Deliveries Management Plan which shall be submitted to the planning authority for approval a minimum of 28 days before any deliveries of materials commence.

No HGV movements shall be permitted to and from the site other than in accordance with the routes defined in the Plan.

The site operator shall maintain a register of complaints and record of actions taken to deal with such complaints at the site office as specified in the Plan throughout the period of occupation of the site.

The Plan shall include details of s routing strategy to avoid non A roads

until C735 from A134 and before and after highway and verge condition surveys on Fornahm Road and Barton Hill.

Reason: To reduce and / or remove as far as is reasonably possible the effects of HGV traffic in sensitive areas in accordance with policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

8. All Operational HGV traffic movements to and from the site shall be subject to a Routing Management Plan which shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval a minimum of 28 days before first use of site.

No HGV movements shall be permitted to and from the site other than in accordance with the routes defined in the Plan.

The site operator shall maintain a register of complaints and record of actions taken to deal with such complaints at the site office as specified in the Plan throughout the period of occupation of the site.

Reason: To reduce and / or remove as far as is reasonably possible the effects of HGV traffic in sensitive areas in accordance with policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

9. The use shall not commence until the areas within the site shown on 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-C-7002 Rev P05 for the purposes of loading, unloading, manoeuvring and parking of vehicles has been provided and thereafter that areas shall be retained and used for no other purposes.

Reason: To ensure that sufficient space for the on site parking of vehicles is provided and maintained in order to ensure the provision of adequate on-site space for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles where on-street parking and manoeuvring would be detrimental to highway safety to users of the highway in accordance with policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

10. Before any access is first used visibility splays shall be provided in accordance with details to be previously approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter shall be retained in the approved form. Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 2 Class A of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 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 to take avoiding action in accordance with policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

11. Prior to the development hereby permitted being first brought into use,

the Framework Travel Plan (dated March 2017) that was submitted to support the application must be implemented in full, thereafter, it shall be reviewed and revised on an annual basis, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. An annual Travel Plan Review, to be undertaken in accordance with the approved Travel Plan must also be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval until further notice.

Reason: In the interest of sustainable development and policies CS7 and CS8 of the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy and policies DM2, DM45 and DM46 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

12. Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted details of the areas to be provided for secure covered cycle storage for 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 interest of sustainable development and policies CS7 and CS8 of the Core Strategy and policies DM2, DM45 and DM46 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document

13. Prior to the first occupation, a completed Travel Information Pack shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning 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. The Travel Information Pack shall be maintained and operated thereafter. Within one month of first occupation, each employee shall be provided with Travel Information Pack that contains the sustainable transport information and measures that was identified in the Framework Travel Plan (dated March 2017).

Reason: In the interest of sustainable development and policies CS7 and CS8 of the Core Strategy and policies DM2, DM45 and DM46 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document

14. No development shall take place until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The applicant shall submit a detailed design based on the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy by Atkins Ltd and will demonstrate that surface water run-off generated up to and including the critical 100 year +CC storm will not exceed the run-off from the existing site following the corresponding rainfall event. The scheme shall also include:-

- A) Details of further infiltration testing on site in accordance with BRE 365 to verify the permeability of the site (trial pits to be located where soakaways are proposed and repeated runs for each trial hole). The use of infiltration as the means of drainage will be taken forward only if the infiltration rates and groundwater levels show it to be possible.
Borehole records should also be submitted in support of soakage testing.
- B) Additional groundwater monitoring is required across the site to verify the depth to the local water table. This should be included in support of additional soakage testing and undertaken where drainage features are to be located.
- C) Provided the Local Planning Authority are satisfied with the infiltration rates the following shall be submitted:
- I. Applicant shall submit dimensioned plans illustrating all aspects of the surface water drainage scheme including location and size of soakaways and the conveyance network. A statement on the amount of impermeable area served by each soakaway should also be illustrated on the plans and should be cross referenceable with associated soakaway calculations.
 - II. Modelling results (or similar method) to demonstrate that the soakaways have been adequately sized to contain the 30yr event for the catchment area they serve. Each soakaway should be designed using the nearest tested infiltration rate to which they are located. A suitable factor of safety should be applied to the infiltration rate during design.
 - III. Infiltration devices will only dispose of clean water due to the site area overlying a Source Protection Zone. Demonstration of adequate treatment stages for water quality control shall be submitted.
 - IV. Infiltration devices should be no more than 2m deep and will have at least 1 - 1.2m of unsaturated ground between base of the device and the groundwater table. If individual soakaways are being used they will be at least 5m away from any foundation (depending on whether chalk is present).
 - V. Soakaways will have a half drain time of less than 24hours.
 - VI. Any conveyance networks in the 1 in 30 event show no flooding above ground.
 - VII. Details of any exceedance volumes during the 1 in 100 year rainfall + CC and their routes should be submitted on the drainage plans. These flow paths will demonstrate that the

risks to people and property are kept to a minimum. There shall be no offsite flows.

- D) If the use of infiltration is not possible then modelling OR a similar method shall be submitted to demonstrate that:-
- I. Surface water runoff will be discharged to a suitable receptor and restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rates for the site.
 - II. Any attenuation features will contain the 1 in 100 year rainfall event including climate change
 - III. Any pipe networks in the 1 in 30 event show no flooding above ground.
 - IV. Modelling of the volumes of any above ground flooding during the 1 in 100 year rainfall + climate change to ensure no flooding to properties on or off-site. This should also include topographic maps showing where water will flow and/or be stored on site.
- E) A management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage system throughout its lifetime.

Reason: To ensure that on-site drainage will not increase the risk of flooding and to protect groundwater in accordance with policies DM2, DM6 and DM14 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015. The details are required before the commencement of development as they are fundamental to the design and layout of the development.

- 15.No development shall commence until details of a construction surface water management plan detailing how surface water and storm water will be managed on the site during construction is submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The construction surface water management plan shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved plan.

Reason: To ensure that on-site drainage will not increase the risk of flooding and to protect groundwater in accordance with policies DM2, DM6 and DM14 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015. The details are required before the commencement of development as they relate to the construction of the development.

16. 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.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in accordance with policies DM2 and DM14 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

17. No development, including any demolition, shall take place until a Construction Environment Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall include a pollution risk assessment and mitigation methods to be implemented, and provide for:

- any requirements for dewatering excavations and how the resulting trade effluent will be managed to comply with the law and prevent pollution;
- the loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- the storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- wheel washing facilities;
- measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction; and
- a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works.

Any changes to these components require the express written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in accordance with policies DM2 and DM14 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015. The details are required prior to commencement as the details relate to the construction of development.

18. No development shall commence until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which first shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The Written Scheme of Investigation shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording.

The programme for post investigation assessment.

Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording.

Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation.

Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation.

Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

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.

Reason: To enable any remains of archaeological significance to be investigated and recorded in accordance with policies DM2 and DM20 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015. The details are required prior to commencement as they relate to matters which require assessment before development can commence.

19. 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 and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition.

Reason: To enable any remains of archaeological significance to be investigated and recorded in accordance with policies DM2 and DM20 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

20. Prior to the occupation of the development a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants within the application site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No part of the development shall be occupied or brought into use until the fire hydrants have been provided in accordance with the approved scheme. Thereafter the hydrants shall be retained in their approved form unless the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority is obtained for any variation.

Reason: To ensure the adequate supply of water for fire fighting and community safety in accordance with policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

21. Prior to their first use in the development, details of proposed photovoltaic panels to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an acceptable form of development in accordance with policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

22. The development hereby permitted shall be occupied in complete accordance with the Odour Management Plan (March 2017) version 5 (document ref ATK-WSOH-PL-RP-EN-006).

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity in accordance with policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

23. The site demolition, preparation and construction works shall be carried out between the hours of 08:00 to 18:00 Mondays to Fridays and between the hours of 08:00 to 13:30 Saturdays and at no time on Sundays or Bank Holidays without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity in accordance with policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

24. Within a 12 month period a maximum of 106,496 tonnes waste and recycled materials may be accepted at the Waste Transfer Station.

Reason: To reflect the scope of the planning application and to protect the amenity of the area in accordance with policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

25. Within a 12 month period a maximum of 607 tonnes of hazardous waste may be accepted at the application site. The operator shall keep a record of all imported material which shall be made available to the Local Planning Authority upon request.

Reason: To reflect the scope of the planning application and to protect the amenity of the area in accordance with policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

26. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted a scheme for the provision of 10 No electric vehicle charging points (to include 7 within the staff parking area, 2 within the fleet parking area and 1 within the visitor parking area) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall include provision

Reason: To promote and facilitate the uptake of electric vehicles on the site in order to enhance local air quality in accordance with Policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015 and Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy.

27. Prior to the commencement of development a Tree Protection Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the approved plan.

Reason: To ensure that landscape features to be retained are adequately protected in accordance with policies DM2 and DM13 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015. The details are required prior to commencement as they relate to the construction of the development.

28. Prior to the first construction of the footpath/cycleway to the south of Barton Hill, a scheme for replacement tree planting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall include provision for the planting of 5 No. Oak trees. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure appropriate mitigation for the loss of trees and to protect the character of the area in accordance with policies DM2 and DM13 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

29. Prior to the implementation of the proposed landscaping to the northern boundary of the site, details of the mound profiles shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure the landscaping can be adequately mitigated in accordance with policies DM2 and DM13 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

30. The development shall not begin, including the removal of tree T1 which lies to the north-east of the site (identified on Appendix 4 Tree Protection Plan of the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment), until details of a replacement Oak tree in accordance with the submitted landscape plan (Dwg No 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-L-7050 P9) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The use of the permitted development shall not commence until the replacement tree has been provided.

Reason: To ensure appropriate mitigation for the loss of trees and to protect the character of the area in accordance with policies DM2 and DM13 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

31. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with section 7 'Mitigation' of the submitted ecology report dated 2 February 2017 prepared by SWT Trading Ltd.

Reason: To ensure appropriate protection and enhancement of ecological features in accordance with policies DM2 and DM12 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

32. The facilities hereby permitted shall not operate outside of the following hours unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority:

Household Waste Recycling Centre

Public opening hours

- 09:00 – 17:00 (Monday – Wednesday, Friday – Sunday)
- 09:00 – 19:00 (Thursday)
- Closed on Christmas Day and New Year's Day

Operational hours

- 06:00 – 20:00 (7 days a week)
- Closed on Christmas Day and New Year's Day

WTS (operational hours only)

- 05:30 – 22:30 (7 days a week)
- Closed on Christmas Day and New Year's Day

Depot (operational hours only)

- 06:00 – 20.00 (Monday – Friday)
- 06:00 – 20:00 (Saturday – for street cleaning services, vehicle and equipment maintenance, trade waste activities and for domestic waste services immediately following bank holidays)
- 06:00 – 20:00 (Sunday - for street cleaning services only)

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity in accordance with policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

33. All vehicles that are to be used on site that are fitted with reversing warning alarms are to be white noise alarms.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the area in accordance with policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

34. Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 7 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order amending, replacing or re-enacting that Order), no fixed plant or machinery, buildings or structures shall be erected, extended or altered at the site without prior permission of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the area and enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control of further development at the site in accordance with policy DM2 of the of the Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015.

Informatives:

- 1) 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.

Any conditions which involve work within the limits of the public highway do not give the applicant permission to carry them out. Unless otherwise agreed in writing all works within the public highway shall be carried out by the County Council or its agents at the applicant's expense.

The County Council's West Area Manager must be contacted on Tel: 01284 758868. For further information go to:
<https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/parking/apply-for-a-dropped-kerb/>

A fee is payable to the Highway Authority for the assessment and inspection of both new vehicular crossing access works and improvements deemed necessary to existing vehicular crossings due to proposed development.

- 2) 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.

- 3) Any works to a watercourse may require consent under section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991
- 4) Any discharge to a watercourse or groundwater needs to comply with the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2003
- 5) 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.
- 6) In accordance with the 'National Planning Policy Framework' the Council confirms it has implemented the requirement to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. In this case amendments and additional information were sought to address objections in relation to drainage and landscaping.

Documents:

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online: <https://planning.westsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=OMQSHRPDN5A00>