



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 17 March 2026

Site visit made on 18 March 2026

by J P Longmuir BA(Hons) DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th May 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/F2605/W/24/3351737

Coughtrey Industrial Estates (Units 1 - 17), Church Road, Griston, Norfolk, IP25 6QB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Eastern Attachments Ltd against the decision of Breckland Council.
 - The application Ref is 3PL/2022/0368/F.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of Units 1-6 (whole block Western boundary) and Units 7-13 (part of North Block), extensions to units 14 and 15 (large extension to North block), extension to unit 16 (small extension to South Block), external fascia changes, refurbishment to Unit 17. Change of use of whole site to mixed B2 and Class E (offices). The reconfiguration of parking and creation of a new loading and unloading area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of Units 1-6 (whole block Western boundary) and Units 7-13 (part of North Block), extensions to units 14 and 15 (large extension to North block), extension to unit 16 (small extension to South Block), external fascia changes, refurbishment to Unit 17. Change of use of whole site to mixed B2 and Class E (offices). The reconfiguration of parking and creation of a new loading and unloading area at Coughtrey Industrial Estates (Units 1 - 17), Griston, IP25 6QB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3PL/2022/0368/F, subject to the conditions in the attached annexe.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal is re-determined following the quashing of the decision, 23 June 2025, by Order of the Court on grounds that the fallback position and planning balance were given insufficient consideration.
3. The proposal was screened on 31 January 2025 under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales Regulations 2017 (as amended) by the Planning Inspectorate and was not found to warrant an Environmental Impact Assessment. This screening was repeated on 19 March 2026 which concurred with the 2025 process and outcome.
4. The Council's position in this appeal was confirmed in the submitted Statement of Common Ground whereby they did not object to the proposal, finding compliance with the Development Plan as a whole. Nonetheless I have a duty to consider the pertinent issues.

5. Evidence was submitted just prior to the opening of this Hearing relating to dust and air quality as well as alternative sites. However I found that this particular information was not material to my consideration and therefore no party was prejudiced by it.
6. On the 16 December 2025 the Government published a consultation on suggested changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I have given this consideration but do not find the changes significant for this appeal.

Main Issues

7. The main issues were identified by the last Inspector and following consultation with both main parties, I found that they remain valid.
8. The main issues are therefore:
 - the appropriateness of the site for the proposal in principle; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the nearby residents in terms of potential noise, odour, air quality, construction and traffic.

Reasons

The appropriateness of the site for the proposal in principle

9. Policy GEN 01 of the Breckland Local Plan (the LP) seeks to direct jobs and growth towards the most sustainable locations, contributing towards the economy and jobs in rural areas. It also seeks to co-ordinate development with transport provision. Similarly Policy TR 01 strives to locate development where it is accessible to sustainable transport and promotes such opportunities.
10. Policy EC 01 promotes economic growth, allocates some employment land and highlights the need for new employment to follow sustainability principles. Policy EC 03 identifies and seeks the protection of General Employment Areas, for their continued land use.
11. Policy EC 04 deals with sites outside the identified General Employment Areas. Employment proposals will be permitted where there are no other suitable sites available or there are particular reasons for the development including the expansion of an existing business. Policy EC 04 also notes that employment uses in locations outside the Policy EC 03 remit are considered important to the economy, particularly in rural areas.
12. Griston is a village with limited facilities and public transport. Nonetheless the site is within a settlement boundary in the LP.
13. The site has been in employment use for several decades; it includes hard standings, buildings and a wide access. Indeed aerial photos of the site between 2006 and 2023¹ show the footprint of buildings is well established.
14. The Appellant has largely relocated its operation onto the appeal site from its previous location at nearby Attleborough. This was necessary following a fire, but in any event, the business was seeking new and more extensive buildings for their operation. The Appellant manufactures ancillary equipment for building and

¹ Page 8 Mr Paker Planning Appeal Statement

- agricultural machinery, including JCB: sheet metal is delivered onto the site, and the finished painted products include digger buckets and various handling tools.
15. The proposal would continue the site's employment use, whilst also involving an increase in the footprint of buildings across the site, resulting in a net increase of 1,250sqm. Potentially such an expansion of buildings could lead to more employees travelling here and the site has limited public transport. The Appellant currently operates a car sharing scheme, and this proposal includes a Travel Plan which would support its continuation.
 16. In addition the Hearing was presented with evidence that the village has had significant residential development, and more is envisaged: the Parish Council's submission to the Hearing² notes potentially an additional 57 homes within the village boundary and a further 60 homes within the Parish boundary. This scale of residential development suggests that the village has potential for growth in planning terms.
 17. All the new buildings and the manufacturing operation would be wholly within the discernible employment site boundaries.
 18. The previous uses here would have generated significant traffic and were not under the control of any formal requirement for a Travel Plan; whereas one is included here which encourages sustainable access.
 19. The proposal utilises an existing employment site for employment purposes and thus there is no difference in land use planning terms. Moreover it is a brownfield site and in this respect the proposal makes a good use of land, which also reflects sustainability.
 20. The employment offered by the proposal would help support and diversify the rural economy, which would support the social and economic well-being of the area.
 21. As the site is not identified as a General Employment Area under Policy EC 03, Policy EC 04 then warrants consideration. This allows for employment uses where there are no suitable sites identified or allocated employment sites and/or there are particular reasons for the development not being located on an established or allocated employment site.
 22. From the evidence before the Hearing there is a pressing need for a confirmed site following the fire at the Attleborough base. The Appellant stated at the Hearing that the development, if allowed, would be completed within nine months and it needs to meet its contractual obligations to ensure its future prospects. This latter point was uncontested and seems wholly logical for an ancillary supplier dealing with a major commercial manufacturer. This site would allow for the required development timescale being brownfield land with an existing employment use, whereas in other locations no planning permission may exist.
 23. The Appellant's processes require a high energy electrical supply, which limits the potential for sites. Local residents suggest that one possible site would be at Snetterton. However both the Council and Appellant agree that 'if the Snetterton site is potentially available and suitable, then new buildings would be required to be constructed, for which planning applications and planning permission would be required for the site and the proposal. This does not provide the Appellants with a

² Page 4 paragraph 14. Also Mr Heath Appendix 1 Church Road

facility to just move into and operate³. I therefore find that delay and uncertainty would result in pursuing Snetterton or any other site.

24. In the above respect the proposal accords with Policy EC0 04 and the Policy is worded 'and/or', which requires only one criterion has to be met. In any event the other criterion is whether there are particular reasons for the development not being located on an established or allocated employment site. This has a sub criterion of whether it is expansion of an existing business, which is met here. I therefore find that on both counts the proposal accords with Policy EC04. In any event I find this is an established employment site. Indeed the lower case wording to the policy states⁴: in order to ensure that business development in the rural areas is sustainable proposals will be expected to make best use of previously developed sites.
25. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would accord with Policies EC 04, and GEN 01. Whilst this site is not an allocation the proposal would respect the sustainability principles of EC 01.

The effect on living conditions

26. Policy TR 02 highlights the need to avoid any material harm to living conditions from heavy goods vehicular movements. GEN 02 is largely concerned with design and includes the need to protect amenity.
27. Policy COM 01 requires development is designed to reduce the impact on local air quality particularly from road traffic. Policy COM 02 expects new development to take appropriate steps to avoid/mitigate potential negative effects on the health of the population and facilitate enhanced health and well-being. Policy COM 03 states development will not be permitted which causes unacceptable effects on residential amenity of neighbouring occupants. Reference is made to odour, noise, vibration, dust/air pollution including particulates, overbearing and overshadowing.
28. Policy EC 03 also highlights the need to avoid any significant detrimental health impacts.
29. The Planning Practice Guidance on Noise suggests the effects will depend on the source, absolute level, time of day/night, type of noise, frequency, pattern of occurrence and background levels. It highlights the complexity of noise and the potential cumulative effects. The arrangement and nature of buildings and the activities will also be influential. Mitigation can include reducing noise at source, layout considerations including potentially distancing sources, use of planning conditions and insulation to buildings.
30. Paragraph 135 of the Framework states that developments should promote health and well-being with a high standard of amenity. Similarly paragraph 89 promotes healthy communities. Paragraph 201 states the focus of decisions should be whether there is an acceptable use of land and not the control of processes or emissions (where they are subject to separate pollution control regimes). Paragraph 198 states planning decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects as well as the sensitivity of the site. It highlights the need to minimise and reduce to a minimum potential impacts from noise. There is a cross reference to the Noise Policy

³ Paragraph 9 Statement of Common Ground

⁴ Paragraph 6.47

Statement for England⁵: its overall policy vision is to 'promote good health and a good quality of life through the effective management of noise within the context of Government Policy on sustainable development'.

31. Paragraph 199 of the Framework promotes air quality management. The Planning Practice Guidance on Air quality states much will depend upon the proposal and acknowledges the potential for mitigation by ventilation/air extraction systems.
32. On north and south sides of the appeal site there are residential properties in a variety of juxtapositions within their gardens, demarcated by close boarded fences. The eastern side of the site fronts the village road where there are various properties opposite. Local residents speaking at the Hearing confirmed one of the nearby buildings is a care home helping residents in need of end of life support. A prison is to the west but is more distanced than the residential properties.
33. The Appellant undertakes manufacturing processes which includes laser cutting, metal pressing, knocking out (removing extraneous material from a particular shape), welding, shot blasting, paint spraying and various loading and unloading activities.
34. The Appellant submitted an acoustic report which monitored the outputs of all the machinery as well as the background noise. The specific intensities, type of noise and duration were all recorded. This depicts the noise environment, its perceptibility and potential nuisance. It also shows potentially accumulative noise as the measurements were recorded over an hour long period.
35. The proposal would enable all the manufacturing to be within the buildings. In addition the processes would be organised to operate on a sequential basis of the production rather than the current ad hoc approach. External activities would be limited to movement of products between the two sets of buildings as well as the loading/unloading of materials. A condition is suggested to control outside working.
36. The new buildings would be constructed with noise insulating material and some of the existing buildings have already had such treatment. The acoustic report shows this would make a significant difference between internal and external noise. Additionally the proposed buildings would have internal walls and doors which would discourage noise leakage when the external doors are open. In any event the doors would only need to be open briefly for loading/unloading and would otherwise remain closed, as in the suggested condition. The Hearing was told that ventilation and cooling would be provided irrespective of the doors. As I observed on the site visit the opening and closing mechanism of the doors is also quiet.
37. The Appellant operates one single daily shift, and hours of use conditions are suggested and agreed by the parties to offer protection to local residents. This would importantly help respect hours of sleeping and resting for most people.
38. The operation uses electric powered forklift trucks which as I saw on my site visit are quiet. The forklifts could be the subject of a proposed condition which includes the potentially audible reversing warnings. Timber pallets are used for transporting materials and they have a cushioning effect to potential noise emissions during the loading process.

⁵ Noise Policy Statement for England (Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs 2010)

39. There is an external bin store which is used for the disposal of steel off cuts, which the noise report notes as a potential nuisance. However this would be likely to be located at the southwest part of the site, and its location and management could be controlled by condition.
40. The proposed layout shows a turning area towards the centre of the site, which would place such movements away from the residential boundaries. The adjacent north and south sets of buildings would stretch along those boundaries, so would serve as acoustic barriers to the nearby properties. However the building footprint does not extend wholly along the southern boundary and a 4m high close boarded acoustic fence is proposed, which could be conditioned as such, for its erection and retention to protect that house and garden.
41. A condition could be imposed on the limits of any increase in noise at the site's boundaries. The noise report provides background noise levels and recommends several measuring points. This would address cumulative noise, the noise character as well as the variables of climatic and ground conditions.
42. The village is not within an Air Quality Management Area and the rurality together with an absence of intensive roads ensures that it enjoys good quality air. The paint spraying, shot blasting, laser cutting and welding activities have the potential to generate emissions, particulates and odours. However these would take place within the buildings, and the emitting air (and fumes) would be expected to be passed into extraction systems with carbon filters. The control and maintenance of the extraction systems and filters, as well as closed windows, could be conditioned which would maintain air quality and prevent odours as well as contaminants.
43. The appeal proposal would also be subject to a condition dust management plan, which could cover the current and any future operation.
44. The site in its entirety is not currently subject to planning conditions preventing outside working noise limits or hours of use. There are personalised conditions on parts of the site, but the majority of the site has no comprehensive controls. This proposal provides an opportunity for robust planning conditions to be imposed which would provide specified controls on the operation of the whole of the site; the quantifiable parameters would inform the Appellant, the Council and local residents rather than the current less specified situation and the establishment of statutory nuisance under the Environmental Protection Act.
45. There was no evidence before the Hearing of any vibration effects of the proposal. Nonetheless the use of particular machinery or processes could change which could lead to such potential. A condition for a management plan could cover any such eventuality.
46. Any conditions imposed would also prevail in the event that the Appellant no longer used the site and another operation took place. With the exception of the boundary fence, the conditions would control the noise at source which would be efficient.
47. Both parties agree this is an 'industrial employment site, which has mixed industrial, light industrial and storage uses (E, B2 and B8)⁶. These uses included industrial and distribution activities which could have led to considerable traffic movements, at any time of the day and in positions on the site close to residential properties.

⁶ Paragraph 1 Statement of Common Ground

- This proposal places traffic movements in the centre of the site and offers a boundary fence and buildings to contain the noise environment as well as potential planning conditions covering noise levels and timing of deliveries.
48. The Appellant stated at the Hearing that the construction process would be likely to last nine months, during which there is the potential for noise, dust and disruption to local residents. A construction environment management plan could be required by condition to minimise these impacts.
49. Additionally there was concern at the Hearing from local residents that the proposed buildings would be oppressive and overbearing. However they would not encroach any further towards the boundary than the existing buildings. In addition their height would be limited, and the roofs would slope away from the properties. Relatedly the acoustic fence would be so positioned to avoid shadowing or overbearing effects.
50. I do not find that a B2 use would harm the character and perception of the village as the experience would be little different to the established site.
51. On my site visit I did experience the operation of some of the machinery involved. Whilst this was helpful for familiarisation of the Appellant's processes, I have not relied upon it for my decision.
52. The Council's Environmental Health Officer makes particular reference to the acoustic report and accepted its methodology and findings. Similarly there were no objections from related consultees, and the dust, odour and air quality potential effects have also been considered. I also note that the last Inspector had no concern in this respect. I acknowledge the concerns of the local residents about the B2 use, however giving consideration of all the evidence before the Hearing, I find that the reasonable living environment of the residents could be safeguarded by appropriate conditions. Such conditions would apply to the appeal site rather than just the Appellant's operation. I therefore find that the proposal would accord with Policies GEN 02, EC 03, COM 01, COM 03 and TR 02 as well as the Planning Practice Guidance on Noise and Air quality.

Other Matters

53. Concern was raised about the safety of Church Road as well as the surrounding road network for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians. Policy TR 02 seeks to protect the safety of the local highway network and that heavy goods vehicles avoid any severe impacts. However this is an existing employment site whereby significant traffic could be generated. Church Road has sufficient width to accommodate large vehicles and is straight so that any approaching oncoming vehicle would be apparent and would be expected to pause to allow it to pass. This would be supported by the 30mph limit as well as the route beyond not being a through road but more circuitous around the village.
54. The site itself has a wide access with good visibility in both directions for vehicles to enter and leave the site. I note that the Highway Authority has no objection, and I similarly find that the proposal would not undermine safety and thereby accord with Policy TR 02.
55. The proposed elevations show typically contemporary modern industrial buildings which reflect the character of the site, which would be representational and

therefore expected. They would have a muted appearance which would not overly attract the eye. Consequently I find that there would be no significant impact on the character and appearance of the area.

- 56. The proposal has been demonstrated not to harm any protected species in the wider area and would allow for a biodiversity net gain. The site has little vegetation, and the proposal would largely retain the significant elements along the boundaries.
- 57. Concern was raised about shadowing to solar panels on a neighbouring dwelling, but as I noted above, in terms of residential amenity, the proposed buildings would be no closer to the boundary with roofs sloping away from the dwellings.
- 58. Concern was expressed about the potential risks of gas containers stored on the site as well as fire risks. However these would be governed by other parameters outside the planning system.

Development Plan, Planning Balance and Planning Benefits

- 59. I have found above that the proposal would accord with the most important policies in the Local Plan as above.
- 60. I therefore find in relation to the Development Plan policies taken as a whole, the proposal would be in accordance.
- 61. Paragraph 88 of the Framework supports the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of businesses in rural areas, recognising the benefits to the local economy. Paragraph 89 states planning decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements and in locations that are not well served by public transport. Paragraph 125 suggests planning decisions support the development of underutilised land and buildings. Paragraphs 89, 135, 198, 199 and 201 recognise the need to safeguard residential amenity and are addressed in the conditions. Paragraph 8 provides social, economic and environmental yardsticks which are met by the proposal. The Framework therefore supports the proposal and reinforces a decision in accordance with the Development Plan.
- 62. The economic and employment benefits of the proposal add support to its compliance with the Development Plan.
- 63. The Council advised at the Hearing that the review of the Local Plan is at Regulation 18 stage and so cannot attract significant weight in terms of this proposal. Similarly I was advised that a Neighbourhood Plan is in preparation but is at an early stage.

Conditions

- 64. Paragraph 57 of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance, Use of planning conditions, provide the tests for the imposition of conditions. The Framework is clear that planning conditions should be kept to a minimum and only imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning, and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. I have assessed the suggested conditions accordingly.
- 65. There was mention during the Hearing that the proposal was at least in part retrospective. Consequently for the avoidance of any doubt I have worded the

conditions with a fair and proportionate time period for compliance rather than any prior to commencement trigger. Similarly the usual condition on commencement to acknowledge compliance with section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is not needed.

66. The condition on the approved plans is necessary to provide clarity and certainty.
67. The condition requiring noise insulation to the buildings would contribute to the low levels of external noise and avoidance of disturbance. Similarly a condition confirming the management and position of the scrap waste bin would ensure that the siting is away from dwellings and limits the potential noise generation. Additionally a condition on the particular type of forklifts is necessary to avoid potential disturbance from engines as well as warning signals. Relatedly a condition on hours of working and outside working as well as deliveries/collections would prevent disturbance during most people's sleeping hours and restful non-working day times. A condition on closure of windows and doors is necessary to avoid sound leakage.
68. As I found above the implementation, retention and/or replacement of the proposed 4m acoustic boundary fence would contribute to the amenity of the adjoining house and garden. Finally a condition controlling the noise limits at the site's boundary would be an overall measure to quantify and control noise limits, which would be a catch all. The increased limits of 3dB and 5dB are set to respect the proximities of the various residential dwellings and this lowers to no increase during the critical night-time period.
69. A condition requiring the submission and approval of a dust management plan would protect against any significant problems in this respect. The condition requiring submission and approval of operational management for paint spraying, shot blasting, laser cutting and welding would ensure that these activities are specified and such details are checked by specialists overseen by the Local Planning Authority, so that potential problems would be contained in the vicinity of the sources. Similarly the condition on details of all air extraction systems would avoid any significant odours, noxious gases or particulates. The conditions as worded do not use the phrase 'unless otherwise agreed' which could undermine their robustness, rather any future variation of the approved details would entail formal re-submission for any approval.
70. A condition preventing incineration of any material is necessary to ensure that any such activity in the future is carried out in a properly dedicated facility to maintain air quality. Similarly a condition on a management plan to remedy the effects of vibration would ensure that the site's ongoing operation respects living conditions.
71. From the evidence before the Hearing, the operational conditions are reasonable and would not prevent the Appellant's processes. The provision of the acoustic fence, sound insulation, dust management and air filtration systems would be proportionate to the proposal.
72. The submission of a Construction Environment Management Plan would ensure that the construction process, including demolition is respectful to the nearby residents in terms of noise, dust, dirt, air quality and general disturbance. The condition to remedy any contaminated land is also necessary for the health and well-being of local residents. The condition on external lighting is necessary to avoid spillage and nuisance to the neighbouring dwellings.

73. As I found earlier a condition requiring a Travel Plan is necessary in terms of carbon emissions. The condition requiring visibility splays is necessary to ensure safe movements onto and from the highway. Provision of car parking including accessible spaces is necessary to support the new buildings. The condition on HGV management is necessary to ensure that routing is safe and conducive to the roadside environment.
74. As found earlier the biodiversity needs to be respected and a condition is required to ensure that appropriate provision is made. The condition on arboricultural works would ensure that the relevant specimens are safeguarded which would help air quality and contribute to Green Infrastructure.
75. A condition requiring the submission and approval of walling and roofing materials would ensure a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

76. The proposal complies with the Development Plan, and material considerations do not indicate otherwise. I therefore conclude that the Appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions in the conditions annexe below.

John Longmuir

INSPECTOR

Appearances

For the Council

Mike Horn, Solicitor to the Council

Rebecca Collins MRTPI PG DIP BA(Hons), Head of Development Management

Stephen Scowen, Strategic Growth Manager

Chris Fitzgerald, Technical Support Officer

For the Appellant

Charles Merrett, Barrister, Francis Taylor Building

Philip Leslie Director and owner of Eastern Attachments Limited

Jason Parker BSc(Hons) Environmental Planning, MRTPI, Director Meadows

Edward Tyrer BSc(Hons) Environmental Planning, Dip Transport Management, MBA, MRTPI, MCIHT, MTPS, Consultant

Paul Zanna BSc(Hons) Environmental Management, Technical Director, Create Consulting

Ian Rees BSc(Hons) MIOA, Acoustics Consultant

Interested Parties

John Heath, Griston Community Group and Parish Council

Sarah Brookes, Griston Parish Council

Kate Steventon, Local resident

Trevor Scott, Local resident

Councillor Clare Bowles, County Council

Michael Wood, Local resident

Simon Spanyol, Caston Parish Council

Alison Price, Local resident

Lee Steventon, Local resident

Conditions Annexe

1. The construction of all the proposed development and use of the site, from the date of this decision notice, shall only be carried out in strict accordance with the application form, and approved documents and drawings, as follows:

Proposed Site Plan 27/0/20018/P/00

Proposed Ground Floor Plans 28/0/20018/P/00

Proposed Elevations – North Block 25/A/20018/E

South Block – Proposed Front Officers 12/A/20018/P/00

South Block – Proposed Elevations 13/0/20018/E

South Block – Proposed Floor Plans 11/0/20018/P/00

Noise Assessment - Adrian James Acoustics – Ref: 12963b Report 1D - 18 April 2024

Operational Dust Assessment by Create Consulting, Ref: NP/VL/P23-2908/03, Dated March 2024

Odour Assessment by Create Consulting, Ref: NP/CC/P23-2908/04, Dated April 2024

Air Quality Assessment by Create Consulting, Ref: NP/VL/P23-2908/01, Dated August 2023

2. No built development shall commencement above slab level, unless or until precise details, (including samples where required), of the materials used in the construction of the external walls and roof(s) of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This condition shall apply notwithstanding any indication as to these matters that have been given in the appeal proposal. The materials to be used in the development shall be in accordance with the approved details.

3. Any operation/works on site shall take place in complete accordance with the approved Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) prepared by Oakfield, reference OAS 21-104-AR01 REV A (July 2022).

4. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment shall be undertaken in accordance with details to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Where remediation is necessary, a remediation scheme must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

5. No built development shall commencement on the site, until a Construction Method Statement is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the Method Statement shall include:

- a) procedures for controlling sediment runoff, noise, dust and the removal of soil, debris and demolition and construction materials from public roads or places;
- b) measures to mitigate impacts on the amenities of existing residential properties due to noise, dust and vibration;
- c) details of the Site Waste Management Plan;
- d) measures to mitigate impacts on the amenities of the adjacent residential properties due to noise, dust and vibration;
- e) the Method Statement shall specify the acceptable working hours as 07:30 - 18:00 Monday – Friday, 08:00 - 1300 Saturday and no works on Sundays or at any time on Bank Holidays;
- f) for the duration of the construction period all traffic associated with the construction of the development will comply with the Construction Traffic Management Plan and use only the 'Construction Traffic Access Route' and no other local roads, unless first approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority;

g) details of a complaints procedure, including contact for operative for local concerns to be raised; and

h) details of an appointed ecological clerk of works.

The approved details (or any approved revision thereof) shall be implemented at the outset and maintained throughout the construction period.

6. Within three months of the date of this decision, visibility splays shall be provided in full accordance with the details indicated on the approved plan. The splays shall thereafter be maintained at all times free from any obstruction exceeding 600mm above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.

7. Prior to the first occupation of any of the new buildings hereby permitted, the proposed access/on-site car and cycle parking, including 6% provision of accessible car parking/servicing/loading/unloading/turning/waiting area shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter available for that specific use.

8. Within three months of the date of this decision, an HGV Management Plan for the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall thereafter be implemented as approved and make provision for:

- a) monitoring of the approved arrangements during the life of the site;
- b) ensuring that all drivers of vehicles under the control of the operator are made aware of the approved arrangements;
- c) the disciplinary steps that will be exercised in the event of a default; and
- d) appropriate signage, to be erected advising drivers of the agreed vehicle routes.

The use of the site shall be in accordance with the HGV Management Plan at the moment of approval in writing and continued as approved thereafter.

9. From the date of this decision, aside from car parking no use of the site, outside of the buildings, shall take place outside the hours of:

06:00 - 18:00 Monday to Friday

08:00 - 12:00 Saturday

10. No plant, power tools or process shall be operated or take place anywhere on the site between 08:00 - 12:00 Saturday outside the buildings, other than electric forklifts to carry equipment between the two sets of buildings.

11. From the date of this decision apart from office or administration uses, no other use shall take place inside of the buildings, outside the hours of:

07:00 - 17:30 Monday to Friday

08:00 - 12:00 Saturday

12. From the date of this decision, no deliveries or collections, or any loading/unloading or vehicles running including engines idling, shall take place anywhere on the appeal site outside the following times 07:30 – 17:00 Monday to Friday.

13. From the date of this decision notice the use(s) on the site shall not generate noise levels exceeding those set out within the BS4142 assessment contained in the Adrian James Acoustics report dated April 2024), including:

a) the sound level at receptor locations R1, R3 and R4 shall not exceed 3dB above the measured background sound level (LA90,T) at any time;

b) the sound level at receptor location R2 shall not exceed 3dB above the measured background sound level (LA90,T) on Saturdays and 5dB Monday to Friday;

c) the sound level at receptor location R5 shall not exceed 5dB above the measured background sound level (LA90,T); and

d) the sound level at any of the identified receptor locations shall not exceed the background sound level between the hours of 23:00 and 07:00.

The above receptor locations R1–R5 shall only be taken from the Adrian James Acoustics report dated April 2024, and all readings shall be in accordance with the methodology set out in BS 4142:2014+A1:2019 (or any subsequent equivalent standard in force at the time of measurement). Additionally all measurements for the above shall only be undertaken using a sound level meter compliant with IEC 61672 Class 1 (or equivalent relevant UK adopted standard), set to a fast time weighting, and calibrated in accordance with the procedures set out in BS 4142.

14. Within six months of the date of this decision, an acoustic fence 4 metres high, comprising of close boarded timber with a mass per unit area of at least 10kg/m², with no gaps between fencing boards or between the base of the fence and the ground, shall be erected on the southern and western boundary of the site, as shown on plan reference 07/A/20018/P/00 and constructed as set out in the submitted noise report titled 'Technical Report' last revised 18th April 2024 by Adrian James Acoustics. The fence thereafter shall be permanently maintained in accordance with these details.

15. From the date of this decision notice all forklift trucks, material moving and lifting vehicles operating on the site shall only be electrically powered and shall use white noise or visual alarm systems at all times and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

16. From the date of this decision notice and continued as such thereafter all windows shall remain closed during operational hours, and all doors shall remain closed except for access and egress. Forklift truck access and egress shall only be through sectional insulated doors with automated opening and closure mechanisms.

17. Within three months of the date of this decision details for the disposal of the scrap material including offcuts, the location of the associated receptacle bin, hours of use, and its management shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. From the moment of approval in writing the scrap, offcuts and bin shall be placed and managed only in accordance with such details and shall remain so thereafter.

18. Prior to any the construction of any walling above ground level, details and specifications of sound insulation measures for all new buildings, based on the Technical Report' 18th April 2024 by Adrian James Acoustics, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The buildings shall only be constructed with the approved sound insulation which shall be wholly in place prior to their first use. The approved sound insulation shall remain in situ as approved thereafter.

19. Within three months of the date of this decision, a dust management plan shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. From the moment of approval in writing the use of the site shall only operate in accordance with the approved details and shall be continued as such thereafter.

20. Within three months of the date of this decision, all paint spraying, shot blasting, laser cutting and welding shall only take place in accordance with details submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, including methodology, location of these activities, details of all air filtration and maintenance, details of their surrounding shielding and disposal of resulting waste/debris. From the moment of approval in writing the use of the site shall only operate in accordance with such approved details and shall be continued as approved thereafter.

21. Within three months of the date of this decision, details of all air extraction shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval including specification, timescale for implementation and maintenance regime. Thereafter all air extraction shall accord with the approved details and shall follow the approved maintenance regime.

22. From the date of this decision notice no burning or incineration shall take place on the appeal site.

23. Within three months of the date of this decision, a management plan to prevent, remedy, monitor and review any existing and potential vibration effects from machinery

or any processes shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. From the moment of approval in writing the use of the site shall only operate in accordance with the approved details and shall be continued as such thereafter.

24. Prior to first use of any of the new buildings, details of all external lighting for the whole site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter only external lighting in accordance with the approved details shall be installed.

25. Prior to any works above slab level, a strategy for biodiversity enhancement and mitigation, encompassing the submitted Ecological Assessment Report (Huckle Ecology Ltd, March 2022), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The content shall include the following:

- a) purpose and conservation objectives for the strategy;
- b) detailed designs to achieve stated objectives;
- c) locations of proposed measures by appropriate maps and plans;
- d) persons responsible for implementing the measures; and
- e) details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance (where relevant).

The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to first use of the new northern block, hereby permitted and shall be maintained in that manner thereafter.

26. From the date of this decision notice, the Travel Plan measures, as in Section 6 of the submitted Transport Statement dated March 2022, shall be wholly implemented and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

End of conditions