

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCILPLANNING COMMITTEE10<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2012**ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS**

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
<b>PART A</b>		
12/0146/EIA	14	<p><u>Highway Authority</u> – The County Council as Highway Authority recognises this development provides part of the Hoo Brook Link road which is a local transport plan identified scheme supported by both the District Council and the Local Enterprise Partnerships. The link road once complete will provide the Stourport Road Employment Corridor with improved access to the Motorway Network and other major transport routes. Whilst elements of this proposal are only indicatively indicated measures such as the rail halt have the potential to remove cars from the highway network and covert them to more sustainable rail trips. The completion of the Hoo Brook Link Road will be provided either by the redevelopment of the remainder of the British Sugar site or by the County Council.</p> <p>The applicant should enter into a section 106 agreement to contribute towards improvements to the A451 Oldington Road Signal controlled junction. This has been agreed with the applicant to be £100,000. This contribution should be provided prior to the commencement of development.</p> <p>The Network Control Manager, on behalf of the County Council, under Article 10 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order, 1995 recommends that any permission which the District Planning Authority may wish to give include the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission of Junction Details</li> <li>• Submission of Rail Halt Details</li> <li>• Details of the means of closure and reinstatement of existing access</li> <li>• Engineering details of the right turning lane at the primary site access and the signal controlled crossing on the A451</li> </ul>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engineering details and specification of the proposed roads and highway drains</li> <li>• Development shall not be occupied until the roadworks necessary to provide access from the nearest publicly maintained highway have been completed</li> <li>• Timing of completion of road works</li> <li>• Wheel cleaning apparatus to be provided</li> <li>• Parking for Site Operatives</li> </ul> <p>Notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mud on Highway</li> <li>• Private Apparatus within the Highway</li> <li>• Section 278 Agreement</li> <li>• Section 38 Agreement Details</li> <li>• Drainage Details for Section 38</li> <li>• No Drainage to Discharge to Highway</li> <li>• Protection of Visibility Splays</li> <li>• Design of Street Lighting for Section 278</li> <li>• Temporary Direction Signs to Housing Developments</li> </ul> <p><u>Environment Agency</u> (summary of comments and recommended conditions) – Having reviewed the information, we are now in a position to remove our objection to the proposed development. However, we wish to make the following comments and recommend that conditions are attached to any planning permission granted:</p> <p>Flood Risk</p> <p>The conceptual drainage strategy states that the volume of surface water runoff was insignificant in comparison to the volume of process water used in the previous use. We would question this statement, especially for higher rainfall events, in considering the abstraction rate provided.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>However, in addressing the above issue and our previous concerns, we note that the proposed maximum surface water run-off rate has been reduced to 1000 l/s, which equates to approximately 34 l/s/h. The run-off has been constrained to the 1 in 10 year run-off rate based on the previously calculated existing run-off. This approach to reducing the proposed brown field rate of discharge post development is considered acceptable in this instance. This addresses our previous concerns in the absence of evidence to confirm the existing run-off rate for the site.</p> <p>SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) Scheme</p> <p>We note that the attenuation has been re-calculated based on the revised run-off rate. The drainage strategy confirms 6326m<sup>3</sup> of attenuation would be required on site for the 1% plus climate change event, based on the lower rate. A range of SuDS techniques have been identified and we acknowledge the precautionary approach taken to ensure space for SuDS on site. The Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site confirms:</p> <p><i>“In a worst-case scenario, it would be feasible for the total attenuation volume of 6326 m<sup>3</sup> to be accommodated within one or several drainage basins on-site, incorporated into landscaped areas”.</i></p> <p>The drawings support the Conceptual Drainage Strategy in confirming space for on site attenuation. However, we would highlight that the surface water storage along the eastern boundary of the site is in the same location as a proposed footpath on the indicative Masterplan. There is a risk of the proposed footpath becoming unusable and /or people trying to use the path during periods when the attenuation is full. It would be better if the footpath was not routed through the surface water storage areas, in considering potential health and safety issues. You should be satisfied that this can be addressed through the detailed design of the proposed development.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>In general, we are satisfied with the additional information that has been provided to inform an overall drainage strategy for the site. The phased development should be progressed in line with this overall drainage strategy.</p> <p>CONDITION: No development, or phasing as agreed, shall commence until a detailed comprehensive surface water drainage scheme, has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include a schedule of works, and details of how the system will be managed and maintained for the lifetime of the development, and shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details. The management and maintenance details shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, the responsibilities of each party, and any other arrangements necessary to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.</p> <p>Contaminated Land</p> <p>We have reviewed the stage 2 scope of site investigation (SI) provided by SP Associates and acknowledge that our previous comments relating to the risk of pollution to groundwater have been addressed within the scope of SI.</p> <p>We are satisfied that the additional information has acknowledged the potential risk to groundwater as a result of the previous uses on site. The applicant has proposed additional SI to better characterise the site, including the impacts on the water environment, to fully inform remediation requirements and subsequent verification. We would recommend the following planning conditions are imposed on any planning permission granted in securing the additional work, to protect the water environment:</p> <p>CONDITION: No development, or phasing as agreed below, shall take place until the components of a scheme to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site are submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>CONDITION: If during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority, a Method Statement for remediation</p> <p>CONDITION: No infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground is permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Biodiversity</p> <p>The close proximity of the Worcestershire Special Wildlife Sites and buffering corridor vegetation and habitats should be safeguarded by appropriate measures during all stages of the development. We note that you have consulted with Natural England in relation to potential impacts on the adjacent Wilden Marsh &amp; Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest.</p> <p>With regards to the ecological survey, we would consider the value of the site with regards to amphibians has probably been under estimated. Originally with the lagoons, ponds and rough semi-natural vegetation, the site would have been of high suitability for amphibians. The infilling of the water bodies and herbiciding of the vegetation will have effectively acted as an exclusion technique.</p> <p>Appropriate landscaping and treatment should be undertaken, as per the recommendations in the Ecology Section (chapter 6) of the Environmental Statement (ES) as part of any approved design for this development. We would look to secure the recommendations in the Mitigation and Enhancement section of the ES (section 6.7 and 6.8) through a condition attached to any planning permission granted.</p> <p>The following wording is recommended for consideration in consultation with your Biodiversity Officer, Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England:</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>CONDITION: No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a Habitat Management Plan for the management and long term maintenance of water bodies, surface water attenuation features and landscaping areas has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Ecologists should input into the design, landscaping and planting/seeding of SuDS features and surrounding buffering habitat. All planted/sown species adjacent to the river/canal corridor and buffering areas to SuDS features should be appropriate native species suited to the ground conditions and of UK genetic stock.</p> <p><u>Worcestershire County Council</u> - Green Infrastructure (GI) &amp; Biodiversity</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposals need to be accompanied by a mitigation strategy for reptiles on this site. We note that one is proposed but has not been submitted.</li> <li>2. Trees with high bat potential which are likely to be removed have been surveyed. The impact of development of high bat potential on trees which are remaining also needs to be considered, given the potential for roosts to become isolated within the development, and bats cut off from their commuting or foraging routes and also given the potential impact of lighting on roosts, particularly if located on trees on the periphery of the development.</li> <li>3. On the fringes of the development it is particularly important to maintain dark corridors and prevent light spill into surrounding areas of woodland / bat commuting routes etc.</li> </ol>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>4. Within the Green Infrastructure information, the role of gardens is referred to as providing new habitats as the housing is developed. Whilst gardens do form a part of the green infrastructure, it is important not to overstate their role particularly as areas of habitat creation. The role of gardens is dependent on the interests of the owners of the properties, and depending in their treatment of the space its contribution can be very limited and is something over which the developer will have no control.</p> <p>5. The ecological area 4 is to be fenced to deter informal access. Given its location within the residential development and as a part of the greenway corridor 2, this seems contradictory. Fencing has a long term maintenance requirement. Inaccessible spaces within development are often overlooked and not valued, and hence suffer from anti-social behaviour etc. A more sustainable approach would be to design the ecological area with resilient habitats which will work alongside limited informal recreation.</p> <p>6. The GI statement makes comment that green roofs are not appropriate in this scheme. Without commentary as to why this conclusion has been reached it is impossible to agree or disagree with this statement.</p> <p>7. We welcome the potential inclusion of bird and bat boxes into the GI, and expect further details of this to be included within detailed design.</p> <p>Blue Infrastructure</p> <p>1. SuDS are considered to be critical to informing the both the strategic design and spatial layout of the site and the more detailed application of landscaping.</p> <p>2. A detailed surface water drainage scheme has not been submitted and as such the precise detail of any on site SuDS structure has not at present been determined. However, the commitment to exploring further detailed design in due course is welcomed.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Concern is raised at the noticeable omission of any evidence of consultation or discussion with the North Worcestershire Drainage Officers.</li> <li>4. A comprehensive approach to the use of SuDS should be adopted throughout the proposed development site and should include some or all of the following elements: open ditches; swales; attenuation basins; scrapes and ponds.</li> <li>5. We welcome the proposal for further consideration of integrating green and blue infrastructure on site in order to achieve amenity and biodiversity value.</li> <li>6. The site is located in a sensitive hydrological setting including the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal, River Stour corridor and the adjacent Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI.</li> <li>7. Under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) the River Stour is currently classified as poor ecological status. The Stour is currently failing on a number of parameters, including phosphates and invertebrates which has lead to the overall poor classification. The WFD objective is to improve the status of the water body to achieve overall good status by 2027.</li> <li>8. As such the SuDS strategy should take account of the treatment steps that will be required to improve the quality of any discharge in line with the Water Framework Directive. Any proposals for ground infiltration should also consider the impacts on the quality of groundwater</li> <li>9. Concern is raised to the response submitted by Pegasus Landscape Design paragraph 16.0 and the exclusion of Green Roofs as "not appropriate" and we would question the justification for such a conclusion.</li> <li>10. The former British Sugar site will be a key development for Wyre Forest and Worcestershire and as such, should where possible seek to include exemplar sustainable development. Green Roofs can be a key attenuation element of the SuDS train whilst also providing other benefits e.g. biodiversity/green infrastructure and added thermal values.</li> <li>11. We would like to reiterate the statutory role placed on Worcestershire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority and the emerging function as the SuDS Approval Body (SAB).</li> </ol>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>12. We would welcome the inclusion of a maintenance strategy that optimises the multifunctionality of the SUDS scheme and should be part of or aligned with the management of the wider green infrastructure.</p> <p>Transport The County Council as Highway Authority recognises that the development proposals will provide part of the Hoo Brook Link road which is identified in the local transport plan and is supported by both the District Council and the Local Enterprise Partnerships. The link road once complete will benefit the Stourport Road Employment Corridor providing improved access to the Motorway Network and other major transport routes</p> <p><u>Natural England</u> – Objection Withdrawn</p> <p>The withdrawal of Natural England’s objection does not necessarily mean that all natural environment issues have been adequately addressed, but that we are satisfied that the specific issues that we have raised in previous correspondence relating to this development has been met. We would like to make it clear that we anticipate further dialogue around the enhancement Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI and around the site’s green infrastructure, with ourselves and/or partners as necessary.</p> <p>1. Protected species We are pleased to have received the clarification from Environ and can confirm that we are satisfied that the survey effort to date has been sufficient. The production of the Construction Environmental Management Plan should be secured through a pre-commencement condition.</p> <p>2. Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI As covered in our previous response (ref: 48715), this development offers potential to contribute towards the restoration/enhancement of Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI by directing surface water onto the SSSI. We remain concerned that dealing with drainage as a reserved matter may lead to opportunities being missed, and seek further reassurance that this issue will be fully discussed.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>3. Green infrastructure  Natural England fully supports the incorporation of GI into the site's design and we welcome the further information provided. However, we note that the corridors proposed are narrow, and question their ability to deliver much GI value. In particular, we note that the ecological enhancement area is located in the centre of the development area within a narrow corridor and are concerned that it may not deliver its purpose. We suggest that it may be worth considering amalgamating small corridors into larger blocks.</p> <p>4. Further information on the withdrawal of our objection  Please note that Natural England is not in a position to give a view on issues such as local sites, local landscape character or the impacts of the development on species or habitats of biodiversity importance in a local context. Your authority should seek advice from the appropriate local record centre, Local Site scheme and other appropriate recording bodies to ensure that any decision made relating to this application is compliant with relevant national planning policies. You should also assess whether the proposal respects and, where possible, enhances local distinctiveness and be guided by your Authority's landscape character assessment where available, and the policies protecting landscape character in your local plan or development framework when determining the application.</p> <p><u>Disability Action Wyre Forest</u> - Support</p> <p><u>Severn Valley Railway</u> – Supportive of the proposal particularly in as much as it provides for new facilities on their operational line. However our client would request that they are further consulted regarding the demolition of the existing silos on the site given the proximity to the line. Also request consultation regarding the detailed drainage proposals to ensure that there is no impact on the operation on the line.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p data-bbox="656 275 1388 375"><u>Officer Comment</u> – The external consultants appointed to assess the applicants financial viability assessment have submitted the following summary of their findings:</p> <p data-bbox="656 412 1381 783">The applicants set out through a viability appraisal and an accompanying report prepared on their behalf an argument that the subject site will only come forward for development/be economically viable if the affordable housing requirement is reduced to 12% and the S106 contribution reduced to £225,000. The applicants conclude that this is a consequence of the downturn in property values since the purchase of the subject site in October 2006, combined with the significant costs of site preparation and infrastructure works associated with the site.</p> <p data-bbox="656 820 1392 1089">We used a different methodology to assess the site’s viability and initially prepared a comprehensive residual development appraisal to model the impact on land value of a 30% affordable housing requirement and a S106 contribution of £450,000 development. The output of this appraisal is a land value which we consider is significantly beneath the level at which the applicants would release the site for development.</p> <p data-bbox="656 1127 1388 1466">We ran a residual development appraisal incorporating the applicants proposal of a 12% affordable housing provision and a Section 106 contribution reduced to £250,000. The output of this appraisal is a land value at which we consider the applicants would bring the site forward for development. As a consequence we would support the applicants proposal to reduce the Section 106 provision associated with the planning application 12/0146/EIA to 12% affordable housing and a S106 contribution of £225,000.</p> <p data-bbox="656 1504 1271 1566">On this basis it is recommended that the S106 Agreement should secure the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="656 1566 1261 1597">(i) a minimum of 12% affordable housing;</li> <li data-bbox="656 1597 1392 1701">(ii) £100k towards a MOVA to be installed to increase the capacity at the junction of Stourport Road/Walter Nash Road West;</li> <li data-bbox="656 1701 1392 1835">(iii) a minimum of £90k towards maintaining three areas of informal open space (i. the knoll, ii. the informal space to the south of the site, iii. the wooded embankment adjacent to the canal)</li> <li data-bbox="656 1835 1170 1871">(iv) up to £35k towards public realm</li> </ul>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Amend Recommendation</u> at paragraph 5.4 to -</p> <p>The recommendation is therefore for <b>delegated APPROVAL</b> subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) the signing of a satisfactory Section 106 Agreement as set out within the Addenda and Corrections sheet; and</li> <li>ii) the conditions as listed in the report (and which may be altered and expanded).</li> </ul>
12/0245/TREE	86	<u>Application</u> <b>DEFERRED</b>
12/0247/FULL	90	<p>Letter received from <u>Applicant's Agent</u> -</p> <p>1. Green Belt</p> <p>Following publication of the Baker Report in 2011, seven of the fifteen sites put forward for further consideration were in the green belt, therefore if these were deemed appropriate why is this site not appropriate ?</p> <p>I assume because there was a lack of provision in the District this was classed as 'very special circumstances' and therefore development would be appropriate. This should be applied to this site because the provision of 30 additional pitches by 2013 has not been met and there are no other suitable sites available.</p> <p>2. The visual impact of the proposal on the Green Belt and surrounding Landscape</p> <p>The site already has heavily landscaped boundaries and subject to a landscaping condition these would be added to with additional tree and shrub planting, screening the site from Timber Lane, River Stour and Leapgate Old Railway Line.</p> <p>I felt this site was the ideal opportunity to follow the design template in the Baker report and create the model site for the District.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>Over the past 5 years I've watch with interest the gypsy caravan site at Duffledown View, Wyre Piddle Bypass, Upper Moor and how the landscaping scheme implement there has allowed the site to harmonise with the open countryside. Indeed that site did not have the back ground of landscaping this site does but the visual impact on the Green Belt and the surrounding landscape has been positive, and likewise I felt this could be achieved at this site while adding to the biodiversity in the area.</p> <p>3. The Need for Gypsy Pitches</p> <p>Having viewed your figures I have revisited my figures and make the following comments.</p> <p>Planning permission for 9 Broach Road was for a change of use to private gypsy caravan site, works to create associated buildings and front boundary wall. This was to regularise a site that was indentified as a tolerated site in the Local Plan and therefore shouldn't really be included in the count.</p> <p>All other figures associated with approved planning permissions I agree.</p> <p>Those sites consulted on as part of the emerging Site Allocations and Polices DPD, I question the inclusion of Land adjacent to Nunn's Corner, Sandy Lane, Stourport because again this a tolerated site and immune from enforcement, therefore this merely regularises these units, likewise the units at The Gables Yard, Broach Road, Stourport are being regularised, I thought the process was about providing pitches for additional units.</p> <p>In addition all caravan sites need to be licensed, I therefore doubt those numbers could be achieved on order to adhere to the condition of the license, with regard to separation between units and boundaries.</p> <p>Therefore I have calculated there will be a shortfall of 8 pitches up to 2013 and 12 pitches up to 2017</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>The applicant owns the site at 9 Broach Road, Sandy Lane, Stourport and they have waiting list of six families requiring pitches and County Council have a waiting list of over 170 travellers/gypsies requiring pitches County/District wide.</p> <p>Of the sites you have identified there are only six pitches at 28/29 Sandy Lane and one at 1A Broach Road left to cater for immediate need let alone that up to 2017, therefore there are very special circumstances to allow this development in the Green Belt, to satisfy the unmet need.</p> <p>4. Highways</p> <p>Regarding the highway officers comments about large vehicles negotiating the road network through the housing estate to deliver the caravans, this would be on a very infrequent basis and would only be for the largest units. When these units are delivered they are accompanied by a banks man, and through local delivery firms we have been informed the access is 'better than some of holiday caravan sites they deliver to.'</p> <p>I take the simplistic view if a Pantechicon can negotiate the roads when someone is moving house then the largest caravan can be delivered or removed as they are of similar size.</p> <p>The maximum unit width would be 3.6m whereas the width through the bridge is 7.5m, the largest unit would over sail the grass verges but there is no footpath in this location, and as previously stated delivery would be with a banks man to comply with Health and Safety procedures.</p> <p>Regarding day to day traffic Timber Lane is a no through road other than under emergency, it does provide access to a number of properties beyond the site, however, its use is limited.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>The existing road from the housing estate to the proposed site does comply with the requirements of a shared surface catering up to 25 dwellings, with a width varying between 3.65m and 6m, with sufficient passing space at the site entrance, before and after bridge.</p> <p>The carriageway width on the housing estate is minimum 4.6m on Timber Lane, increasing to 5m and 5.5m wide over Millgate and Evergreen Avenue with 4.5m, 6m and 10m junction radii all capable of accommodating the additional traffic.</p> <p>It must be remembered Timber Lane used to be a through road and accommodated two way traffic at that time and was frequently used as a short cut to by pass Stourport, also the site has an existing horticultural use and if implemented would see an increase in vehicle movements and size.</p> <p>5. Flooding</p> <p>On the basis of my response to item two, I feel there is a need for pitches and therefore the tests apply. The Baker Report may not have identified this site, however, through the process of consultation is has proved there are no other sites available because these have rejected by the Report or Cabinet.</p>
<p><b>PART B</b> 12/0236/FULL</p>	<p>111</p>	<p><u>Amend Recommendation –</u> <b>Delegated APPROVAL</b> subject to no new issues being raised during the further notification period.</p>