

Special Development Control Committee



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the **Special Development Control Committee** held on **Thursday 2 November 2017 at 10.00 am** at the **Conference Chamber, West Suffolk House, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds IP33 3YU**

Present: **Councillors**

Chairman Jim Thorndyke

Vice Chairman Carol Bull and David Roach

John Burns

Terry Clements

Jason Crooks

Robert Everitt

Paula Fox

Susan Glossop

Ian Houlder

Ivor Mclatchy

David Nettleton

Alaric Pugh

Andrew Smith

Julia Wakelam

In attendance:

Sara Broughton

Beccy Hopfensperger

Ward Member for Great Barton

Ward Member for Fornham

5. **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Peter Stevens.

(Councillor Peter Stevens had previously indicated that to avoid the perception of pre-determination and bias due to his close association with the applicant in his capacity as Portfolio Holder for Operations, he would not be present during the consideration of Planning Application No: DC/17/0521/FUL.)

6. **Substitutes**

There were no substitutes present at the meeting.

7. **Planning Application DC/17/0521/FUL - Land North of Hollow Road Farm, Hollow Road, Fornham St Martin (Report No: DEV/SE/17/041)**

(Councillors Robert Everitt, Paula Fox, David Nettleton and David Roach declared local non-pecuniary interests as Members of Suffolk County Council and remained in the meeting for the consideration of this item.)

Creation of a 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, paths, internal roads and paths, parking, weighbridges, and landscaping (as amended)

This application had been originally referred to the Development Control Committee on 19 July 2017 because it was a Major Development, the Parish Councils had objected, and because the applicant was the Council. Furthermore, the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission was contrary to the adopted Development Plan.

The application was deferred from consideration at the 19 July meeting to enable Officers to source further information on specific matters identified by Members during discussion, for reporting back to the Committee.

Amended plans and additional information were then submitted by the applicants; and the planning application was reconsidered at the meeting of the Committee on 21 September 2017, where Members resolved to grant planning permission.

However, the Service Manager (Planning – Development) explained that a matter of policy was raised during the public speaking section of the Committee on 21 September, and following the meeting Officers provided the Chairman with advice with regard to this matter and recommended that further clarification of planning policy was required. As a consequence, the Chairman asked Officers to provide a further report for the Committee on the application.

Therefore, Report No DEV/SE/17/041 formed a comprehensive and stand-alone Committee report. The Service Manager advised the Committee that no regard was to be given to the previous reports considered in July and September.

Furthermore, Members were required to consider the planning application afresh and to reach a resolution, with no weight to be given to the Committee's resolution to grant planning permission in September.

Lastly, the Service Manager reminded the Committee that if they resolved to grant planning permission Officers would consult the Secretary of State in order to provide him with an opportunity to consider whether to call the application in for his own determination.

The Principal Planning Officer then advised on the following updates further to the publication of the agenda:

- A change to the description of development which had been formally agreed with the applicants:
Creation of a 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, paths, internal roads and paths, parking, weighbridges, and landscaping (as amended).
- Corrections to the figures stated in Paragraph 162 of the report in respect of the Transport Assessment:
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~~ **242** staff trips resulting in a total of ~~2052~~ **2152**.

The Officer explained that despite this typographical error the Transport Assessment had tested the correct figures and the Highways Authority had stated that they were satisfied that the Transport Assessment was sufficiently robust.

- Paragraph 144 of the report was to be disregarded in totality, as it made reference to the footpath which had been removed from the application.
- Planning Application DC/17/1359/FUL for a proposed agricultural storage building on land adjacent to the application site was a 'live' application seeking determination and had been mistakenly omitted from Paragraph 21 of the report. The Officer explained that he would make reference to this application within his presentation, however, he did not consider it to have any impact on the application before Members.
- Further representations in respect of the application had been received from the following (the contents of which were verbally summarised):
 - Mark Aston (resident of Fornham St Genevieve)
 - Simon Harding (on behalf of the Suffolk West Action Group)
 - Frank Stennett (of Stennetts in Ingham)
 - A collective letter from the Parishes of Fornham St Martin, Fornham All Saints and Great Barton which had been circulated to all Members of the Committee the day prior to the meeting.

(Councillor Jason Crooks interjected at this point and explained that he had not received a copy of the letter in question, the Chairman subsequently tabled a copy to Councillor Crooks for his reference.)

The Case Officer then responded in detail to the points raised in the letter from the Parishes. In summary, the letter concluded by stating that the application was a departure from the adopted Development Plan, which the Officer report concurred with. Hence, there was nothing raised in the letter which changed the Officer recommendation of approval.

The Deputy Monitoring Officer also addressed the meeting at this point and responded to the points raised within one of the 'late' representations with regard to predetermination. The Officer confirmed that Members were aware of the provisions of Section 25 of the Localism Act 2011 and the importance of not having a closed mind in respect of the proposal before Members that was seeking determination.

Two Member site visits had taken place in respect of the application. Officers were continuing to recommend that the application be approved, subject to the conditions set out in Paragraph 297 of Report No DEV/SE/17/041.

The Principal Planning Officer then made his presentation which outlined the application in detail and in which the Committee was advised that the main issues required to determine the application were as follows, each of which were spoken on in detail with supporting visual slides:

- The Principle of Development and Policy Context
- Highways
- Landscape and Visual Impact
- Noise, Odour and Air Quality

- Drainage and Protection of Groundwater

In conclusion, the Officer summarised the benefits and dis-benefits of the scheme and explained the reasoning behind the balanced recommendation for approval.

A second presentation was then made to the Committee by the Suffolk County Council Highways Officers in attendance.

The presentation opened by explaining that the Highways Authority was only able to recommended refusal of an application where a development was considered to have a 'severe' impact on the highway network.

In response to the application seeking determination, the Highways Officers explained that:

- Whilst the Highway Authority maintained that the provision of a footway on Barton Hill was desirable the removal of this from the scheme did not result in them recommending refusal of the application;
- In terms of the access, the proposed alternative of A134/A143 Compiegne Way (as raised at the 19 July meeting) was not considered viable; and
- With regard to traffic calming, whilst a safety audit had already been undertaken further audits would be carried out during the detailed design process and the design would be adjusted if considered necessary. Furthermore, the Highway Authority continued to advise that a lower speed limit was not appropriate for the location.

The Chairman then invited the following registered public speakers to speak in turn. He explained that due to the level of public interest in this application, he had again (as per the 19 July and 21 September arrangements) varied the Committee's protocol for public speaking on this occasion. To be fair and equitable to all interested parties, each category of public speaking had been extended to allow a total time allocation of 12 minutes instead of the usual three:

- (a) **Objector** – Mr Colin Hilder, representing Lark Valley Gravel Group and Hengrave Belt Amenity Group;
- (b) **Objector** - Mr Mark Aston, a resident of Fornham St Genevieve;

(Prior to commencing his 3 minute speaking allocation Mr Aston sought clarification with regard to the location of the application site, which the Case Officer had referred to within his presentation as being "on the outskirts of Bury St Edmunds", when it was located within the village of Fornham St Martin. The Case Officer was invited to respond by the Chairman and he clarified that the site was within Fornham St Martin and was not within the town of Bury St Edmunds.)

- (c) **Objector** – Mrs Sarah Bartram, a resident of Great Barton and former resident of Fornham St Martin;
- (d) **Objector** – Mrs Penny Borrett, as resident of Fornham St Martin;

- (e) **Supporter** – Mr Steve Lumley, occupier of an immediate neighbouring business at Hollow Road Farm;
- (f) **Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve Parish Council** – Councillor Mike Collier, Chairman;
- (g) **Fornham All Saints Parish Council** – Councillor Howard Quayle, Chairman;
- (h) **Great Barton Parish Council** – Councillor Philip Reeve, Chairman;
- (i) **Bury St Edmunds Town Council** – Councillor Tom Murray, Chairman;
- (j) **Ward Member** – Councillor Beccy Hopfensperger, Fornham Ward;
- (k) **Ward Member** – Councillor Sarah Broughton, Great Barton Ward;
- (l) **Agent** – Mr Richard Sykes-Popham, agent for the applicant; and
- (m) **Applicant** – Mr Bryn Griffiths, Suffolk County Council, applicant.

(At the end of the public speaking, the Chairman adjourned the meeting for a short comfort break. The meeting resumed at 12.20pm.)

A detailed debate then ensued with the following points raised:

- (a) Councillor David Nettleton asked if the policy matter had been raised by Councillor Philip Reeve (Great Barton Parish Council) on 21 September 2017. The Service Manager (Planning – Development) confirmed that was the case but explained that this point was not pertinent to the consideration of this application, which Members had been advised to consider afresh.
Councillor Nettleton stressed that the site was in the countryside and the proposal was for an industrial complex. In his opinion there had not been 'exceptional circumstances' demonstrated to justify the departure from the Development Plan.
Councillor Nettleton also raised questions with regard to the process if the application was refused and concerning the weighting of the material considerations in respect of the application site.
The Case Officer explained that if the application was refused the applicants would have the right of appeal, as per the normal process. With regard to the weightings in respect of the application site, the Officer stressed that Members were only considering the application before them, irrespective of the weight that could be attributed to alternative site(s).
- (b) Councillor Julia Wakelam also raised similar questions with regard to the weightings attributed to the benefits and dis-benefits of the proposal. In response to which, the Case Officer clarified that the 'windfall' of development, on those sites that would be vacated if the application was approved, was purely weighted on the benefits of that windfall development – not the financial benefits brought about by developing on those site(s).

The Service Manager (Planning - Development) further stressed that financial savings were not a material planning consideration.

- (c) Councillor Terry Clements spoke on his personal experience of navigating the roads in question as a passenger of an HGV vehicle and stressed the need to ensure that the movement of these types of vehicles was prescribed in terms of their access to the site via specific conditions. He voiced disappointment that there was not to be a reduction in the speed limit.

The Suffolk County Council Highways Officer that was in attendance responded and explained that the Highways Authority followed nationally prescribed guidance in respect of speed limits and reiterated that they did not consider a lower speed limit to be appropriate for the location.

- (d) Councillor Alaric Pugh spoke at length in support of the application. He praised the Case Officer for such a comprehensive report in which the benefits of the scheme were clearly balanced and justified the recommendation for approval. Councillor Pugh stressed the need to judge each application on its own merits as not all land classifications were 'equal' when considered in detail;

- (e) Councillor Robert Everitt spoke in support of the application by making reference to the wider community benefit of the scheme in view of a growing population and increased need. He also spoke on the established successful relationship between the Borough Council, and Forest Heath District Council in delivering waste services in partnership for many years – with colocation being the next logical step. These comments were echoed to some extent by both Councillors David Roach and Andrew Smith who believed that the future proofing and colocation benefits outweighed the disbenefits of the scheme;

- (f) Councillor John Burns raised concerns with regard to the application and also expressed disappointment at the lack of a reduced speed limit. He raised caution with regard to proposed changes to household waste sites across the county and the impact this could have on the scheme. Councillor Burns also raised questions with regard to waste limits and the potential cumulative traffic impacts with other future schemes, if approved.

The Case Officer explained that the scheme was unable to mitigate *future* development, it would be down to the future development to address their own impacts alongside all other considerations. In relation to any matters reserved by planning conditions in connection with the application Planning Officers would seek legal advice as to whether these could be dealt with via Officer delegation or if a report would need to be brought back to the Committee.

Lastly, in respect of waste weight limits the Officer clarified that if the prescribed limits were exceeded by the facility then this would be a planning breach and would be subject to enforcement by the Planning Authority. It would also be open to the applicant to apply for planning permission to vary the limits in advance.

(g) A number of other questions/comments were raised in relation to the following: what the site was used for, the capacity of the existing facility at Rougham Hill, the travel plan, land levels and disabled access.

The Case Officer then responded to the points raised as follows:

Land Use – the Planning Authority was not aware of what the land in question was specifically used for previously, only that it was 'agricultural use';

Capacity at Rougham Hill – the Committee was reminded that the Rougham Hill facility was purely a household waste site, at present. And that capacity was not a key driver in terms of the proposed scheme;

Travel Plan – the Case Officer explained that facilities in rural locations limited the influence of a Travel Plan. Hence, the applicants had emphasised staff movement within their Travel Plan. Whilst it was recognised that there would be some increased staff movement across West Suffolk to the new facility, this was to be balanced against the significant decreases in HGV movements that the scheme would result in;

Land Levels and Disabled Access – attention was drawn to the relevant slides within the presentation that demonstrated the land levels across the site. The Case Officer assured the Committee that this would not affect users' stability in anyway. Members were also advised that the proposed facility included a number of accessibility benefits, a key one being that containers in the household waste recycling centre would be 'at level', meaning there were no steps for users to navigate.

Councillor Ian Houlder spoke in support of the application and stated that he considered that the reasons for departing from the adopted Development Plan had been comprehensively addressed by the Case Officer. He moved that the application be approved, as per the Officer recommendation. This was duly seconded by Councillor Carol Bull who concurred with Councillor Houlder's statement.

Prior to the vote being taken on the motion for approval Councillor David Nettleton requested a recorded vote and this was supported by five other Members, in line with the Committee's Procedure Rules.

Upon being put to the vote Members voted as follows:

| Name of Member | For | Against | Abstained |
|-----------------------|------------|----------------|------------------|
| Carol Bull | X | | |
| John Burns | | X | |
| Terry Clements | | X | |
| Jason Crooks | | X | |
| Robert Everitt | X | | |
| Paula Fox | X | | |
| Susan Glossop | X | | |
| Ian Houlder | X | | |
| Ivor Mclatchy | X | | |
| David Nettleton | | X | |
| Alaric Pugh | X | | |

| Name of Member | For | Against | Abstained |
|-----------------------|------------|----------------|------------------|
| David Roach | X | | |
| Andrew Smith | X | | |
| Jim Thorndyke | X | | |
| Julia Wakelam | | X | |
| TOTAL | 10 | 5 | 0 |

With 10 voting for the motion and 5 against, it was resolved that

Decision

Subject to the Secretary of State (upon consultation) confirming that he does not intend to call in the planning application for this own determination, planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun no later than 3 years from the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the approved plans and documents.
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 P07. Thereafter the access shall be retained in the specified form.
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.
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.
6. No development shall commence on the path shown on drawing No. 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-C-7002 P07 until construction specifications have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The path shall thereafter be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development.
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 a routing strategy to avoid non A roads until C735 from A134 and before and after highway and verge condition surveys on Fornham Road and Barton Hill.
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.

9. The use shall not commence until the areas within the site shown on 5121919-ATK-WSOH-PL-DR-C-7002 Rev P07 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.
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.
11. Prior to the development hereby permitted being first brought into use, the Framework Travel Plan (dated August 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 for a period of 5 years from the site being brought in to use.
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.
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 August 2017).
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.
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.
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.
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.
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.
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.
 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.
 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.
 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).
 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.
 24. Within a 12 month period a maximum of 106,496 tonnes waste and materials for recycling may be accepted at the Waste Transfer Station. The operator shall keep a record of all imported material which shall be made available to the Local Planning Authority upon request.
 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.
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 an approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
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.
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.
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.
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.
32. The facilities hereby permitted shall not operate outside of the following hours unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority:
- 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)
- 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
33. All vehicles that are to be used on site that are fitted with reversing warning alarms are to be white noise alarms.
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.
35. Prior to the commencement of any development a scheme for the provision and implementation of foul water drainage shall be submitted

- to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans and/or specifications at such time(s) as may be specified in the approved scheme.
36. Prior to the first use of the Waste Collection Depot, the Household Waste Recycling Centre or the Waste Transfer Station, a strategy (or strategies) for the management, control and/or avoidance of vermin, birds and litter for that individual facility shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the facilities shall be operated fully in accordance with the approved strategy (or strategies).
 37. Prior to the construction of any individual building at the application site, a schedule of the colour finishes to be applied externally to the walls and roof of that building shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter the approved colour finishes shall be applied to the individual building before it is first brought into use.
 38. The development shall be carried out and operated fully in accordance with Sections 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 of the Odour Management Plan, submitted with the planning application and forming part of the package of approved documents.

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.

The meeting concluded at 1.21 pm

Signed by:

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank