



PLANNING COMMITTEE SOUTH - UPDATE SHEET

26 October 2021

Item 6 – DC/21/1575/FUL – Reserved Matters approval sought for details of access, appearance, layout, landscaping and scale pursuant to condition 1 of outline planning permission ref. DC/17/4257/OUT dated 28th June 2018 comprising the erection of 4 no. warehouse buildings with associated parking and servicing arrangements, along with details submitted pursuant to conditions nos. 7 (phasing management plan), 9 (construction management plan), 10 (site wide masterplan document), 14 (parameter plan), 18 (link road), 8 (surface water management strategy), 11 (external facing and roofing materials), 12 (roads and footways), 13 (electric vehicle charging points), 16 (boundary and boundary enhancements), 17 (noise attenuation measures, 4 (framework travel plan) and 5 (external lighting) at Orwell Crossing Service Area, A14 Nacton East Bound, Nacton.

Daily vehicular movements:

The agent has confirmed that the minor increase in commercial floor space sought within this Reserved Matters application equates to an additional 15 trips in the morning peak hour (08:00 – 09:00) and 13 trips in the afternoon peak hour (17:00 – 18:00) over that modelled and approved at Outline application stage.

This represents a total of 162 movements during the morning peak hour (08:00 – 09:00) and 139 movements during the afternoon peak hour (17:00 – 18:00).

Both the National and County Highway authorities have confirmed that this increase will have a negligible impact on the highway network.

Height of tree to rear of 'Wetheroak'

Information included within a tree survey submitted in support of this application confirms that the height of the tree on the opposite side of the railway line - as viewed by members from the rear garden of Wetheroak during a site visit undertaken on Monday 4 October 2021. This is being checked and will be reported verbally in the meeting.

LEGAL ADDRESS East Suffolk House, Station Road, Melton, Woodbridge IP12 1RT
DX: 41400 Woodbridge

POSTAL ADDRESS Riverside, 4 Canning Road, Lowestoft NR33 0EQ
DX: 41220 Lowestoft

Employment use policy allocations

The application site was previously designated for employment use within the 'Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies' document (adopted January 2017) as:

'Policy SSP20 – Ransomes, Nacton Heath

30ha of land is identified at Ransomes, Nacton Heath as shown on the Policies Map for new employment provision for a mix of B1, B2 and B8 uses'.

The 2017 allocation has been carried forward within the 'East Suffolk Council – Suffolk Coastal Local Plan' (adopted September 2020) as:

'Policy SCLP12.21: Ransomes, Nacton Heath

30ha of land is identified at Ransomes, Nacton Heath as shown on the Policies Map for new employment provision for a mix of B1, B2 and B8 uses'.

Building height comparison:

Following discussion at Planning Committee South (Tuesday 28th September) concerning the heights of notably comparable buildings local to the site, the following is provided to advise members in their consideration of the proposed 21 metre ridge height sought by this Reserved Matters application:

- County Council waste transfer centre (Ransomes industrial estate) - 10.9 metres (as per 14/00840/FCM).
- HomeStore self-storage (Ransomes industrial estate) – 13.5 metres (as per 07/00396/REM).
- It is also noted that the original outline consent provided for indicative heights of between 15-20 metres and

Not in the surrounding area but a reference building in Felixstowe

- Uniserve distribution centre (Felixstowe) - 24 metres (as per DC/20/3298/VOC and DC/21/2597/AME);

Tree retention:

The agent has confirmed that the trees on the eastern boundary between the piggeries and Unit 4 are to be retained and protected. A diverted cable route to power the site will be kept outside of root protection areas and will not adversely impact the viability of existing trees. The proposed new pedestrian pathway will be of a minimal dig construction to reduce impacts on these trees.

Proposed bund height:

The agent has confirmed that the height of the proposed bunds along the site's northern boundary varies between 1.3m and 3.3m above existing ground level. Additional planting on top of the bunds will further mitigate the visual impact of the buildings.

Truck stop closure:

The agent has confirmed that new signage has been erected to make it clearer to passing drivers that the truck stop facilities are no longer in operation.

Driver welfare facilities:

The agent has confirmed that welfare facilities for drivers will be integrated within each warehouse unit's ancillary office areas in-line with prospective tenant's expectations. Sufficient lorry parking for each warehouse will also be provided.

Pedestrian access:

The agent has confirmed that the proposal has been designed on the principle of encouraging east to west permeability. This is achieved by a new pedestrian and cycle link to Lytham Road which will provide direct access to the Ransomes Industrial Estate. A gated emergency vehicular access is also proposed at this location.

The existing Public Right of Way, which currently dissects the eastern half of the site, will also be diverted to facilitate north to south movements.

Change of wording to condition 6

The following conditions are to be amended to reflect the following:

6. *Prior to the commencement of each phase of the development full details of the strategy for the disposal of surface water on that phase shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority (LPA).
Reason: To ensure that the principles of sustainable drainage are incorporated into the development and to ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained.*
7. *Prior to the commencement of each phase of the development full details of the implementation, maintenance and management of the approved strategy for the disposal of surface water on that phase has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure clear arrangements are in place for ongoing operation and maintenance of the disposal of surface water drainage.*

Letter received from Agent

The Council received a letter from the Agent dated 25 October 2021. It seeks to address comments received by Brightwell Foxhall & Purdis Farm Group Parish Council on the 12th and 23rd August 2021 and Councillor Day on the 10th August 2021. It also responds to concerns raised by residents during the determination of application ref. DC/21/1575/ARM at Orwell Crossing, Felixstowe.

Presentation slides received from Mr Day

Presentation slides have been received relating to building heights and comparisons and these will be made available in the officer's presentation.

Item 7 and 8**DC/20/3362/FUL and DC/20/3284/FUL - Full Planning Application for the erection of 70 dwellings, including affordable dwellings, together with public open space, roads, accesses, parking, garages, drainage and associated infrastructure. Land West of Chapel Road, Grundisburgh.**

For both Item 7 and Item 8, following the documents appended to the committee reports a final report from the Council's Independent Transport Consultant has been received, informing the Councils recommendation on both cases. That is appended to this report.

A re-consultation has taken place in October 2021 following receipt of further information from Brookbanks, independent highways consultant and applicants Highways consultant in response.

Based on the Council's consideration of the Brookbanks conclusion the Council takes on board the professional advice and accepts it. The brief for the independent consultant did not seek for them to be a proxy for the Highway Authority, its sought scrutiny, review and recommendations. Albeit ahead of the most recent documents submitted by the applicant, the Highway Authority have updated their position for the appeal setting out that they have no objections subject to conditions. The Council's consultant has reviewed this and proposes that the Transport Assessment is no longer deficient and that a conclusion on the application can be reached in its favour subject to conditions.

Based on the Council's consideration of the Brookbanks conclusion the Council takes on board the professional advice and accepts it. The brief for the independent consultant did not seek for them to be a proxy for the Highway Authority, its sought scrutiny, review and recommendations. Albeit ahead of the most recent documents submitted by the applicant, the Highway Authority have updated their position for the appeal setting out that they have no objections subject to conditions. The Council's consultant has reviewed this and proposes that the Transport Assessment is no longer deficient and that a conclusion on the application can be reached in its favour subject to conditions.

An informal email response (below) has been received on 25th October from the Highway Authority in respect of both the application and appeal, though at the time of the update sheet no formal response to the application had been received:

My understanding is that the Cannon updated information and surveys was very useful and confirmed the findings of their technical note, which we endorsed. Overall this supports our overall view that the scheme would not give rise to a paragraph 111 severe impact, and permission should not be refused on highways grounds.

The Local Planning Authority has therefore been advised by both the Highway Authority as Statutory Consultee and its independent Transport Consultant that there are no grounds to refuse/defend the appeal for Highways reasons. The position presented to the Planning Committee recommending approval of both applications on 29th June therefore should remain, following its deferral for independent advice, which has now been received in full. Refusal of the live application and defence of the appeal set against this position would place the Council at risk of an undefendable and an evidenced position and at risk of significant cost for unreasonable behaviour in both the current appeal and any future appeal. Members are therefore presented with updated recommendations at the end of this update sheet.

As of 22.10.2021 a **further 177 representations have been received in objection** to the proposed development raising the following matters:

- Unsuitability of highway network to serve development. Park Road cannot be adequately widened; Lower Road cannot be widened and has a blind 'S' bend. It will be used by the majority of traffic from/to site heading to/from Woodbridge and A12. Junction of Park Road with Ipswich Road is substandard. Chapel Road is narrow without footways. Roads are constantly used by pedestrians, disabled residents, cyclists and equestrian traffic and any increased vehicular use of these substandard roads will cause severe danger.
- There are no passing places in Lower Road and vehicles can only pass in domestic entrances to the detriment of safety and amenity of existing residents.
- Objectors are appalled by ESDC disregard for road safety recommendations of Messrs Brookbanks.
 - Safety of pedestrians in Park Road and Lower Road has still not been properly assessed.
- Recent road closure of the B1079 resulted in traffic re-routed via Lower Road with absolute chaos and gridlock. This would be a foretaste of the situation post-development if approved. A recent accident at crossroads of Park Road, Lower Road and Chapel Lane show inadequacy of road system and danger.
- Poor pedestrian and cycle links. No permission exists from landowner(s) for footpath surfacing and footpath 20 cannot therefore be improved. The desire-line between site and pub and shop is along Chapel Lane/Meeting Lane where there are no continuous footpaths resulting in significant danger. Footpath 20 does not provide an appropriate route to village facilities and will conflict with use of the recreation ground access and car park which are well used. The access is narrow and with no separation between pedestrians and vehicles. There is no provision for cyclists within the scheme which is unacceptable.
- Surfacing of Footpath 20 will require elevated sections which will be dangerous to users, particularly wheel chair users
- ESC has sufficient housing land in local plan without the Chapel Field Site which is totally unsuitable. Limited weight should be given to allocation of site.
- Development of site will result in vehicular movements which will increase emissions.
- Development layout will encourage crime and anti-social behaviour. There should not be alleyways, garages/parking should be within eye sight of the owner of that garage.
- Development is disproportionately large for this village
 - No civil engineering assessment of works to Park Road so no conclusions are possible that there will not be severe impact on Grundisburgh Hall Historic Parkland
 - Hopkins submission needs to be independently assessed. New traffic count information is flawed given it took place during fuel crisis.

- One of the objections was from Grundisburgh Playing Field Management Committee who object to the works proposed to surface Footpath 20 because of likely increased (illegal) use by cyclists to the detriment of pedestrian safety and conflict between users of footpath and vehicular access to pavilion, recreation ground and car park. There is also concern that the development will result in dogs on the recreation ground which is not permitted.

Suffolk Fire and Rescue have confirmed that they previously responded in September 2020.

Cadent Gas comment that the development is in the vicinity of gas assets and make a holding objection whilst engineering team reviews information.

Suffolk Coastal Disability Forum comment that they welcome the inclusion of 6 bungalows but point out that people with mobility impairments requiring bungalows can be of any age. They welcome as a minimum requirements that 50% would meet Part M4(2) and be accessible. Suggest that a reference should be made to all dwellings needing to meet Part M4 (2) of the Building Regulations. They note that there is no provision for a wheelchair accessible dwelling within the development and that there should be at least one of the dwellings built to wheelchair standard M4(3). Also state that all footpaths should be wide enough for wheelchair users and of a suitable surface with a minimum width of 1500mm, with drop kerbs level with the road surface. In addition they stated that play equipment should be fully accessible to disabled children and that there is a concern that access to shops by public transport for disabled people will be minimal or possibly non-existent.