

Parish: BENTLEY

Location: Land east of Capel MOT Centre, Bentley Hall Road, Bentley

Proposal: Erection of 1 no industrial building as use for B1 and B2 starter units

Applicant: Mr P Davis

Case Officer: Deborah Board

Date for Determination: 16.12.2009

A panel of Members inspected this site on 25th November 2009 in order to assess the impact of the proposal on the countryside at the request of the Councillor Jones.

THE SITE

1. The application site is located to the east of the A12 slip road for Capel St Mary and comprises an area of land measuring approximately 0.27 hectares with a frontage onto Bentley Hall Road of 75 metres and a depth of 40 metres. The land currently contains some hardstanding, a single container and telegraph poles. An existing gated access to the site is located in the north-east corner.
2. Immediately to the west of the site is an existing vehicle MOT workshop building (B/98/01647/OUT and B/00/01360/RES refers). The land to the north and south comprises agricultural land, with residential properties and Bentley Autos located to the east. The closest residential properties being Moyes Cottages.
3. The site is located outside of the any defined built-up area boundaries and is therefore located in the countryside for planning policy purposes. The site contains TPO trees, located on the north site boundary and is adjacent to a Special Landscape Area.
4. The site has an extensive planning history, detailed below, with the last lawful planning use being the use of the site for the containerised composting of organic waste (SCC application).

THE PROPOSAL

5. The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of an industrial building to be made available for starter units for B1 and B2 units, with a total floor area of 657m². The building would be sited within the far east area of the site, siting 10.5 metres from the east site boundary and between 12 and 18 metres from the site frontage. The area around the site would be utilised for parking and turning areas in connection with the proposed building.
6. The building itself would have a frontage to Bentley Hall Road of 36.5 metres and extend to a depth of 18 metres into the site. The height to the ridge would be 7.45 metres and 5.2 metres to the eaves. The proposed design is functional and utilitarian in approach of a steel frame industrial design clad with plastic coated coloured steel sheeting and roofing. Each unit would have independent access and roller shutter doors to the frontage with Bentley Hall Road.
7. The access for the proposal would be taken via the existing access to the established MOT station from Bentley Hall Road, which itself connects to the A12 slip road.

8. The applicant has confirmed that the existing access in the north east corner of the site is not proposed to be utilised and would be stopped up as part of the proposals. The applicant has also confirmed that all the TPO trees on site are to be retained and have amended the arboricultural report accordingly.

RELEVANT HISTORY

9. B/08/00466/FUL - Continued use of land for siting of porta cabins for office purposes, Refused.
10. B/06/00627/OUT - Outline planning permission, Erection of vehicle body repairs shop and vehicle body parts storage area with associated vehicle parking area. Alterations to existing vehicular access, Withdrawn,
11. B/99/01577/FUL – Planning permission granted for Renewal of B/96/01249/FUL – continued use of land for containerised composting of organic waste (pp expired 31/12/02) (SCC application).
12. B/96/01249/FUL – Temporary planning permission granted for Use of land for containerised composting of organic waste (pp expired 31/12/99) (SCC application).
13. B/94/0388/A – Advertisement consent refused for the erection of five 48 sheet advertisement hoardings for a period of three years.
14. W/7057/4 (1973) – Application for Established Use Certificate for storage of vehicles, contractors plant and goods refused.
15. W/7057/3 (1972) – Application for Established Use Certificate for coal depot refused.
16. W/7057/1 (1968) – SCC Application for use of land as storage depot for road materials and gritting machine – no objections.
17. W/7057 (1966) – Outline planning permission refused for petrol filling and service station.

Adjacent Site

18. B/05/01888/FUL - Planning permission granted for the Variation of Conditions 06 and 09 of PP B/98/01647 to allow vehicle sales (up to 3 ½ ton) and Condition 08 to allow parking for more than 18 vehicles.
19. B/00/01360/RES – Planning permission granted for the Submission of details under OPP B/98/01647/OUT – the siting and design of the building, parking layout and the landscaping of the site for a vehicle MOT workshop.
20. B/98/01647/OUT – Outline planning permission granted for Outline erection of a vehicle MOT workshop

NATIONAL GUIDANCE

21. **PPS1:** Delivering Sustainable Development
22. **PPS3:** Housing
23. **PPS4:** Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth
24. **PPS7:** Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

25. **PPS9:** Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
26. **PPG13:** Transport
27. **PPS23:** Planning and Pollution Control
28. **PPS25:** Planning and Flood Risk

PLANNING POLICIES

29. The Development Plan comprises the East of England Plan, adopted 2008, saved policies in the Suffolk Structure Plan, adopted 2001, and the saved policies of the Babergh Local Plan (Alteration No. 2) adopted 2006. The following policies are relevant to this proposal:

East of England Plan 2008

- **E2** (Provision of Land for Employment)
- **ENV2** (Landscape Conservation)
- **ENV7** (Quality in the Built Environment)
- **SS1** (Achieving Sustainable Development)

Babergh Local Plan (Alteration No 2) 2006

- **CR01** (Landscape Quality)
- **CR04** (Special Landscape Areas)
- **EM01** (General Employment)
- **EM20** (Expansion of Existing Employment Uses)
- **CN01** (General Design)
- **TP01** (Pedestrians)
- **TP03** (Provision of Cycle Routes)
- **TP15** (Parking Standards – New Development)
- **TP16** (Green Travel Plans)
- **EN02** (County Wildlife Sites)

The relevant documents can be viewed via the internet. Please see page 4 for details.

CONSULTATIONS

30. Bentley PC – recommend refusal
 - the size and scale of the proposed building is too large and is considered to be over development of the site.
 - the proposed materials are not in keeping with the rural nature of the site. The existing building on the adjacent site was originally approved as a smaller scale Suffolk barn type development. The changes to this building were approved as modifications. Bentley Parish Council was not consulted on these changes.
 - the proposed use B1 and B2 is not appropriate for a rural area.
 - there is no reference to any controls on noise, pollution, hours of working or other environmental controls. The residential properties adjacent to the site will suffer a reduction in their standard of living if suitable controls are not put in place and strictly monitored.

- the application does not include any means of storing and collecting waste nor arrangements for storage and collection of recyclable materials. These means are essential for the B1 and B2 uses being proposed.
 - the application indicates foul sewerage is to be disposed of via main sewer. Mains sewerage is not available in the area. The plans do not show any other method of disposal.
 - the application shows the site as being occupied. The site is vacant.
 - without knowing the businesses which will occupy the site it is not possible to state that the proposed use of the land would not be vulnerable to the presence of contamination.
 - the Council's Tree Warden has visited the site and has reported to the Council that in his opinion there are three Beech trees worthy of preservation. Two Trees are still alive of which one is proposed to be removed. The third tree is dead and could be removed but the stump left for invertebrates like stag beetles which are present in the vicinity. He has contacted Babergh BC Arboriculture Officer direct on these matters.
 - the application confirms the need to dispose of trade effluents or waste. As mentioned above the plans do not show how this will be undertaken. It contradicts the information in Section 7 of the application.
 - the plans do not show how the existing, but unsuitable, entrance to the site is being dealt with.
31. Copdock and Washbrook PC – No comment
32. LHA – recommend that permission be refused. The boundary fence to this site obstructs visibility of other vehicles within the public highway and as such vehicles cannot enter the public highway safely. The provision of an industrial unit and the vehicles associated with that unit will exacerbate this problem and would create additional dangers and hazards to road users.
33. Highways Agency – The Highways Agency has no objection to the proposal and does not intend to issue a direction. It is noted that the proposal is in a rural location where there is little opportunity for sustainable travel measures. Little information is given about the likely vehicle movements to and from the site and as the application is for B1 and B2 usage this implies the site could be used for office based operations. This implies there is a likelihood of the intensification of car borne trips. Therefore the Highways Agency request that BDC in conjunction with SCC give due consideration to the inclusion of a Travel Plan.
34. EA – to be reported.
35. SWT - The presence of dormice in the area has been mentioned in the submitted Phase 1 survey, this has not been adequately dealt with. Dormice are known to occur on the disused railway line to the east and in other woodlands to the south-east (2008 survey) and this information can be obtained through SBRC. The consultants are correct that dormice occur in the ancient woodland to the north (County Wildlife Site) and in 2009 evidence of dormouse were found in the southern edge of this wood as part of monitoring of the populations. The site of the proposed development is therefore located within the key ecological network for this species.

36. Impacts on this species must therefore be taken into consideration. Although only a small amount of vegetation is being proposed for removal along the roadside, a method statement should have been submitted detailing how impacts on dormice are to be avoided and this needs to be addressed prior to any consent being granted. We would expect this to address the issues of timing, disturbance and the risk of damage to any animal or nests, as well as impacts relating to fragmentation of the population.
37. Further note that additional survey work is required for reptiles and a bat survey of any trees and that these surveys cannot be carried out at this time of year. In accordance with PPS9 and its accompanying circular the findings of the surveys should be provided before an application is determined.
38. Natural England – no objection with recommendations are as follows:
- ‘Prior to works a presence/absence reptile survey should be undertaken to establish whether a reptile population is present upon the site. This survey entails seven visits between March and September.
 - A detailed bat-roost potential survey of any trees that are subject to removal or are in close proximity to the works should be undertaken to establish the potential for bat roosts
 - Sensitive lighting should be used to avoid disturbance to any bats using the site or adjacent woodland
 - Removal of any areas of dense scrub/vegetation should be undertaken outside of bird nesting season.’
39. CAM (Arboricultural Officer) – Agree to the arboricultural aspect of the application subject to the proposal for the removal of Beech T5 being amended to retention.
40. NABE (Environmental Health) - Background noise levels in the vicinity of the nearest noise sensitive premises are already quite high and I would not want to see any further "loss of amenity" for these residents. The façade of the nearest sensitive premises is just 35m from the proposed development. If the development cannot be restricted solely to B1 uses, would therefore recommend that conditions requiring the following be attached to any permission(s) granting a B2 use:
1. No noise generating plant, machinery or equipment shall be installed in any part of the development until full and precise details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The details shall include a BS4142:1997 noise assessment and 1/3 octave frequency analysis with appropriate corrections for acoustic features and shall detail any mitigation measures, physical or operational to ensure that noise resulting from the use of the plant, machinery or equipment shall not exceed a level of 5dB(A) below the existing background level (or 10dB(A) below if there is a particular tonal quality) when measured at any adjoining or nearby residential property.
 2. No odour generating plant, machinery or equipment shall be installed in any part of the development until full and precise details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.
 3. A restriction on hours to prevent night time and early morning working- and weekend/Bank Holiday working as appropriate.
 4. No activities or processes shall be carried out outside the building(s).

REPRESENTATIONS

41. Nine letters of representation have been received and the comments are summarised as follows:

- Why is the proposed building so large if its purpose is for small business starter units?
- Is there a need for starter units in this area when there are already vacant units close by at Dodnash, Raydon, Washbrook, Capel St Mary etc.?
- Why remove hedges and trees which form a natural barrier for our property from the A12 sounds and smells and Capel Station Garage MOT required noises, Engine revving and horn honking especially when one tree is protected by a TPO?
- What conditions or controls will be put in place for noise, pollution, working hours etc.?
- How as stated in the application will this building be connected to a main sewer that to my knowledge does not exist?
- The application states the site is occupied this is not correct; this is a separate site from the garage site and is clearly shown as so on the garage application plans.
- An existing entrance to the site which has in the past been deemed unsuitable for access by the highways department still exists. The plans are not clear on the future of this access.
- Because the garage that was built does not resemble the original plans we were shown by the planning office how can we be sure that this proposal will not turn out the same?
- This is a countryside location and is wholly inappropriate for industrial development, which would be directly contrary to national and local policy
- There are no special circumstances which would justify ignoring policy
- The use does not require a rural location; indeed, Ipswich has large amounts of unused employment land and premises in a much more sustainable location;
- The existing permitted use is low impact and does not require significant built development. Moreover, it would be a serious mistake to consolidate commercial development at this location, both because of the harmful visual impact and the inadequate, narrow road access, which is not suitable for the type of traffic which industrial development will attract.
- The existing MOT garage was permitted against officer recommendation. Please stand firm on further development at this location
- There has never been any building or man made structure in this yard. Such development would cause an increase in traffic on an already overloaded country lane not designed for this purpose
- We are also very concerned about pollution and noise from this development as it is very close to our property

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

42. The main issues in consideration of the application are:

- The Principle of Development;
- Landscape Impact;
- Highway Considerations;
- Protected Species;
- Protected Trees;
- Relationship to adjoining properties;
- Other Material Considerations.

The Principle of Development

43. The site is located within the countryside where the governing planning policies are PPS7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas), PPS4 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth) and policy CR01 of the Babergh Local Plan. The aim and purpose of CR01 is to protect the landscape character and quality of the countryside by restricting development to that which is essential for the efficient operation of agriculture, forestry and horticulture and outdoor recreation.
44. PPS4 makes specific reference to planning for economic growth in rural areas and at paragraph EC6.2a states that ‘in rural areas, local planning authorities should... strictly control economic development in open countryside away from existing settlements, or outside areas allocated for development in development plans’. The aim and purpose of this guidance is to direct such uses to town/village centres and allocated sites in order to protect the countryside from intrusive or inappropriate unjustified development. The application site is not within a defined village or town built up area and it is not an allocated employment site.
45. It has been asserted that the application site is a ‘brownfield site’. PPS3 (Housing) defines previously developed land as follows:

“Previously-developed land is that which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated fixed surface infrastructure.”

The definition includes defence buildings, but excludes:

- *Land that is or has been occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings.*
 - *Land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill purposes where provision for restoration has been made through development control procedures.*
 - *Land in built-up areas such as parks, recreation grounds and allotments, which, although it may feature paths, pavilions and other buildings, has not been previously developed.*
 - *Land that was previously-developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape in the process of time (to the extent that it can reasonably be considered as part of the natural surroundings).*
 - *There is no presumption that land that is previously-developed is necessarily suitable for housing development nor that the whole of the curtilage should be developed.”*
46. When considered against this definition it is clear, when viewing the planning history that the application site falls within one of the itemised exclusions. Planning permission B/99/01577 gave permission for a County Development where (as detailed in bullet point 2 above) the Development Control process made provision for the restoration of the site through the imposition of conditions on the planning decision. The planning history demonstrates that there were no authorised developments on site following that permission reinforcing the position that the site is considered as Countryside for planning policy purposes. The previous use of the site for a composting facility or the prior railway yard related uses should not lead the Council to support a permanent and larger form of non essential development on the application site.
47. Therefore it is concluded that the development of the site with a new building for employment purposes would be unacceptable in principle and would fly in the face of the national and local planning policies outlined above and would have a harmful impact on the open character of the countryside in this location.

48. The application proposal is accompanied by a supporting statement from the applicant. This sets out that they consider the proposal to represent the expansion of an existing employment facility as detailed in saved policy EM20. EM22 is also referenced by the applicant but this cannot be considered as this is not a saved policy and as such no longer forms part of the Development Plan.
49. The assessment of the application against EM20 is misleading in that the proposal is made speculatively and the applicant does not own the application site or adjoining MOT station. Notwithstanding this position PPS4 provides the most up to date policy guidance on economic development in rural areas and protection of the countryside and consequently is afforded substantial weight. Within this context proposed development of the application site either speculatively or by an existing business would not be acceptable in principle. Further policy EM20 states that proposals for the expansion/extension of an existing employment site will be permitted provided there is no material conflict with residential and environmental amenity and highway safety and as detailed further in the report the proposal is not acceptable in any of these areas.
50. Guidance on 'main town centre uses' such as B1 offices is contained in the new PPS4. It is prudent to be mindful of this guidance in consideration of the application as this guidance is primarily aimed at sites proposed for allocation or unallocated sites and as such carries weight in assessing the application proposal that has to be balanced against the Local Plan Policy. PPS4 sets out that "National policy requires impact test to be applied in respect to all main town centre uses...Main town centre uses (including offices and arts, culture and tourism) will require impact testing, but the scope and level of detail required will vary according to the local circumstances." The design and access statement accompanying the application sets out that it proposes a mix of B1 and B2 development with no indication of the level of each use proposed. The B1 element of the proposal is considered as a main town use and could potentially, dependent on the end user, be the whole 657 square metres of floor area. The provision of this use outside of a town centre has not been justified by the applicant and as such it is considered an inappropriate use in this location that would harm town centre vitality and viability. This position compounds the inappropriateness of this location for the proposed development.
51. Issues surrounding the proposed B2 use are discussed further in this report in the section assessing impact on residential amenity.

Landscape Impact

52. The application site sits in a prominent location within the countryside open to public views especially from the north and south. The site is visible from the main A12 trunk road and within the immediate locality. The site is currently open in character affording views across it to Moyes Cottages and the landscapes beyond. The site is adjacent to the Special Landscape Area, which is designated to the north of the site. The preceding section has addressed the inappropriateness of the principle of the development. This is compounded by the failure of the proposal to sit comfortably within the landscape.
53. Policy CR01 requires proposals that are allowed in the countryside to be compatible with their surroundings, be sensitively designed, maximise potential for wildlife on site, not introduce a proliferation of structures and relate well to the highway network. The proximity of the site to the SLA requires development proposals to maintain or enhance the SLA in accordance with policy CR04. Policy EM01 refers to employment related proposals, and states that one of the key factors to be assessed is the impact of the development on environmental quality.

54. The proposal represents a significant building, having a height of 7.45 metres to the ridge with a basic industrial appearance. This building would be surrounded by a significant area of hardstanding. The building would be prominent in the location and be clearly visible from neighbouring dwellings and from public views. It is considered that the proposal would result in an incongruous form of development that would not be compatible with the open countryside location to the detriment of the appearance of the locality. Further the proposal does not consider the wildlife issues on site or relate well to the highway network. The proximity of the SLA reinforces the adverse landscape impact as the proposal would neither maintain the current position nor provide an enhancement in terms of landscape quality.

Highway Considerations

55. The key policies to consider are TP03, TP15 and TP16 of the Babergh Local Plan. These policies seek development that is well laid out in terms of site access and highway safety, traffic flow and the environment and where appropriate seek the submission of a Travel Plan. Parking requirements (maximum) within the Suffolk advisory standards are one space per 30 square metres gross floor area for B1 up to 2500 square metres and adequate turning and loading for one lorry to be provided and 1 cycle stand per 300 square metres gross floor. For a B2 premises the maximum requirement is the same.
56. The application proposal would therefore be required to provide a maximum of 22 car parking spaces and 2 cycle stands. The application proposal presents 15 car parking spaces in the areas around the building. The presence of the TPO trees to the site frontage rules these areas out for provision of further parking. The site is in a location where there is limited scope for access by means other than car. The Highways Agency note that “the proposal is in a rural location where there is little opportunity for sustainable travel measures” and the applicant has not proposed a Travel Plan of any sort. These issues emphasise that B1 uses, that could be high trip generators, are inappropriate in this location where there is limited ability for sustainable travel and the site constraints are such that parking provision up to maximum standards could not realistically be achieved contrary to policies TP15 and TP16 of the Babergh Local Plan.
57. Considering issues of highway safety the LHA have objected to the proposal due to the lack of visibility. They consider that the boundary fence to this site obstructs visibility of other vehicles within the public highway and as such vehicles cannot enter the public highway safely. The provision of an industrial unit and the vehicles associated with that unit will exacerbate this problem and would create additional dangers and hazards to road users. As such the proposal would result in harm to highway safety contrary to policies contrary to policies TP15 and TP16 of the Babergh Local Plan.

Protected Species

58. PPS9 and Local Plan Policy EN02 state that development should not be permitted which would have a material adverse impact on protected species. The site is located opposite a County Wildlife Site (Bentley Long Wood). The application is accompanied by a phase one ecological assessment. In summary this assessment identifies that further survey work is required to establish whether protected species are present on the site or not. PPS9 advocates a precautionary approach and, as identified by the SWT in their consultation response, the surveys should be carried out prior to the grant of planning permission.
59. On the basis of the submitted information it is not possible to conclude that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on protected species.

Protected Trees

60. The site contains a group of protected Beech Trees on the north boundary. The Arboricultural Officer recommends that the findings of the applicant's tree report be amended to ensure that the TPO trees are all retained. The applicant's agent has confirmed this and the arboricultural aspects of the application are considered acceptable.

Relationship to Adjoining Properties

61. Policy CN01 of the Local Plan seeks to resist development that would have a materially adverse impact on residential amenity and seeks well designed layouts that provide an appropriate scale, density and form and relate well to their surroundings.
62. The proposal would not result in overlooking or overshadowing/loss of light to nearby dwellings, the primary consideration is loss of amenity from noise and disturbance from the proposed use.
63. PPG24 paragraph 10 is of relevance when considering the impact of the proposed B2 uses, which could potentially result in loss of amenity to neighbouring properties. This sets out that " Much of the development which is necessary for the creation of jobs and the construction and improvement of essential infrastructure will generate noise. The planning system should not place unjustifiable obstacles in the way of such development. Nevertheless, local planning authorities must ensure that development does not cause an unacceptable degree of disturbance".
64. The application site is within 25 metres of the nearest properties Moyes Cottages with the building itself being approximately 35 metres from these dwellings and proposes a building that would be highly visible from these properties. The speculative nature of the application is such that the whole building could potentially be used for B2 units, which have potential for noise and hence adverse impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by these dwellings. There is no noise assessment submitted with the application to demonstrate to the Local Planning Authority that the proposed use could operate on site without harm to residential amenity from noise.
65. Specialist guidance was sought from NABE (Environmental Health) who comment that they would not want to see any further "loss of amenity" for these residents as the façade of the nearest sensitive premises is just 35m from the proposed development. If the development cannot be restricted solely to B1 uses they would recommend that conditions be attached to granting a B2 use. One of the conditions proposed is for the submission of a noise assessment. Mindful of adopting a precautionary approach and the guidance of PPG24 that "local planning authorities must ensure that development does not cause an unacceptable degree of disturbance" it is concluded that, in the absence of a noise assessment, it is not possible to be satisfied that the proposals would not result in harm to residential amenity and to impose conditions would not be appropriate.

Other Material Considerations

66. The planning history of the site is a material consideration in the determination of the application. It is of note that application B/08/00466/FUL for the 'Continued use of land for siting of porta cabins for office purposes' was refused planning permission for the following reason:

The proposal, for the continued use of land for the siting of porta cabins for office use, is contrary to policies CR01, CR04, CN01 and EM01 of the Babergh Local Plan Alteration No. 2 (2006). Policy CR01 states (inter alia) that the landscape quality and character of the countryside will be protected by restricting development to that which is essential for agriculture, forestry, horticulture and appropriate outdoor recreation. Policy CR04 refers specifically to development proposals in Special Landscape Areas, and states that they will only be permitted where they are designed and sited so as to harmonise with the landscape setting. Policy CN01 states that all new development must be of appropriate scale, form and detailed design for the location, paying particular attention to (inter alia) the environment surrounding the site. Policy EM01 refers to employment related proposals, and states that one of the key factors to be assessed is the impact of the development on environmental quality.

The proposal represents all undesirable intensification of an employment use on a site outside any defined built up area boundary and within open countryside where development is strictly controlled. Part of the site also lies within a designated Special Landscape Area where development is also strictly controlled in the interests of safeguarding the character of those areas. The proposal is considered to represent an inappropriate form of development in this location in visual terms by virtue of the temporary nature and poor appearance of the porta cabins thereby contrary to all the above planning policies.

CONCLUSION

67. The proposal represents an unjustified, inappropriate and incongruous form of development in a countryside location that would be harmful to landscape character and openness, residential amenity, protected species and highway safety contrary to local and national planning policies.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

- Inappropriate and unjustified employment development in a countryside location contrary to policies CR01 and EM01 of the Babergh Local Plan Alteration No. 2 and PPS4;
- Incongruous and intrusive form of development harmful to landscape character and the character of the Special Landscape Area contrary to policies CR01, CR04 and CN01 of the Babergh Local Plan Alteration No. 2;
- Unjustified B1 development in an out of town and unsustainable location harmful to the vitality and viability of the District's centres contrary to PPS4, PPS1 and PPG13;
- In the absence of an appropriate noise assessment detrimental impact to residential amenity resulting from the proposed B2 uses contrary to policies CN01 and EM01 of the Babergh Local Plan Alteration No. 2 and PPG24;
- In the absence of appropriate species surveys the LPA cannot be satisfied that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on protected species contrary to PPS9 and policy EN02 of the Babergh Local Plan Alteration No. 2;
- The application does not provide satisfactory access arrangements in terms of visibility of other vehicles within the public highway when accessing the site and as such vehicles cannot enter the public highway safely. The provision of an industrial unit and the vehicles associated with that unit will exacerbate this problem and would create additional dangers and hazards to road users. As such the proposal would result in harm to highway safety contrary to policies TP15 and TP16 of the Babergh Local Plan.