

Development Control Committee
3 June 2020

**Planning Application DC/18/2210/FUL –
Land at Willie Snaithe Road, Newmarket**

Date Registered:	23.11.2018	Expiry Date:	10.06.2020
Case Officer:	Adam Ford	Recommendation:	Grant
Parish:	Newmarket Town Council	Ward:	Newmarket North
Proposal:	Planning Application - (i) 2no drive-through cafe/restaurant units (Use Class A1/A3 for Costa and Use Class A3/A5 for McDonald's) with associated parking and landscaping and (ii) McDonalds Climbing box		
Applicant:	C.I. Industries Ltd		

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:

Adam Ford

Email: adam.ford@westsuffolk.gov.uk

Telephone: 01284 757353

Background:

Due to the conflict between the Officer recommendation of APPROVAL and the objection from the Town Council, this application was considered by the West Suffolk Delegation Panel on 19 May 2020.

The members of the Panel resolved that the application should be referred to the Development Control Committee with a (virtual) site visit.

The application is recommended for APPROVAL subject to planning conditions and Section 106 agreement to secure a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).

Proposal:

1. The application proposes two drive-through café/restaurants with associated parking and landscaping. Access will be provided via the existing truncated roundabout off Fordham Road which also serves Wickes.
2. The McDonalds unit, which sits on the Northern boundary of the site is a two-storey development with an internal floor area of 501m². The Costa Coffee unit which sits adjacent to the site's Eastern boundary is a single storey building with an internal floor area of 167.23m²
3. In total, the scheme provides 82 car parking spaces with landscaping proposed on the site boundaries.
4. The application is supported by the following:
 - Planning Statement
 - Design and Access Statement
 - Transport Assessment – traffic notes, safety audit (updated)
 - Noise Assessment
 - Retail Impact Assessment including Sequential Test
 - Drainage strategy and maintenance plan
 - Foul drainage assessment
 - Landscaping strategy
 - Land contamination assessment
 - Existing and proposed elevations and floor plans
5. It should be noted, when considering the above, that since the original submission, a number of amended plans / documents to address highway matters have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority.
6. All plans and documents which have been superseded are clearly labelled as such on the website. Those which represent amended or updated versions are also clearly marked as such.

Site Details:

7. The 0.42hectare application site lies within the defined settlement boundary for Newmarket. The application site lies to the north of the town centre with Willie Snaith road bounding the north west of the site and Fordham Road to the north east. To the immediate west is the Wickes store and to the south east is George Lambton playing fields. A large Tesco store lies to the North of the application site.
8. The site at present is partly laid out as hardstanding to provide parking for the Wickes store, albeit has never been used, with the remainder overgrown.
9. The site was designated as an employment site in the Forest Heath Local Plan 1995 and forms part of a wider employment area under policy SA16(m) of the adopted Site Allocations Local Plan 2019.

Planning History:

Reference	Proposal	Status	Decision Date
DC/18/2211/ADV	Application for Advertisement Consent - (i) 3no internally illuminated fascia signs, (ii) 1no internally illuminated height barrier	Application Withdrawn	15.04.2020
F/2004/1016/CCA	County Application: construction of 3m wide pedestrian/cycle path	No Objections	17.01.2005

Consultations:

10.Economic Development Team

- No objection to the proposal whilst noting the 'employment' status of the application site.

11.SCC Highway Authority

- As evidenced on the Planning Authority's website, the Highway Authority have submitted multiple formal comments with respect to this application. The section of this report entitled "*Highway implications*" within the Officer comment section details the responses from the Highway Authority in detail.
- Whilst initially the Highway Authority objected to the proposal in their comments dated 24th January 2019 and 2nd February 2019, in their most recent comments dated 15th April, no objection has been raised.

- Subject to the requested planning conditions and a S106 agreement for a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), the Highway Authority raise no objection to this proposal.

12. Public Health and Housing

- Although Costa have specified operating hours as daytime only, it is understood McDonalds do intend to operate throughout the night-time. A noise assessment presents predicted noise levels associated with use of each drive thru and from customer car parking activity and compares them with the guideline values contained within the WHO Community Noise Guidelines, looking particularly at the night time maximum noise level.

The report concludes that the peak or maximum noise levels predicted to arise from 'drive thru' activity at both the proposed McDonalds and Costa restaurants will fall well within the WHO guideline values for daytime and night time noise. In addition, the combined overall noise levels from the drive thru activities are generally below the measured LAeq 1 hour levels. It is therefore concluded that the proposed drive thru facilities could trade on an unrestricted 24 hour basis without giving rise to a significant adverse impact at the nearest residential premises. Bearing in mind that the background noise level recorded in April are likely to be on the low side, the results can be considered to be generally robust.

- It must however be noted that all noise monitoring is averaged out and there will be occasions when the noise levels from individual vehicles using the drive thru facilities may still be audible above background levels, particularly if engines are being revved on site or customers are playing loud music within the vehicle.
- No objections subject to conditions controlling construction hours, noise, ventilation details, lighting and delivery hours.

13. Environment Team

- The application is supported by a Site Investigation Report undertaken by Ground Engineering Ltd, reference C13766, dated April 2016. The report includes both a desk study and intrusive investigation and provides an appropriate risk assessment. The report concludes that the site is suitable for use as a commercial development and no special precautions are required. Therefore, satisfied with the contents and conclusions of the report and do not require any further assessment at this stage.

Two electric vehicle charge points (rapid EVCP) are shown on the plan and described within the Transport Assessment which is in line with adopted policy. A condition is recommended to ensure these are installed.

14. Commercial Environmental Health

- No objections to this planning application in principle. However, the businesses must comply with food hygiene regulation requirements.

15. Suffolk Fire and Rescue

- Recommends that fire hydrants be installed within this development on a suitable route for laying hose, i.e. avoiding obstructions. Offers guidance to applicant regarding sprinklers.

Representations:

16. Newmarket Town Council

- The objection from Suffolk Highways is supported and this planning application is objected to on highway grounds and because it is in contravention of the Newmarket Neighbourhood Plan, specifically Policy NKT32.

17. Ward Councillor

- No comments received.

18. Public comments

Objections have been received from residents at 1 and 3 Hatchfield Cottages and Hatchfield Cottages annexe, concerning the following:

- Increased traffic on two busy and dangerous roads (Willie Snaith Road and Fordham Road).
- Litter, odour, noise and light.
- A drive thru restaurant already operates on Fordham Road why is another required.

Planning Policy:

19. On 1 April 2019 Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council were replaced by a single Authority, West Suffolk Council. The development plans for the previous local planning authorities were carried forward to the new Council by Regulation. The Development Plans remain in place for the new West Suffolk Council and, with the exception of the Joint Development Management Policies document (which had been adopted by both Councils), set out policies for defined geographical areas within the new authority. It is therefore necessary to determine this application with reference to policies set out in the plans produced by the now dissolved Forest Heath District Council.

20. The following policies of the Joint Development Management Policies Document and the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy 2010 and Vision 2031 have been taken into account in the consideration of this application:

Joint Development Management Policies Document:

- Policy DM1 Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy DM2 Creating Places
- Policy DM6 Flooding and Sustainable Drainage
- Policy DM7 Sustainable Design and Construction
- Policy DM14 Safeguarding from hazards
- Policy DM30 Appropriate Employment Uses and protection of Employment land
- Policy DM35 Proposals for Main Town Centre Uses
- Policy DM45 Transport Assessments and Travel Plans
- Policy DM46 Parking Standards

Former Forest Heath Core Strategy May 2010

- Policy CS5 Design Quality and Local Distinctiveness
- Policy CS6 Sustainable Economic and Tourism Development
- Policy CS11 Retail and Town Centre Strategy

Site allocations Local Plan 2019

- Policy SA16m – Employment areas

Newmarket Neighbourhood Plan 2020

- NKT32 – Gateways into the Town

Other Planning Policy:

21. The NPPF was revised in February 2019 and is a material consideration in decision making from the day of its publication. Paragraph 213 is clear however, that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the revised NPPF. Due weight should be given to them according to their degree of consistency with the Framework; the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework; the greater weight that may be given. The policies set out within the Joint Development Management Policies have been assessed in detail and are considered sufficiently aligned with the provision of the 2019 NPPF that full weight can be attached to them in the decision making process.

Officer Comment:

22. The material considerations to be taken into account when determining this application are as follows:

- Principle of development
- Design, form and scale and resultant visual amenity
- Residential Amenity
- Highway safety/traffic/parking
- Ecology matters

- Other issues

Procedural matter

23. Planning law (Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless **material** considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF itself reiterates the primacy of the development plan at paragraph 12.

Principle of development

24. This proposal seeks planning permission for uses within classes A1, A3 & A5 of the Use Classes Order with the principle use being for a restaurant and café for the sale of food and drink on the premises. Ancillary drive through facilities enabling consumption off the premises are also provided.

25. From a National Planning Policy perspective, the 2019 NPPF includes a number of paragraphs which are directly relevant to this proposal, and these are as follows:

- Paragraph 86 states that Local Planning Authorities should apply a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre uses which are neither in an existing centre nor in accordance with an up-to-date plan. Main town centre uses should be located in town centres, then in edge of centre locations; and only if suitable sites are not available (or expected to become available within a reasonable period) should out of centre sites be considered.
- Paragraph 87 provides that when considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites which are well connected to the town centre.
- Paragraph 90 states that if an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact on existing provisions, it should be refused.

26. From a local policy perspective, the (former) FHDC Core Strategy offers support to the proposal through a number of policy provisions. Within the confines of policy CS1, the Spatial Strategy for the District focuses growth in the towns and key service centres where employment, housing, services and facilities can be provided in close proximity with each other. As such, given the site's location within the defined settlement boundary, the broad principle of development is something that the Local Planning Authority can support subject to material planning considerations.

27. Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy offers a general degree of support to proposals which give rise to an economic benefit and those which generate employment opportunities. It is noted that policy CS6 is slanted towards supporting B1, B2 and B8 uses but it is important to acknowledge the

economic and employment advantages which can be offered through non-conventional 'employment' uses such as the one proposed.

28. Additionally, Policy CS11 of the FHDC Core Strategy Document states that support will typically be given to those proposals which maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of hierarchy towns – including key service centres – where material planning concerns do not indicate otherwise. Whilst it is noted that policy CS11 is intentionally worded to focus on the provision of retail uses, it does, at the same time, provide *general* support for other uses that would typically be found within town centres.

29. Reflecting on the provisions within the aforementioned NPPF paragraphs, policy DM35 classifies A1, A3 and A5 uses as town centre uses and states that proposals for uses within these classes which are:

1. not in a defined centre and
2. not in accordance with an up to date Local Plan

must apply a sequential approach in selecting the site; demonstrating that there are no suitable, viable and available sites in defined centres or edge of centre locations. This is a crucial element of the development plan as the proposal triggers both points 1 and 2 as set out above. To establish the principle of development in this location, a sequential test is therefore required by the Local Planning Authority and it should be noted that one has been submitted.

30. In applying the sequential approach, the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) states that the use of the sequential test should recognise that certain main town centres uses have particular market and locational requirements which means that they may only be accommodated in specific locations.

31. The brownfield application site is located in an 'out of centre' location that is characterised by commercial uses such as Wickes and Tesco, with the wider area encompassing offices and a retail park as well as another drive through restaurant. On this basis, the applicant makes the argument that despite the out of centre location the site is located within an established retail & service destination.

32. The proposal is for two drive-through facilities which, given their draw, are unlikely to be accommodated within a town centre with the success of these types of proposals being in such a specific out of town location. The desirability of enticing more vehicular traffic into the town centre should also be considered, as such uses still contribute to the local economy but help to prevent undue congestion and traffic within more centralised locations.

33. In this instance, as clarified above, given the provisions of policy DM35, a sequential test has been carried out by the applicant. A degree of flexibility in scale and format was applied, however, as demonstrated within the report, none of the potential sites within the town centre - or just outside the centre - met the required criteria and were available for development.

A retail impact assessment, although submitted, is not a material consideration in this case, given that the scale of development proposed falls below the threshold for assessing impact.

34. The site was designated as an employment site in the Forest Heath Local Plan 1995 and forms part of a wider employment area under policy SA16(m) of the Site Allocations Local Plan 2019. Employment uses are defined as B1, B2 and B8 uses and, as a result, the proposed use would not constitute an 'employment' use in development plan terms. However, although not an 'employment use' per se, it is anticipated that the development as proposed will create 70 jobs (25 full time and 45 part time) and this will be in addition to the wider economic benefits that the development would deliver.
35. Consequently, on the face of it, whilst this development appears to represent a conflict with adopted policy, policy DM30 is clear that proposals for non-employment uses on sites allocated as such will only be resisted where there is deemed to be an *adverse impact* on employment generation. In this instance, given the time that the site has sat vacant and with respect to the number of jobs likely to be created, a significant conflict with the development plan as a whole is not considered to arise.
36. The West Suffolk Retail and Leisure Study 2016 provided an assessment of Newmarket's retail offer and concluded that whilst the number of units has increased slightly there has been no significant change in the scale of Newmarket's offer over the last five years, which highlights a lack of major new retail investment and development in the centre. It recognises that leisure uses are well represented although there are limited multiple brands in the food and beverage category. The report acknowledges that multiples are a strong draw for customers and help to generate frequent shopping within an area.
37. The site has been used intermittently as a park and ride car park but otherwise has been empty for a prolonged period. The adjacent site was recently developed as a Wickes store and in conjunction with this development, part of this site was tarmacked and laid out as car parking. Whilst this area of the site was intended as overflow parking for Wickes, the site access has been blocked and the site therefore, never used. The Wickes permission was recently amended to remove this car parking as allocation for Wickes and enable the current application to be considered on its own merits.
38. In conclusion, a sequential assessment has been undertaken in accordance with both DM35 and the NPPF. The Local Authority are satisfied with the content of this assessment which concludes that no suitable and available sites exist that can adequately accommodate the proposed development. Furthermore, whilst it is acknowledged that the site is identified as an employment site, it has had this designation since 1995 and yet has remained undeveloped. The development proposed will generate jobs and compliment the surrounding commercial uses such that a material conflict with DM30 does not arise. Both local and national planning policy objectives seek to attract high quality economic development, creating a strong,

competitive economy which encourages sustainable business and improves the mix and quality of jobs and the scheme is judged to deliver on these aspects.

39. On this basis, given the degree of support offered to the proposal through both the NPPF, the Core Strategy and policies DM35 and DM30 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document, the principle of development is something that can be supported. This, however, is subject to the other material planning considerations set out below.

Appearance and visual amenity

40. With the broad principle of development established as being something that the Local Planning Authority can support, consideration must next be given to the proposal's design form and scale.

41. In conjunction with Policy CS5, Policy DM2 provides that proposals for development should recognise and address the key features and characteristics of the locality within which they're proposed. The NPPF also clarifies the role of good design and the importance of not undermining existing visual amenity at paragraphs 110 and 124.

42. The style of the buildings in the surrounding area is varied but they are generally of contemporary design reflecting particular functional and practical requirements of the buildings' uses. In this case, both units propose the use of timber cladding and grey aluminium fascia details, are flat roofed and with a commercial appearance. This enables them to assimilate into the prevailing vernacular and prevents the proposed built form from appearing as visually jarring additions which contrast with the landscape within which they sit.

43. The flat roofed McDonalds building is two storeys with an eaves height of 7.2 metres whereas the lesser scaled Costa building measures 5.3 metres to its ridge. It is acknowledged that, particularly McDonalds, is a large building which will be readily apparent in approaching views from the north (Exning and the A14). As a comparison, the eaves height of the adjacent Wickes store which was recently approved is 8.7m. This development would therefore reduce the openness of the site and views from the south. However, bearing in mind the nature of the built form to the north and west the development, this would not appear out of character with the area and these buildings would be seen (from the south and East) against a backdrop of similar buildings. Simply being visible is not necessarily something that should be resisted; where buildings harmonise with their environment and do not adversely impact the prevailing vernacular or character, merely being *apparent* is not adequate justification for refusal.

44. The buildings as proposed do not appear as unduly large additions and nor do they loom over the street scene in a way that the Local Planning Authority would seek to resist. It is noted, given reliance on passing trade, that they are designed to be visually conspicuous, but they are not so large or ill-proportioned that they demonstrably harm the existing vernacular. Given

that the site is allocated for employment use and bearing in mind the nature of the immediate locality's built form, it is not considered that the scale of the proposed units are unacceptable. A large area of hardstanding is proposed and the positions chosen for the buildings will largely hide this. Landscaping has also been proposed, which, although not extensive nor designed to screen or obscure the buildings, it will assist in softening views and providing a softer frame to the proposal.

45. With respect to the visual impact of the development, Newmarket Town Council have objected to the development on the basis that it conflicts with the Newmarket Neighbourhood Plan policy NKT32. This policy seeks to ensure that any development proposals at the gateways to the town defined on the proposals map should be high quality and sympathetic to the locality. This policy document acknowledges that this entrance to the town is 'dominated by commercial and warehouse-type buildings with obvious branding' and has 'no real sense of a 'Newmarket' identity'. However, whilst this is noted, the site is allocated as an employment site and has remained empty for years as an overgrown informal car park; this detracts from the area and offers no visual enhancement. Given that no plans have been promoted for a different use on this site, it is considered very unlikely that an alternative land use, which would not rely on similarly scaled or styled buildings would be pursued. Presently, the existing site does little to contribute positively to the street scene and as such, it is likely that its redevelopment will prove to be an enhancement.

46. As noted above, in considering the concerns raised by the Town Council due regard must be had to the policy's wording as *published* and adopted – additional meaning or intention cannot and should not be imposed. Accepting that the site forms a gateway into the town, albeit an area designated for commercial styled uses, policy NKT 32 is worded as follows:

- *"Any new development or re-development at the gateways to the town (as identified on the Policies Map) and in particular along the A142, should be of high quality and sympathetic to the locality"*

Therefore, despite the objection raised by the Town Council, given the prevailing vernacular and character of the locality, a material conflict with policy NKT 32 is not judged to arise and is not considered to be something which would withstand scrutiny at appeal. The two buildings, by virtue of their design and scale are sympathetic to the locality as required by the policy and there are no material planning reasons to suggest that the built form would be of a poor quality and conflict with policy NKT 32.

47. In conclusion, whilst the development will, quite naturally be visible to users of the highway and the wider area, this would not give rise to a proposal which causes undue visual harm to either the immediate or wider context. With respect to the form and scale, the proposals are therefore considered to be appropriate for the application site and exhibit a satisfactory degree of compliance with policies CS5, DM2 and NKT 32 to enable the Local Planning Authority to support them.

Residential Amenity

48. Policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document is clear in that proposals for all development should not, taking mitigation measures into account, adversely impact the amenities of adjacent areas by reason of noise, smell, vibration, overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light, volume or type of vehicular activity generated. The NPPF at paragraph 127 also sets out that proposals should not harm existing levels of amenity.
49. In this instance, the proposed development does not share a boundary with any sensitive developments or land uses. The closest development is the existing Wickes building. Given the commercial nature of Wickes, an adverse impact on amenity is not judged to arise.
50. However, there are a small number of residential properties located to the east of the application site and objections have been submitted by a number of these properties. Concerns have been raised by residents living opposite at Hatchfield Farm Cottages that the development will be visible from these dwellings above existing boundary hedging. Visually, given the degree of separation and the wider sense of openness, this is not deemed to represent a significant nor material conflict with DM2.
51. As part of the formal submission, a noise assessment has been carried out and Public Health and housing are content that due to the existing (relatively high) background noise levels in this location, it is unlikely that any further disturbance will be caused by the development, including during night time hours.
52. With respect to the noise concerns raised, a baseline acoustic survey was undertaken from 20:24 hours on Wednesday 22nd April until 09.30 hours on Thursday 23rd April 2020, at a single measurement location in the south east corner of the proposal site, broadly representative of the noise climate at Hatchfield Cottages.
53. Whilst it is likely that the noise levels, due to a reduction in vehicle movements during the COVID-19 pandemic restrictions were lower than normal, the levels generally compare with those measured back in 2015 when the Tesco application was submitted. The report concludes that the peak or maximum noise levels predicted to arise from 'drive thru' activity at both the proposed McDonalds and Costa restaurants will fall well within the WHO guideline values for daytime and night time noise.
54. In addition the combined overall noise levels from the drive thru activities are generally below the measured LAeq 1 hour levels. It is therefore concluded that the proposed drive thru facilities could trade on an unrestricted 24 hour basis without giving rise to a significant adverse impact at the nearest residential premises. Bearing in mind that the background noise level recorded in April are likely to be on the low side, the results can be considered to be generally robust. It must however be noted that all noise monitoring is averaged out and there will likely be

occasions when the noise levels from individual vehicles using the drive thru facilities may still be audible. However, these would represent single one-off events and would not amount to a persistent or significant erosion of residential amenity.

55. Conditions have been recommended to ensure ventilation and plant will satisfactorily deal with odour emissions without causing a noise nuisance, lighting details will need to be submitted and approved, as will details of litter bins within the site.

56. Accordingly, in light of the above, a materially adverse impact upon residential amenity is not deemed to arise and DM2 is considered to be suitably met by the development.

Ecology matters

57. As required by the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) at paragraphs 8c, 170 and 175 the LPA have a duty to consider the conservation of biodiversity and to ensure that valued landscapes or sites of biodiversity are protected when determining planning applications. At a local level, this is exhibited through policies CS2, DM10, DM11 and DM12.

58. The National Planning Policy Framework indicates that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities must aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity and that opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged (Paragraph 175). This is underpinned by Paragraph 8 of the Framework, which details the three overarching objectives that the planning system should try to achieve and it is here that the Framework indicates that planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

59. In this instance, given the urban context and pre developed nature of the site away from any points of biodiversity interest, the proposal is not judged to be one which has the potential to inflict harm upon local biodiversity or require further supporting information. No valuable habitats are at risk and the site is not subject to any special protection from an ecological perspective. As such, a phase 1 ecology report has not been submitted nor requested by the Local Planning Authority.

60. Policy DM12 advises that where development proposals are approved, ecological enhancement measures should be secured which are commensurate and proportionate to the development. In this instance, given the urban location and proximity to a main artery road into the Town, a condition requiring ecological enhancements is not considered to be necessary and nor would it be justified.

Highway implications

61. At paragraph 109, the 2019 NPPF provides that applications for planning permission should, where it is possible to do so, enable safe use of public highways for all stakeholders. The extent to which this is required will of course be dependent upon and commensurate to the scale of development proposed and the degree of interaction with the public highway – which, in this instance, is considered to be high.

62. In this instance, vehicular access is provided via the existing roundabout which serves the existing Tesco and Wickes stores. The Wickes access would also serve the application site. The site is well accessed by pedestrian links which will continue throughout the site. A cycle lane exists on Fordham Road providing access and two bus stops are located on Willie Snaith Road close to the site.

63. Significant discussion has taken place between the applicant, the Highway Authority and the Local Planning Authority during the consideration of the application to assess the potential traffic impacts of the development. This has involved a comprehensive transport assessment (TA), surveys, traffic notes and plan redesign. This dialogue is synthesised in the narrative below.

64. Since the initial submission of this application, the Highway Authority have submitted five sets of formal comments as set out below.

65. Initial comments dated 24th January 2019

In their initial comments, the Highway Authority recommended a holding objection due to an identified 'severe risk' to Highway safety. The formal response from the Highway Authority raised the following:

- No safe pedestrian links to off site development provided
- Insufficient parking spaces
- Incompatible site layout
- Lack of information relating to deliveries, bin stores and cycle stores

66. Further comments dated 2 February 2019

In addition to the comments dated 24th January 2019, further comments were provided on the 2nd February 2019 and these raised further issues for the applicant to address.

In conjunction with needing to re-consider the parking provisions, the Highway Authority asked for the following:

- 1) A detailed assessment of the proposed car parking provision should be provided.
- 2) Updated traffic surveys should be undertaken.
- 3) Junction geometries should be evidenced.
- 4) Traffic flow diagrams should be provided.
- 5) Information on how the junction model has been validated should be provided.

67. Further comments dated 28 August 2019

Based on the request for further information as set out by the Highway Authority on 2nd February 2019, the applicant provided an updated traffic assessment which sought to clarify the Highway Authority's requests for further information.

In response to this amendment, the Highway Authority commented as follows:

- We note the revised TA has up to date traffic count data, which we welcome, but if this traffic data is to be relied upon in the highway junction and queue analysis, a 14-day ATC (Automatic Traffic Counter) should be used. The results of the one day turning survey traffic turning distribution should then be applied to the 14-day counts. This will better highlight any peaks and anomalies.
- We note the applicant has not investigated re-designing the site to allow a longer drive-thru queuing lane, which is disappointing. We note the revised layout has addressed some of our concerns regarding pedestrian access through the site.
- We note the applicant has provided a proposed drainage strategy and we are currently seeking advice from the LLFA as we have concerns with soak-aways close to the highway. We normally recommend 6.0m clearance between soak-aways and the outer edge of any highway construction. Regardless of the outcome of the above, the Highway Authority retain a HOLDING OBJECTION until such time as the car-parking proposed for McDonalds and Costa is not allocated to another site.

68. In addition to these comments, the Highway Authority provided a further, more detailed analysis of the transport assessment as reproduced below:

"Wickes Car Parking Provision

It is noted that the survey of the Wickes store shows it functioning comfortably within capacity; however, the potential exists another operator could use the store, assessment of this potential is undertaken using a TRICS assessment, which is based on weighted average parking and results in a peak occupancy of 47 vehicles for 55 bays, this equates to just over 85% occupancy and leaves 8 bays available. Given that this is based on a weighted average and that it is only an hourly survey, meaning that the peaks are not actually being recorded, it leaves very little room for error, and it is recommended that an assessment of the 85%ile car parking demand is undertaken, which outlines the potential occupancy and implications of whether the car park would exceed capacity and for how long.

This would provide a robust assessment of the provision and set out the potential risks.

McDonalds Site

Within the TA, three assessments, in terms of capacity have been undertaken of the proposed layout, these relate to; car parking, junction capacity and the drive-thru. As they are all interrelated and adjustments to one assessment can effect another, I have set out how the applicant could provide a more robust assessment to give the highway authority greater confidence in the site's operation.

Only Three McDonalds stores have been used as part of the assessment. Although, the updated Transport Assessment compares the proposed unit to the surveyed three stores and highlights that they are not unreasonable comparisons, the limited dataset means that there is inherently risk in the assessment, ideally you would want a far greater dataset for confidence. The simplest way to address this and provide a more robust assessment of the car parking, junction capacity and drive-thru is to assess the proposals based on the busiest store surveyed, this would give confidence in the robustness of the assessment. For instance, the busiest drive thru queue at any McDonalds is actually 20 vehicles – so for the proposal site the assessment should be updated to identify whether the site could cope with this level of queueing, and what the implications would be on car parking (reduce the potential provision) and the site access arrangements (would vehicles still be able to access and move around the site) or would it result on queuing back onto the highway. This assessment should be set out in the context of how long significant levels queuing associated with the Drive-Thru could reasonably be expected to last and during what hours.

The assessment of the Costa is based on a single survey, and so presents a significant amount of risk, including how the customer survey has been used to apportion parking. This could be addressed by surveying additional sites or by including some inherent risk within the assessment (all vehicles park onsite etc) – perhaps using the variation between the McDonalds sites as an indicator of potential variation or another reasonable method.

As part of previous discussions, the potential for minor improvements at the site access roundabout have been discussed, however, this has not been suggested given the updated results of the transport modelling. The reasons for the updated results, including how they differ from the previously submitted TA should be identified (most likely this is as a result of the updated traffic survey), but any changes to the junction models, or any other element of the assessment, should be noted so it can be understood why the assessment results in different impacts at the junctions. It is worth considering the use of an

ATC to provide greater confidence in the updated traffic data when compared to the historic data.

The additional data used for the assessment should be provided, this includes the:

- *Traffic survey data.*
- *Queue data.*

The summarised queue data does not compare particularly well with the outputs of the modelling, there are reasons for this – as it is not a like-for-like comparison, but, given the updated results of the capacity assessment, it further undermines the conclusions. As part of any updated technical note, why this is the case, and whether the models are reasonable, should be set out. Once the above has been done, and the inputs for the assessment are agreed, a review of the junction models can be undertaken.”

In response to these detailed comments from the Highway Authority, a further amended Transport Assessment was submitted to the Local Planning Authority in March 2020.

69. Final comments from Highway Authority dated 15 April 2020

Following their review of the most recently submitted information, the Highway Authority have submitted a detailed response to the Local Planning Authority which confirms their position with respect to the highway implications of this development. Their comments are as follows:

- Overall, we accept the methodology shown in the traffic modelling. We accept that the analysis of a selection of similar McDonald/Costa sites is a reasonable approach and that projected traffic based on an average of these sites is reasonable.
- We note that a very limited data set has been used, only 3 McDonalds and 1 Costa have been selected. This is not a robust data set. We question whether the 3 sites shown are the most comparable. Arnold is a town centre, Folkstone and Plymouth are within large retail areas with parking areas combined with other retail units. All 3 are significantly smaller than this proposed. However, we do accept that size of restaurant/s will have less impact on the number of visitors than location, and the 3 sites chosen are representative of McDonalds restaurants generally, so an average of these sites is a reasonable basis for modelling. We also accept that there is no evidence to suggest a larger data set would yield significantly different average results.
- We therefore accept that the traffic modelling shows that Willie Snaith Road should still function within capacity during peak visitor times.
- While we still feel the outside seating area should contribute towards the parking allowance, we accept this is not clearly detailed in the Suffolk Guidance for Parking (SGP) and therefore this development should provide 82 spaces. This must not include the drive-through 'waiting bays'. There is a slight under-allocation based on the SGP recommendations, but as this location is close to good public service links, the proposed number of parking spaces is accepted, as long as it is supported by good cycle storage, including secure storage for staff which is not accessible to customers.
- The safety audit advises that the location of the parking spaces we were previously concerned with should not result in collisions as there is sufficient visibility. To effect adequate manoeuvring space behind these spaces the

entry/exit lane must be flush and demarked with road markings only. There is a possibility vehicles may ignore the lane markings and one-way system in peak times. However, any conflict should be contained within the site.

- The combination of an under-allocation of parking spaces, drive-through queues backing up within the car park, congestion within the site at peak times, and the closeness of the restaurant building to the public highway poses a risk of vehicles parking on the Willie Snaith Road (including partly or fully on the footway). However, this could be resolved with parking restrictions between Fordham Road and the Wickes DIY store.
- We note drawing 6929-SA-8361-P007 Rev G (Proposed Landscape Plan) indicates a zebra crossing at the start of Willie Snaith Road by the Fordham Road roundabout, although this is not shown on drawing 6929-SA-8361-P004 Rev R (Site Layout Plan). There is no supporting evidence within the Transport Assessment to suggest a zebra crossing would be warranted at this location. There is already a formal pedestrian crossing near Wickes and the bus stops. If the applicant proposed an additional formal pedestrian crossing this would need to be fully evidenced, assessed and safety audited.
- Drawing 6929-SA-8361-P007 Rev G (Proposed Landscape Plan) shows hedging and trees against the back edge of the highway (footway) of both Willie Snaith Road and Fordham Road. In this location this vegetation would overgrow the highway causing obstruction and damage. We recommend any planting adjacent to the highway is set back and a linear root guard installed to protect the footway construction. We also recommend the visibility splays for the roundabouts are kept clear and suitable planting and/or fencing should be used to stop headlight glare of the drive-through lanes affecting traffic on the highway. Therefore, we do not accept the information on this drawing.

70. Accordingly, in light of the revised comments from the Highway Authority, the conclusion is that the proposed McDonalds and Costa with associated parking layout will not have a serious or detrimental impact upon the highway. The Highway Authority's concerns with respect to obstructive parking could be addressed by a s106 contribution for a Traffic Road Order (TRO) and planting/ boundary treatments by condition. It should also be noted that the Suffolk Parking guidance requires the development to deliver 82 parking spaces and this, as demonstrated on the submitted plans, can be delivered.

71. The Highway Authority is therefore satisfied with the information and modelling submitted and does **not** consider the proposal to adversely affect highway safety or junction capacity for the roundabout. A material conflict with policies DM2, DM46 or the NPPF is not therefore judged to arise. Nonetheless, a Traffic Regulation Order is considered necessary to prevent customers parking on Willie Snaith Road. This is a process that will be undertaken by Suffolk Highways Authority but the applicant has completed a section 106 agreement which commits them to fund this.

72. Finally, as evidenced in the Highway Authority's response, a number of planning conditions have been recommended and these seek to control the following elements:

- Details for storage of refuse and bins
- Boundary treatments to prevent headlight glare
- Means to deal with surface water
- Cycle storage provision
- Construction deliveries management plan
- Servicing and deliveries post completion

73. In addition, the Highway Authority have also noted that drawing 6929-SA-8361-P007 Rev G (Proposed Landscape Plan) shows hedging and trees against the back edge of the highway (footway) of both Willie Snaith Road and Fordham Road.

74. In this location, however, the Highway Authority have concerns that this vegetation would overgrow the highway causing obstruction and damage. Accordingly, an additional planning condition will be imposed which requires the submission of a soft landscaping scheme. Upon submission, any plan as submitted will then be shared with the Highway Authority who will be able to review the details to ensure their suitability.

75. On the 22 May 2020, in relation to the need for planning obligations, further clarification from the Highway Authority was provided in the form of an email to the case officer. This email confirmed the following:

- *"In the context of the very high background traffic flows on the A142 and A14 this site is a relatively low trip generator and it would not be proportionate to expect them to contribute to a strategic road improvement at A14 J37. As Hatchfield Farm has been permitted at appeal and has now got through the JR period it can be taken as a fully committed scheme and the associated improvements can also be considered as committed. The signalisation of the slip roads removes the current traffic desire to turn left and U turn at the first roundabout (Studlands Park Ave.) to travel northbound on the A142, at times when the right turn manoeuvre is very difficult. This improvement will ease traffic flow on the A142, reducing the impacts of this scheme as well"*

76 Accordingly, in light of the lack of an objection from the Highway Authority and owing to the control available through planning conditions and the recommended Traffic Regulation Order, the scheme is not considered to represent a material conflict with paragraph 109 of the NPPF or policies DM2 and DM46 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document.

Other Issues of relevance

76. Paragraph 105 of the NPPF states that *local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, policies should take into account the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultralow emission vehicles.* Paragraph 110 of the NPPF

further outlines that *applications for development should be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultralow emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.*

77. Policy DM14 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document states that *proposals for all new developments should minimise all emissions and ensure no deterioration to either air or water quality.*

78. In a similar vein, section 3.4.2 of the Suffolk Parking Standards require that *the developer shall provide and maintain an electricity supply for charging points. A minimum of 1 space per every 20 non-residential spaces should have charging points installed for electric vehicles.*

79. A condition, therefore, requiring 4 electric vehicle charge points is therefore recommended to enhance the local air quality through the enabling and encouraging of zero emission vehicles.

80. In addition to electric charging points for vehicles, the proposal is able to demonstrate a range of other sustainability initiatives which also weigh in favour of the scheme:

- Bike racks, promoting cycle to work schemes
- Potential to include low energy lighting installed in fit out
- Improved energy metering, to monitor consumption
- Low flush toilets
- Low carbon monoxide heating and cooling systems
- Building to achieve a BREEAM 'very good' rating
- PV panels to be provided on south facing slope of roof if required to achieve building regulations compliance and BREEAM requirements

81. These are all elements which enable the development to meet the requirements of policy DM7 which requires proposals, as appropriate, to showcase compliance with the broad principles of sustainable construction and design.

82. In this instance, it is noted that the submitted information suggests the buildings will be constructed to the 'very good' BREEAM standard and would therefore be in the top 25% of new buildings with respect to its sustainability credentials. However, policy DM7 only requires non-residential proposals to achieve this where the proposed floor space exceeds 1000sqm. In this instance, the cumulative non-residential floor space created is 668sqm and thus falls below the locally adopted threshold above which proposals are required to meet BREEAM very good. Controlling this via a condition would therefore be unreasonable and disproportionate in this instance.

Conclusion and planning balance

83. In conclusion, this is an application which is able to showcase sufficient compliance with the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework to enable the Local Planning Authority to recommend approval.
84. Although the application is allocated as an employment area pursuant to policy SA16 of the 2019 Site Allocations Local Plan, in conjunction with the NPPF, policies CS1, DM30 and DM35 the principle of the proposed development in this location is supported. A significant conflict with the development plan, as a whole, does not therefore arise.
85. With respect to the visual impact of the development, given that the site is allocated for employment use and having regard to the nature of the immediate locality's built form, it is not considered that the scale and form of the proposed buildings are unacceptable. They are appropriate for the area's prevailing grain, character and vernacular. Accordingly, a material conflict with policies CS5, DM2 and NMKT 32 is not judged to arise.
86. When considered against the requirements of the NPPF and policies DM2 and DM46 of the Joint Development Management plan documents, as a result of the planning conditions and S106 agreement recommended by the Highway Authority, a severe or substantial risk to highway safety has not been identified. The proposal is also able to evidence that it meets the required parking standards.
87. Overall, the proposal does not represent a conflict with the advice contained within the NPPF or any of the Local Planning Authority's adopted planning documents.
88. Therefore, given the lack of conflict with the development plan and the lack of other material considerations to indicate otherwise, the application represents a proposal that the Local Planning Authority are able to support.

Recommendation:

89. It is recommended that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions and the completed Section 106 agreement:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun not 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:

Reference No:	Plan Type	Date Received
2019576	Acoustic Report	23.04.2020
6929-SA-8361-P004R	Site Plan	16.03.2020

6929-SA-8361-P005E	Proposed Elevations & Sections	16.03.2020
6929-SA-8361-P006E	Proposed Floor Plans	16.03.2020
6929-SA-8361-SK22A	Site Layout	16.03.2020
6929-SA0-8361-P002J	Proposed Block Plan	16.03.2020
ADL/CC/3225/10A	Transport Assessment	16.03.2020
4180179-1200 REV 1	Drainage Plans	12.08.2019
4180179-1201 REV 1	Drainage Strategy	24.12.2018
E09 004 PLAY FRAME	Details	24.12.2018
1607 001	Site Location Plan	23.11.2018
1607 002	Existing Layout	23.11.2018
E0004 Play box	Details	31.10.2018
Travel plan	Travel Plan	31.10.2018
01D - COSTA	Floor Plans	31.10.2018
02D - COSTA	Elevations	31.10.2018
03C - COSTA	Roof Plans	31.10.2018
04B - COSTA	Sections	31.10.2018

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

- 3 The site preparation and construction works shall only be carried out between the hours of 08:00 to 18:00 Mondays to Fridays and only 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: To protect the amenity of the area.

- 4 No plant or equipment associated with the development shall be operated until details thereof have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include specifications of the design, location and screening of the proposed plant or equipment.

The plant or equipment shall be installed in complete accordance with the approved details before being first brought into use. Following installation the plant or equipment shall be retained in accordance with the approved details unless the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority is obtained for any variation of the approved details or specifications.

The rating level of the sound emitted from the site shall not exceed the existing background sound level. The sound levels shall be determined by measurement or calculation at the nearest residential premises. The measurements and assessment shall be made according to BS 4142:2014+A1:2019.

Reason: To protect the amenities of occupiers of properties in the locality, in accordance with policies DM2 and DM14 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

- 5 Prior to first use details of the ventilation system and system to control

odours from any cooking process shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the measures to abate the noise from the systems and a maintenance programme for the systems. The system shall be installed prior to first use and thereafter the systems shall be retained and maintained in complete accordance with the approved details unless the written consent of the Local Planning Authority is obtained for any variation.

Reason: To protect the amenities of occupiers of properties in the locality, in accordance with policies DM2 and DM14 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

- 6 Prior to first operation on site, details of all proposed external lighting sources and fittings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and thereafter be retained in the approved form.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy DM2 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapters 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

- 7 Commercial deliveries to the two café/restaurant units hereby approved shall be restricted to between 07:00 and 22:00 hours on Mondays to Saturdays and 08:00 and 18:00 hours on Sundays, Bank and Public Holidays. Outside of these hours, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no commercial deliveries shall take place.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with policy DM2 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapters 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

- 8 Prior to operational use of the site, at least 4 publicly available electric vehicle charge points shall be provided at reasonably and practicably accessible locations within the car park. The Electric Vehicle Charge Points shall be retained thereafter and maintained in an operational condition. Charge points shall be Rapid (Minimum 43kW AC /50kW DC) chargers.

Reason: To promote and facilitate the uptake of electric vehicles on the site in order to minimise emissions and ensure no deterioration to the local air quality, in accordance with Policy DM14 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document, paragraphs 105 and 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Suffolk Parking Standards

9. No development above ground level shall take place unless the need for fire hydrants has been assessed and, if deemed to be required, a scheme for the provision of a fire hydrant or fire hydrants has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No part of the development shall be brought into use until any fire hydrants that are required 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 firefighting and community safety, in accordance with policy DM2 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapters 8 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

- 10 No development above ground level shall take place until a scheme of soft landscaping for the site drawn to a scale of not less than 1:200, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include accurate indications of the position, species, girth, canopy spread and height of all existing trees and hedgerows on and adjacent to the site and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection during the course of development. Any retained trees removed, dying or becoming seriously damaged or diseased within five years of commencement shall be replaced within the first available planting season thereafter with planting of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent for any variation. The works shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans and in accordance with a timetable to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enhance the appearance of the development and to ensure that the most vulnerable trees are adequately protected during the periods of construction, in accordance with policies DM2, DM12 and DM13 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapters 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

- 11 The development hereby approved shall not be brought into operational use until the areas to be provided for storage, presentation and collection of Refuse/Recycling have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved waste management scheme shall be carried out in its entirety before the development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for no other purpose.

Reason: To ensure the incorporation of waste storage and recycling arrangements, in accordance with policies DM2 and DM14 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapters 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

- 12 No development above ground level shall take place until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority showing the means to prevent headlight glare for the drive-through lanes affecting other highway users and means to ensure any fencing, planting or other boundary treatment will not cause harm to the highway.

Reason: To prevent hazards caused by headlights adversely impacting

visibility of other highway users in accordance with policy DM2 and DM6 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapters 9 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

- 13 No development above ground level shall take place until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority showing the means to prevent the discharge of surface water from the development onto the highway. The approved scheme shall be carried out in its entirety before the access is first used and shall be retained thereafter in its approved form.

Reason: To prevent hazards caused by flowing water or ice on the highway, in accordance with policy DM2 and DM6 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapters 9 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

- 14 Before the development hereby approved is first brought into operational use, details of the areas to be provided for the secure cycle storage for staff and customers shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be carried out in its entirety before the development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter and used for no other purpose.

Reason: To ensure the provision and long term maintenance of adequate on-site space for the secure storage of cycles in accordance in accordance with policy DM2 and DM46 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapters 9 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies and Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2019) and in the interest of promoting sustainable travel options

- 15 All HGV and Construction traffic movements to and from the site over the duration of the site clearance and construction period shall be subject to a Construction 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 Plan shall include:

- 1) Routes to and from the site and means to monitor and enforce
- 2) Means to ensure no water, mud or other debris will egress onto the highway
- 3) Means to ensure suitable space will be provided on site for the manoeuvring and parking of all site traffic including deliveries, staff and visitors.
- 4) Means to ensure sufficient space is provided on site for the storage of materials and equipment

5) Means to ensure no light source from the site can cause glare or hazard to highway users.

6) 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 and construction traffic on the highway.

- 16 All delivery and servicing traffic movements to and from the site throughout the duration site's operational life shall be subject to a Delivery and Services Management Plan which shall be submitted to the planning authority for approval a minimum of 28 days before the first use of the site.

No delivery or servicing traffic movements shall be permitted to and from the site other than in accordance with the routes and times 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 and construction traffic in sensitive areas, in the interest of highway safety, in accordance with policy DM2 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

- 17 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) and the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, as amended, the two buildings as approved shall be used only for the purposes permitted and for no other purpose unless previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the area, in accordance with policy DM2 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

- 18 No development above slab level shall take place until samples of all facing materials to be used within the construction of both approved buildings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with policy DM2 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies

- 19 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in complete accordance with the details contained within sections 9 and 10 (or such amendment thereto as may be approved in writing by the local planning authority) of the submitted Travel Plan as dated July 2017 and authored by Woods Hardwick.

Reason: To encourage the use of sustainable forms of transport and reduce dependence on the private motor vehicle, in accordance with policy DM2 and DM45 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015, Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework and all relevant Core Strategy Policies.

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?keyVal=PHGNCUPDJWX00&activeTab=summary>