

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE – 19<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER, 2015**

### **SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT**

**REPORT AT SCHEDULE ITEM 2: NORTH PICKENHAM:** The Airfield, Hilborough Road: Erection of anaerobic digestion plant:  
Reference: 3PL/2015/0378/F  
(see pages 29-38)

#### **CONSULTATIONS**

North Pickenham Parish Council: Further comments on amended scheme awaited

South Pickenham Parish Council: Concerns have been raised about increased use of local country lanes by lorries and tractors/trailers

Highways Authority: Objection maintained: The Highway Authority considers that, notwithstanding the proposal to source feedstock locally, the proposal would be likely to result in increase movements of large vehicles on local roads, the suitability of which has not been properly assessed.

**REPORT AT SCHEDULE ITEM 4: ATTLEBOROUGH:** Land adjacent to Oak Tree Park, Norwich Road: change of use to residential for the siting of up to 23 mobile homes  
Reference: 3PL/2015/0485/F  
(see pages 53-60)

#### **RELEVANT SITE HISTORY:**

Following the completion of a S106 legal agreement, planning permission 3PL/2013/1039/O (Residential development of 25 dwellings) was issued on the 14/10/2015

In respect of para. 2.9: Members' attention is drawn to Relevant Site History which clarifies that outline planning permission for residential development has now been issued following the completion of the Section 106 agreement.

**REPORT AT SCHEDULE ITEM 6: LITTLE ELLINGHAM:** Kerry Food Ltd, Attleborough Road: Construct an extension to existing factory, relocate entrance from the highway and additional HGV handling areas:  
Reference: 3PL/2015/0682/F  
(see pages 86-98)

#### **CONSULTATIONS**

Rocklands Parish Council:

OBJECT – in summary, the parish Council have concerns principally over the HGV and staff traffic. Such concerns relate to the use of Double Decker vehicles on country lanes which the Parish Council consider unsuitable; increase in staff numbers will increase traffic on neighbouring villages; concerns over increase in operational hours from 5.5 days to 7 days a week; other issues relate to noise, possible light pollution and odour; and the Parish Council would prefer the whole business to relocate to a purpose-built industrial area.

Highway Authority:

Further to my initial response of 24 August 2015, having met the applicant and analysed the additional information supplied I would advise as follows:-

The existence of the business in this rural location is a matter of fact. I am therefore mindful that the proposal relates to an expansion of an existing business and that my primary concern is whether any additional traffic, generated by an increase in production, will be to a level where it would have a material impact on the surrounding road network and would prejudice highway safety.

We are advised that the proposal seeks to expand the existing facility to produce a range of ready meals for a supermarket chain who Kerry Foods already supply.

#### **Incoming deliveries.**

We have been supplied with data which indicates that Kerry Foods currently receive 177 inbound HGV deliveries per week but that these do not travel at capacity. Post expansion the same suppliers will deliver goods utilising, in the main, the present spare capacity. However 3 suppliers will need to increase the number of vehicles used each week by a single vehicle each, resulting in a combined increased total of 3 HGVs per week. This equates to an overall increase in inbound vehicles of 1.69%. On the basis that the proposal will utilise capacity in vehicles already supplying the site and that the overall increase in inbound vehicles is less than 2% I would have difficulty in substantiating a highway objection to the principle of the proposal on the grounds of the increase in incoming HGV activity.

#### **Outgoing Goods**

We have been supplied with current production and vehicular generation figures over an 8 week period this year and also with quarterly output figures for last year. Further, details of the highest and lowest output expressed in terms of pallets and HGVs (also known as Trunks) over the last 12 months has also been supplied for comparison.

From the data provided outgoing goods were transported by an average of 21 HGVs per week although not all vehicles were full – some having up to 37% spare capacity. As part of this application, Kerry Foods are installing 2 Double-Deck loading bays to enable them to transport outgoing goods by Double-Deck HGVs. These vehicles have a much larger capacity than conventional Single-Deck HGVs and are able to accommodate 44 pallets per vehicle as opposed to the 26 of a Single-Deck. We have been advised that the reason for the introduction of Double-Deck HGVs is a matter of economy together with an on-going need to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions since this forms part of a Key Performance Indicator associated with an environmental accreditation which the applicant holds.

We are advised that over half of production, being all of the new production lines together with an amount of the existing, will be transported by the new Double-Deck HGV system. Kerry Foods are currently unable to transport more outgoing goods in this way as the system is reliant on the end client being able to receive Double-Deck deliveries.

We are advised that 50.83% of production will be transported by 8 No. Double-Deck HGVs with the remaining 49.17% being transported by 13 No. Single-Deck HGVs. This equates to the current vehicular generation of an average weekly total of 21 HGVs transporting outgoing goods.

On this basis I do not consider that there would be a material increase in out-bound vehicles. I would however require a condition to be imposed requiring the new loading bays to be available for use before production starts to ensure goods are transported in the way described.

Further, at a recent meeting, Kerry Foods advised they would be prepared to limit outgoing deliveries to between the hours of 18:00 – 06:00 to avoid any conflict with the school opening and closing times and other issues on the network. This should form part of a condition of any approval.

### **Staffing**

The applicants agent has advised in the Planning Statement that the figure of 60 new staff quoted on the application form was incorrect and has supplied a detailed breakdown of staff currently employed which averages 300 although was 317 on the day of the survey supplied. We are advised that a revised shift pattern, together with an increase in automated processes, requires that an additional 26 staff are to be employed.

We are advised in Para 2 of the Planning Statement that “A car sharing scheme will be introduced and encouraged on the site”. This was indicated to me by the amount of spare capacity on the car park on the date of my site inspection however, to support this, I will require a Workplace Travel Plan to be completed, operated and updated on a regular basis.

### **Off site works**

The applicant has included a single passing place in mitigation for the development.

Overrun on Attleborough Road is present in several places between the site and Hingham Road. Whilst the increase in vehicular traffic is not considerable, nevertheless I consider any increase at all warrants, in addition to the passing bay proposed, an additional two areas of localised widening to achieve a 5.5m carriageway width. I have discussed these with the applicant's agent and have also identified remedial works adjacent to the existing site access to repair the carriageway edge. All of these works are referred to in the Planning Statement.

I would normally agree the detail of any off-site improvements at this stage but, because of the time constraints, am happy for these to be dealt with by way of a condition if you consider that to be appropriate.

Further, the scheme of off-site works will need to include a scheme of off-site positive signage to direct traffic along B1077 and Hingham Road and not through unsuitable local routes.

### **Site access**

The access indicated needs minor alterations to ensure vehicles do not oversail the opposing carriageway and do not turn left out of the site.

Again, because of the time constraints, I would be happy for the design of the access to form part of a condition so that it may be approved at a later date.

### **Car parking**

Because of the sites rural location and absence of public transport provision there is a reliance on travelling by car.

The current parking layout drawing TR15-025 provides for 151 car parking spaces, 4 motor cycle spaces and 6 cycle spaces although the number of parking spaces is quoted as 160 in the Planning Statement possibly because the area to the north of the site is unmarked.

The revised details (drawing No TR15-026) include provision for a covered cycle storage facility for 24 cycles, 6 motor cycle spaces and 180 car parking spaces. In this instance I would be prepared to accept this level of parking.

### **Traffic Routing**

An acceptable route, which avoids Little Ellingham village, for associated traffic to access and egress the site is detailed on Drawing SK-101-P1. The directions given by Fowler Welch need to include this route as they imply a left turn at the junction of B1077 Attleborough Road with Hingham Road rather than a right turn.

This route will also need to form part a Construction Traffic Management Plan to ensure all construction traffic uses the approved route. The details referred to as a Construction Phase Traffic Management Plan TR151-024 in the Planning Statement only shows the physical construction phase. However it will be acceptable for the details of a CTMP to be approved at a later date.

In summary, whilst I do not consider that I could substantiate a highway objection to the proposal in principle I would require conditions outlined below to be imposed together with a suitably worded condition concerning permitted hours of operation for outgoing vehicular movements:-

Laying out of access / on-site car and cycle parking / servicing / loading, unloading / turning / waiting areas;

Visibility splays;

Provision of vehicular access ;

Construction Traffic Management Plan and Access Route;.

Routing for the Construction Traffic Management Plan;.

Scheme of off-site highway improvement works;

Completion of the off-site highway improvement works;

Interim Travel Plan; and

Full Travel Plan following Interim Travel Plan.

You may also wish to investigate whether any Permitted Development rights exist which may result in any further increase in production without a formal planning application being submitted. If this is the case you may want to consider the removal of any such PD rights.