

Planning and Regulatory Committee

Tuesday, 25 August 2015, County Hall, Worcester - 10.00 am

		Minutes
Present:		Mr R C Adams (Chairman), Ms P Agar, Mrs S Askin, Mr P J Bridle, Mr M H Broomfield, Mr P Denham (Vice Chairman), Mrs A T Hingley, Mr A P Miller, Mr D W Prodger, Mr A C Roberts and Mr R J Sutton
Also attended:		Dr K A Pollock was also in attendance.
Available papers		The members had before them: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. The Agenda papers (previously circulated);B. A copy of the summary presentations from public participants invited to speak (previously circulated); andC. The Minutes of the meeting held on 19 May 2015 (previously circulated). A copy of documents A-B will be attached to the signed minutes.
912	Named Substitutes (Agenda item 1)	Ms P Agar for Mr J Baker.
913	Apologies/ Declarations of Interest (Agenda item 2)	Apologies were received from Mr A T Amos, Mr J Baker and Mr S J M Clee.
914	Public Participation (Agenda item 3)	Those presentations made are recorded at the Minute to which they relate.
915	Confirmation of Minutes (Agenda item 4)	RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 19 May 2015 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.
916	Proposed	The Committee considered a planning application under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General

development of a new rail station and associated infrastructure. The application comprises of new platforms on the Birmingham - Bristol railway line and one platform on the Cotswold railway line, a new station building, a public right of way footbridge over the Birmingham - Bristol railway line, car parking, flood attenuation and a new roundabout on the B4084 on land to the east and south of the Crucible Business Park, Norton, Worcester, Worcestershire (Agenda item 5)

Regulations 1992 for a proposed development of a new rail station and associated infrastructure. The application comprises of new platforms on the Birmingham - Bristol railway line and one platform on the Cotswold railway line, a new station building, a Public Right of Way footbridge over the Birmingham - Bristol railway line, car parking, flood attenuation and a new roundabout on the B4084 on Land to the east and south of The Crucible Business Park, Norton, Worcester, Worcestershire.

The report set out the background of the proposal, the proposal itself, the relevant planning policy and details of the site, consultations and representations.

The report set out the Planning Development Control Manager's comments in relation to the justification for the proposal, location of the development, alternatives, economic impact, impact on other railway stations, traffic, highway safety and impact upon public rights of way, ecology and biodiversity, landscape character, visual impact and residential amenity, noise and vibration, air quality, contaminated land, water environment, other matters including the historic environment, cumulative effects, human rights, loss of agricultural land, impact upon existing waste management facilities, integrity of the railway line, Network Rail operational land, and sustainable development.

The Planning Development Control Manager concluded that the principle of the proposed development in this location was acceptable and accorded with adopted and emerging planning policy; and there was a compelling need for the proposal.

Given that the premise of the development was a strategic interchange facility between the Birmingham and Bristol lines and the Cotswold line, which was unique at this location within the County, and as the site was allocated within the adopted Local Plan and the emerging Local Plan, it was considered that the approach taken to consideration of alternatives was acceptable.

The Planning Development Control Manager acknowledged that the NPPF afforded significant weight to sustainable economic growth and considered that the proposal would provide considerable economic development benefits in accordance with the NPPF.

The proposal would not significantly reduce the demand for the existing Worcestershire railway stations, which would continue to be viable. The applicant anticipated

that car parking spaces and seats on trains released by passengers transferring to the proposed Worcestershire Parkway railway station would be taken up by new rail passengers to the network, who were currently unable to access their nearest railway station by car because the car parks were at capacity.

Based on the advice of Worcestershire Regulatory Services it was considered that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the air quality and contaminated land subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

The Planning Development Control Manager was satisfied that the proposed development would be acceptable on noise and vibration grounds, subject to the imposition of appropriate and robust planning conditions to ensure noise mitigation measures for the duration of the construction phase were implemented to minimise noise impacts on the Follies, the nearest noise sensitive property.

The Planning Development Control Manager considered that based on the advice of Highways England, the County Highways Officer, the County Council Transport Project Officer and the County Footpath Officer and subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, including requiring the applicant to enter into an appropriate legal agreement under Section 6 of the Highways Act 1980 to provide a detailed road signage strategy on the M5 Motorway and Junction 7 of the M5 Motorway, the proposed development would be acceptable on traffic and highway safety grounds and would cater for the existing Public Rights of Way enabling a safe crossing over the Birmingham and Bristol railway line.

The Planning Development Control Manager complimented the applicant on the design of the proposed station building, which was considered to be of a high quality, providing an inspiring compact station building, using contemporary materials, whilst respecting the context of the site.

The Planning Development Control Manager considered that subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, the impact upon the character and appearance of the local area and upon the amenity of local residents in terms of overlooking or overbearing implications would be acceptable due to its design, size, and location.

Based on the advice of the Lead Local Flood Authority,

the Environment Agency and Severn Trent Water Limited, it was considered that subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, there would be no adverse effects on the water environment.

Based on the advice of Natural England, the County Ecologist and Worcestershire Wildlife Trust, it was considered that subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, the proposed development would not have any adverse impacts on ecology and biodiversity at the site or on the surrounding area. In view of this, it was considered that the proposal was a sustainable development, which accorded with the NPPF in relation to its presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Taking into account the provisions of the Development Plan and in particular Policies WCS 16 and WCS 17 of the adopted Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy and Saved Policies GD1, GD2, GD3, SR5, SR6, ENV1, ENV4, ENV5, ENV6, ENV7, ENV8, ENV17, ENV19, SUR1, SUR2, SUR3 and ECON1 of the adopted Wychavon District Local Plan, it was considered the proposal would not cause demonstrable harm to the interests intended to be protected by these policies or highway safety.

The representative of the Planning Development Control Manager commented that members had visited the site, driving down Woodbury Lane and accessing the site along the public right of way off Woodbury Lane, crossing over the level crossing and observing the proximity of the nearest residential property, The Follies. Members travelled along the B4084 past the site, observing the location of The Follies and the proposed site for the roundabout. Members travelled through the villages of Stoulton and Norton and observed the location of approved Crookbarrow Way bridleway bridge and the South Worcester Urban Extension sites.

He added that since the publication of the report, further comments had been received from Pershore Town Council, the CPRE and Norton Parkway Development Limited. Pershore Town Council welcomed the concept of the original Parkway Station proposal in the 1970s which included proposals for Halts at Henwick, Rushwick and Battenhall with a shuttle service to Great Malvern and Evesham. It was also concerned about the impact of this proposal on the traffic along the B4084 and on Pershore Railway Station. The CPRE raised additional concerns about the footbridge from Woodbury Lane as to its conformity with the Equalities Act. It referred to a

ministerial statement made by the Secretary of State for Transport made on 25 June 2015 in relation to the performance of Network Rail and future planning investment. It also referred to the growth strategy of the greater Birmingham/Solihull LEP and questioned the connectivity benefits of the Worcestershire Parkway Station. The letter from Norton Parkway Development Limited objected to the proposal, and it was understood that a similar letter had been sent from Norton Parkway Developments Ltd directly to Members of the Committee.

Ms Mackinnon, an objector to the proposal addressed the Committee. She commented that her key objection was the prematurity of the application, given the number of important issues yet to be resolved. The County Council did not own the site and there was a lack of clarity surrounding this issue in particular whether it was suitable proposal for accommodating the urban extension proposals for Worcestershire. In relation to the strategic transport network, the Regional Spatial Strategy Phase 2 revision had tested the spatial plan for the area in 2009. There was a Panel report that expressed doubts about whether the operation of the railway network could accommodate a parkway station. The Panel suggested that the Council, in consultation with the rail operators should look at more local stations to the south and west of Worcester. If the scheme was so attractive, it was difficult to understand why the Council was promoting it and not Network Rail or the train operating companies.

She added that it had been recognised that the East Midlands Parkway Station had been located in the wrong place and alternative solutions should have been sought. This emphasised the importance of exploring alternative strategies. Some time ago Cheltenham and Gloucester had rejected the proposal for a parkway station because it would compromise Cheltenham station. This would happen in Worcestershire with Pershore and Worcester Shrub Hill stations being compromised. In addition, the Council did not have a strong record of introducing park-and-ride facilities.

She stated that there was a lack of transparency with this scheme. It was basically a construction and development project. The case for the project did not stack up without development of the surrounding area. If permission was granted, there would be potential for speculative development as far away as Wadborough. This would result in tremendous pressure/planning blight on the local area. She therefore objected to the environmental impact on the surrounding area. The priority of the Council

should be a sustainable transport for the City of Worcester and its environs. If planning permission was agreed, she would request that it be called-in by the Secretary of State.

Representatives of the applicant (Mr A Maginnis and Mr T Delaney from the County Council and Mr Haigh from SLC Rail) did not address the Committee but were available to answer questions. The following issues were raised:

- Could the applicant confirm whether there was any intention to close Shrub Hill Station in Worcester should this permission be granted? Mr Haigh from SLC Rail stated that the demand evaluation had demonstrated that the amount of abstraction from local stations would be relatively small albeit slightly higher at Shrub Hill than Foregate Street Station because people tended to walk to Foregate Street whereas Shrub Hill had car parking provision. Discussions had been held with the Department for Transport (DfT) and no suggestion had been made to close Shrub Hill Station. The DfT had encouraged further development at Shrub Hill Station to increase business on the Birmingham and Cotswold lines. There would be low abstraction levels from Pershore Station and First Great Western were looking to develop the station and expand the car park there
- What was the biggest driver to providing a Parkway station in this location? Mr Haigh explained that the UK had one of the fastest growing rail systems in Europe. The key issue was that Worcestershire did not have direct access to the cross country strategic rail network and this lack of access had been a hindrance to economic growth of the county. Work had been undertaken with First Great Western and Cross Country operating companies which had demonstrated the feasibility of being able to stop at the Parkway Station on both rail lines without penalty for existing passengers or significant detriment to either performance or journey time. The rail operators supported the future timetables had been demonstrated to work
- Could the applicant give an indication of how the art work (and the link to Norton Barracks) would be included in the station design and whether the local councils would be involved? Mr Delaney explained that a separate application would be submitted for the art work. It was intended to attract a grant from lottery funding. A full consultation process would be undertaken

- The intention for this application appeared to be to provide a faster service to London along the Cotswold Line. How could this be achieved without an impact on existing station stops? Mr Haigh stated that timetable proposals developed with First Great Western were based on the December 2018 timetable which would involve the introduction of new inter-city express passenger trains. This new rolling stock would allow a faster service with a significant impact on journey times to London. At the moment it was anticipated that there would be no loss of station calls
- The platform for the Cotswold Line was raised and open to the elements, had any consideration been given to providing cover for passengers in the design of the platform? Mr Haigh commented that two shelters had been included in the design of the platform
- Objectors to the application had indicated that there had not been any negotiation with landowners in the locality. What consultations had taken place and what would happen if another application was made for the same site? Andy Maginnis explained that every effort had been made to talk to anyone who had an interest in the land. The aim was to acquire the land and associated rights through negotiation
- Was the applicant confident that the land would be acquired within the timescale set out in the report? Andy Maginnis stated that the preference was to acquire the land through negotiation. Should negotiations with landowners fail, then approval had been granted by Cabinet to acquire the land by Compulsory Purchase Order if necessary
- The "passive provision" to accommodate a second platform and the redoubling of the Cotswold Line did not provide confidence that it would happen in the near future. Given the aspiration for the Parkway Station was to increase the frequency of trains and provide faster journey times to London, could this be achieved with a single track and one platform or would it require double-tracking on the line and two platforms? Mr Haigh indicated that "passive provision" meant that the single platform would be built in its future position should doubling of the line go ahead. Doubling of the line would increase the frequency of trains and accelerate services. However at this stage it was an aspiration as neither Network Rail nor the DfT had any such proposals. It was therefore not practical to propose the construction of a second platform at this stage for something that might not happen. Based on the 2018 timetable and the new

inter-city passenger trains, it was anticipated that the Worcestershire Parkway Station to London journey time would take less than two hours, whereas the journey time from Shrub Hill would take slightly over two hours

- It had been made clear that car parking revenue would be required to pay the prudential borrowing taken out to pay for the facility. Would every effort be made to ensure that car parking charges at the Parkway Station were competitive in comparison with other local Birmingham commuter stations? Mr Haigh indicated that the level of the car parking charges at the Parkway Station had yet to be determined. In the demand and revenue evaluation there was an assumption of a daily charge of £5 which compared to £5.50 at Shrub Hill Station. It also needed to be borne in mind that the DfT wanted the applicant to consider that car parking charging was a sensitive tool in determining how demand was manipulated. The current service provision in and out of Birmingham was based on Worcester Shrub Hill and Foregate Street stations. It was a very intensive and costly operation run by London Midland and that was where the current rolling stock capacity was to meet the demand into the West Midlands. The Cross Country rail network was a strategic network and not designed for city commuting and most of the demand for the Parkway Station would be for destinations beyond the west midlands conurbation. The strategy for the Parkway Station was for long distance journeys. There was no business case for the station as a commuter route to Birmingham because of the need to purchase additional rolling stock
- The proposed station was located some distance out of the centre of Worcester and without the doubling of the Cotswold Line, there would be no benefit to the residents of Worcester city. Were there any proposals to introduce a rail shuttle service? Mr Haigh stated that there were no proposals for a rail shuttle service because it would not be operationally possible with a single track line. However there was no reason why a local rail shuttle service could not be developed in the future should the Cotswold Line be doubled. There was a commitment from the County Council to fund a second platform should doubling of the line go ahead. It was a car-based park and ride facility but the facility was aimed at the wider population of the county rather than Worcester City itself. Roughly 50% of the population of the county was rural-based and required the use of a car for their journey. One of the benefits would be that the Parkway Station would relieve

some of the car parking pressure at Shrub Hill Station at off-peak times and thereby relieve congestion in the city

- It would appear that the proposal would only benefit residents in certain areas of the county. What alternative proposals had been considered and had development of the existing rail framework been considered? Mr Haigh stated that the DfT required that alternative options were considered as part of the business case for the project. There was no available land to develop a car park at Foregate Street Station and Shrub Hill Station had limited land available and alternative proposals were in existence. A Traffic Impact Assessment had been carried out for Shrub Hill Station based on a car park increase of between 100 and 300 spaces and it was determined that the impact of traffic congestion on the surrounding road network would be too harmful. The possibility of increasing the car park at Pershore Station to 300 spaces had been examined. However Pershore Station would only generate 30% of the new demand in comparison to the Parkway Station therefore it was not considered economically viable to expand Pershore Station due to the extra travelling time of car drivers and the inferior road access to the station. Service-based alternatives had been evaluated and as part of the business case, the potential to link into the north/south rail network had been examined. Cross-Country Rail had looked at the possibility of diverting the service via Shrub Hill Station. However the extra 12-14 minutes required to stop there made it economically unviable. The key issue for the Cotswold Line was parking because with the improvements to the rail service, there was nowhere for people travelling by car to park at the existing stations
- It was disappointing that the north-west of the county had not been included in the consultation process which was disappointing considering the poor transport infrastructure in that part of the county. The project appeared to have been undersold given the benefits to residents in this area of the Parkway Station. Would residents be consulted in the future? Mr Haigh explained that consultation had been carried out county-wide via the media and on the Council's web site. There would be benefits in terms of reduced journey times for residents of the north-west of the county and perhaps the level of demand and benefits of the project had been under-played. Mr Maginnis indicated that he would endeavour to ensure that all residents in the county were consulted

in the future on projects of this kind

- In response to a query about the design of car parking spaces, Andy Maginnis stated that the precise layout of the car park had not been finalised however he would look at the possibility of positioning car parking spaces on the diagonal
- It was possible that the applicant was underestimating the level of demand for the station due to the increased building proposals for the area since the project was designed. It was therefore important that the car park was future-proofed for future demand with the capacity to easily create a double-level car park. It would also be beneficial to introduce a public announcement system that kept sound within the site. Had the applicant looked at car parking payment system that would ease transit for passengers from car to rail and that was future-proof? Mr Haigh indicated that the final design of the facility had not been completed however he acknowledged the importance of future-proofing its design. No decision had been made to date about how the car parking payment system would operate but he accepted that it should be a seamless process for the customer.

In the ensuing debate, the following principal points were raised:

- The local councillor stated that there was tremendous support for the principal of a parkway station from local parish councils. However there were concerns expressed by Norton Parish Council about the possibility of the route through Norton Barracks/Woodbury Lane onto the B4084 being used as a rat-run. Could assurance be given that the situation would be monitored and if a problem arose, remedial measures would be undertaken? The representative of the County Highways Officer stated that the modelling of the project did not support a significant amount of rat-running through Norton. However she was aware of these concerns expressed by the parish council about this application as well as the potential impact of the South Worcester Urban extensions. The housing developer was committed to introducing traffic calming measures through Norton. The Council would wait until the facility was up and running and monitor the situation before determining the most appropriate course of action to be taken should a problem with rat-running occur
- The local councillor pointed out the narrow roads through to the Retreat Public House in Norton and

expressed concern about the impact on cyclists and queried whether the impact on cyclists would be monitored. The representative of the County Highways Officer commented that she was aware that the road through Norton was popular with cyclists and formed part of the National Cycle Network. There had been consultation with the sustainable schemes team who were responsible for the cycling infrastructure of the county. The situation would be monitored to assess the safety impact of the development on cyclists

- The local councillor stated that there were concerns from residents on Woodbury Lane, Littleworth and Norton about the potential impact of increased parking along the Lane as a result of this proposal. The representative of the County Highways Officer stated that it was in the best interests of the applicant to ensure that the car park on the application site was fully used and to prevent indiscriminate parking along Woodbury Lane. The applicant was working with the traffic management team to ensure that suitable Traffic Regulation Orders were put in place along Woodbury Lane to address these concerns
- The local councillor understood that the purpose of this project was not to resolve pre-existing issues in the locality however, what was being done to alleviate flash-flooding issues along Woodbury Lane? The representative of the County Highways Officer commented that work to alleviate the drainage problems had been programmed later in the financial year
- It was essential that people accessing the Station from Woodbury Lane used the public right of way due to the dangers associated with fast-moving trains along this section of the rail line
- It was important that the roundabout was created with the minimal disruption to travellers along the B4084. In particular, there was a narrow humpback bridge in close proximity to the proposed site of the roundabout and had this been taken into account in its design? The representative of the County Highways Officer indicated that there was a condition attached to the permission that required that the detailed design of the roundabout to be agreed by the County Planning Authority. This would take into account the safety concerns about the humpback bridge. She was confident that the roundabout would be constructed in such a way that would minimise disruption on the B4084
- The scheme was in the right location where the two rail lines met and was welcomed. It would be

beneficial however if covered walkways were provided in the scheme design

- In response to a query, the representative of the County Highways Officer indicated that any landscaping and maintenance arrangements would not impact on the visibility of motorists using the roundabout
- The proposal was a very important, long-awaited, necessary and exciting project for the economy of the county. It was not a perfect scheme and it was disappointing that the proposal was so based on the use of cars and that there were no proposals for non-car drivers. It was also hoped that car parking charges would be reviewed so that they would not act as a deterrent to people using the facility. It was also a concern that there was no commitment to doubling the Cotswold Line
- It was a very positive project although it was disappointing that there was no proposal for a rail shuttle service into Worcester City Centre. There was a danger that as a result there would be an increase in transit journeys to the site across the city of Worcester
- There did not seem to be any reference to secure cycling provision at the site. The representative of the Planning Development Control Manager indicated that two cycle storage areas had been proposed on the site, next to the public right of way and in the station building itself. West Mercia Police had expressed concern about security and as a result, a condition had been included requiring the final design of the cycling provision to be submitted to and approved by the County Planning Authority. The provision of cctv surveillance had also been included as a condition
- This proposal was a great benefit to residents in the south of the county who at present travelled to Warwickshire Parkway to access the Cross Country rail service.

RESOLVED that, having taken the environmental information into account planning permission be granted for a proposed development of a new rail station and associated infrastructure. The application comprises of new platforms on the Birmingham - Bristol railway line and one platform on the Cotswold railway line, a new station building, a public right of way footbridge over the Birmingham - Bristol railway line, car parking, flood attenuation and a new roundabout on the B4084 on Land to the east and south of The Crucible Business Park,

Norton, Worcester, Worcestershire, subject to the following conditions:

Commencement

- a) **The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission;**
- b) **The development enures for the benefit of Worcestershire County Council only;**
- c) **The developer shall notify the County Planning Authority of the start date of commencement of the development in writing at least 5 working days prior to the commencement of development;**

Approved Plans

- d) **The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following documents and drawings, except where otherwise stipulated by conditions attached to this permission:-**

Documents:

- **Worcestershire Parkway Planning Statement, dated February 2015;**
- **Worcestershire Parkway Design and Access Statement, dated February 2015;**
- **Worcestershire Parkway Environmental Statement, dated February 2015;**
- **Worcestershire Parkway Flood Risk Assessment & drainage Strategy, dated February 2015;**
- **Worcestershire Parkway Transport Assessment, dated February 2015; and**
- **Worcestershire Parkway Travel Plan, dated February 2015;**

Drawings:

- **00-C-GA-0029, Rev P10 – Roundabout General Arrangement;**
- **06-C-DR-0012, Rev P4 – Overall Drainage Strategy (Rail & Non Rail);**
- **00-C-DR-0064, Rev P1 – B4084 Northbound Cross Sections;**
- **00-C-DR-0065, Rev P1 – B4084 Northbound Cross Sections;**

- 00-C-DR-0066, Rev P1 – B4084 Northbound Cross Sections;
- 00-C-DR-0067, Rev P1 – B4084 Northbound Cross Sections;
- 00-C-DR-0080, Rev P1 – B4084 Southbound Cross Sections;
- 00-C-DR-0081, Rev P1 – B4084 Southbound Cross Sections;
- 08-C-CS-0221, Rev P1 – Site Cross Sections;
- 08-C-CS-0222, Rev P1 – Site Cross Sections;
- 08-C-CS-0223, Rev P1 – Site Cross Sections;
- 08-C-CS-0224, Rev P1 – Site Cross Sections;
- 00-C-DR-0077, rev P3 – Footpath NJ-523 Footbridge General Arrangement for AIP;
- 08-C-DR-0166, Rev P6 – Land Ownership and Access Rights WCC/NR;
- 08-C-DR-0186, Rev P5 – Drainage WCC Ownership;
- 08-C-DR-0188, Rev P2 – Proposed Site Levels;
- 08-C-DR-0250, Rev P1 – Construction Plan;
- 08-EN-DR-0008, Rev P4 – Figure 2.1 Location Plan;
- 08-EN-DR-0009, Rev P4 – Figure 2.2 Red Line Boundary;
- 08-LA-DR-0128, Rev P2 – Landscape and Ecological Masterplan;
- 08-EN-DR-0197, Rev P1 – Environmental Statement Masterplan Figure ES2.3;
- 08-EN-DR-0252, Rev P1 – Existing Site Plan;
- 08-LA-DR-0233, Rev P2 – Planting Plan;
- 00-C-DR-0082, Rev P3 – Proposed Right of Way and Cycle Route;
- 00-C-LS-0034, Rev P2 – General Arrangement Longitudinal Sections;
- 00-SL-DR-0031, Rev P2 – Non Rail Lighting Layout;
- 02-00-AP-2000, Rev P2 – Ground Floor and Mezzanine Level Plan;
- 02-02-AP-2100, Rev P2 – First Floor Plan;
- 02-00-AP-2200, Rev P2 – Roof Level Plan;

- 02-09-AP-2500, Rev P2 – Station Front Elevation and Cross Section;
- 02-09-AP-2520, Rev P2 – Station Building and Circulation Atrium Side Elevations;
- 02-09-AP-2530, Rev P2 – Circulation Atrium and Interchange Bridge Rear Elevation; and
- 02-09-AP-2540, Rev P2 – Station Building Long Sections;

Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP)

- e) **Notwithstanding the submitted details, no development hereby approved shall commence, including demolition, ground works and vegetation clearance until a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP), in accordance with Worcestershire Regulatory Services "Code of Best Practice for Demolition and Construction Sites" has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The approved CEMP shall be implemented for the duration of the construction phase. The CEMP shall address the following issues:**

Hours of Working

- i. **A scheme providing the days and hours of construction operations;**

Highways

- ii. **Measures to ensure that vehicles leaving the site do not deposit mud or other detritus on the public highway;**
- iii. **Details of site operative parking areas, material storage areas and the location of site operatives facilities;**

Dust

- iv. **A scheme to minimise and mitigate the impacts of dust emissions;**

Noise and Vibration

- v. **A scheme to minimise and mitigate the impacts of noise and vibration;**

Water Environment

- vi. Measures to be undertaken to ensure that any pollution and silt generated by the construction works shall not adversely affect groundwater and the ordinary watercourse running through the site;**
- vii. A method statement for the protection of sustainable drainage system (SuDS) features and associated Green Infrastructure during each phase of construction to ensure that 'soft SuDS' are adequately established prior to bringing them into beneficial use;**
- viii. Phasing arrangements to ensure that flows along the ordinary watercourse and Stoulton Brook do not increase until the flood mitigation and SuDS features are completed in accordance with the scheme approved under Condition k) of this permission and operational;**

Ecology

- ix. Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities;**
- x. A plan to identify all existing trees, shrubs and hedgerows to be retained and details of their protection; and identification and appropriate fencing, exclusion barriers and signage of biodiversity protection zones;**
- xi. The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features, including hedgerows;**
- xii. The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works;**
- xiii. Responsible persons and lines of communication;**
- xiv. The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works or similarly competent or key specialist personnel;**
- xv. Maintenance of a daily 'works biodiversity log' to record any observations of wildlife and the status of the site and its protective features (including integrity of any exclusion fencing) and to list any remedial actions required and the named operatives tasked with undertaking those actions;**
- xvi. A procedure to ensure that during the construction phase all**

trenches/excavations/pipes are closed off overnight, or if unavailable, are fitted with wood or earth escape ramps to allow trapped wildlife to escape;

- xvii. A procedure to address the clearance of vegetation on site outside the bird breeding season, which generally extends between March and August inclusive. If this is not possible then any vegetation that is to be removed or disturbed should be checked by an experienced ecologist for nesting birds immediately prior to works commencing. If birds are found to be nesting any works which may affect them would have to be delayed until the young have fledged and the nest has been abandoned naturally;
- xviii. A Great Crested Newt Reasonable Avoidance Measures document (or similar);
- xix. A pre-construction and construction phase Ecological Monitoring Strategy, which shall have the purpose of identifying any recent occupation of features on site by highly mobile species, and to update the status of features used transiently by protected species which may subsequently be subject to construction / operational impacts, shall include the following:-
- Aims and objectives of monitoring to match the stated purpose;
 - Identification of adequate baseline conditions prior to the start of development;
 - Appropriate success criteria, thresholds, triggers and targets against which the effectiveness of the various conservation measures being monitored can be judged;
 - Methods for data gathering and analysis;
 - Location of monitoring;
 - Timing and duration of monitoring;
 - Responsible persons and lines of communication;
 - Review, and where appropriate, publication of results and outcomes;
- xx. A report describing the results of the pre-

construction and construction phase ecological monitoring shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority at intervals identified in the pre-construction and construction phase Ecological Monitoring Strategy as required by Condition e) xix. above. Where the results from ecological monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives will not be met, the report shall set out how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed with the County Planning Authority, and then implemented so that the development delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the approved scheme;

xxi. A biosecurity protocol detailing measures to minimize or remove the risk of introducing non-native species into a particular area during the construction, operational or decommissioning phases of a project;

xxii. Prior to the commencement of development hereby approved, a Reptile Mitigation Strategy shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The Reptile Mitigation Strategy shall detail the proposed capture and exclusion methods, including:-

- Mechanisms for protection of reptile receptor sites;
- Key personnel and proposed translocation effort timing;
- Constraints: weather, seasonal constraints, maximum capture number parameters;
- Habitat manipulation approach: extent/height and timing of creation/management operations, both prior to and during construction phases;
- Approach to capture and animal welfare provision;
- Proposed approach to reptile 'watching brief';
- Any contingencies; and
- Timing and protection of

compensation measures;

Lighting

- f) **Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to the development being brought into use, a lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the height of all lighting, the intensity of lighting (specified in Lux levels), spread of light, including approximate light spillage levels (in metres), light colour, the times when the lighting would be illuminated, any measures proposed to mitigate impact of the lighting or disturbance through glare (such as making use of cowls and hoods) and it shall clearly identify features used by bats and ensure measures are taken to minimise any impacts on any existing flight lines and commuting routes identified by the precautionary pre-works bat activity survey as required by Condition g) below. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;**

Ecology and Landscape

- g) **Prior to the commencement of development hereby approved, updated (pre-works) bat activity monitoring shall be undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist during the appropriate season (April to September inclusive) to ensure refinements to the detailed lighting scheme required by condition f) above are informed by and reflect an up-to-date understanding of site usage by commuting and foraging bats. The monitoring information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority;**
- h) **Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, an Ecological Management Plan (EMP) for a period of at least five years from the date the development hereby approved commences, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The EMP shall include the following:**
- i. **Description and evaluation of features to be**

- managed;
- ii. Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management;
 - iii. Aims and objectives of management;
 - iv. Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives;
 - v. Prescriptions for management actions;
 - vi. Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period);
 - vii. Details of the body or organization responsible for implementation of the plan;
 - viii. Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures;
 - ix. Details of any legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the EMP will be secured by the applicant with the management bodies responsible for its delivery;
 - x. A planting scheme to include native species of local provenance, locations, numbers, densities, spacing and planting sizes for the development hereby approved. The scheme shall be implemented within the first available planting season (the period between 31 October in any one year and 31 March in the following year) on completion of the development. Any new trees or shrubs, which within a period of five years from the completion of the planting die, are removed, or become damaged or diseased, shall be replaced on an annual basis, in the next planting season with others of a similar size and the same species;
 - xi. Specifications for any watercourse profile changes, pond creation, and pond enhancement measures shall be detailed, including new pond profiles, planting, detailed outfall designs and timetables of works;
 - xii. A Reptile Mitigation Strategy which shall include measures appropriate for the favourable management of key reptile habitats, including: timing and height of grass cut regimes; size, height and exact location of any conservation margins and/or planting; installation and upkeep of any educational resources/interpretation panels and the management/upkeep and location of any reptile hibernacula for a period of no less than 5 years. It shall also identify key

- roles and contractors identified to undertake the specified management prescriptions to a specified timetable;
- xiii. Favourable management of vegetation across the site for breeding birds and bats;
- xiv. Installation and upkeep of public interpretation features such as signage/information boards which outline the value of features including: Sustainable Drainage systems, flood alleviation spaces, key habitats of biodiversity or Green Infrastructure value and operations undertaken to promote the conservation value of these
- xv. Details of at least twelve bat boxes which are capable of supporting the diversity of bats identified on site and eight bird boxes which shall be installed on site, including the location and specifications. Once installed, bat and bird boxes shall be maintained for a period of at least five years;
- xvi. Details of the mammal ledges to be installed within the culvert under the B4084 and under the Cotswold railway line embankment;
- xvii. A post construction and operational phase Ecological Monitoring Strategy to include appraisal of impacts and mitigation effectiveness for reptiles, bats, great crested newt and birds for a period of at least five years from the date of this permission. The Ecological Monitoring Strategy shall:
- Identify a timetable of survey effort for individual target species. This should include survey methodologies and reporting format;
 - The period of survey monitoring and the parties responsible for undertaking monitoring;
 - Objectives for evaluating the success or otherwise of mitigation strategies, and should inform subsequent stakeholder reviews and any operational modifications (if required) to the remaining period of the Ecological Management Plan; and
 - Survey reports shall be compliant with current Chartered Institute of Ecology

and Environmental Management best practice guidance and provided to the County Planning Authority and the Worcestershire Biological Record Centre;

- i) If the development hereby approved does not commence or, having commenced, is suspended for more than 12 months the approved ecological measures secured by conditions shall be reviewed and, where necessary, amended and updated. The review shall be informed by further ecological surveys commissioned to establish if there have been any changes in the presence and/or abundance of habitats and species and identify any likely new ecological impacts that might arise from any changes. Where the survey results indicate that changes have occurred that will result in ecological impacts not previously addressed in the approved scheme, the original approved ecological measures shall be revised and new or amended measures, and a timetable for their implementation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;
- j) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the Recommendations set out in Section 4.0 'Conclusion', in the submitted 'Worcestershire Parkway - Addendum to Bat Survey Report', prepared by CSa Environmental Planning, dated May 2015, Report No. CSa/2201/02;

Water Environment

- k) No development shall take place, until a detailed design and associated management and maintenance plan of surface water drainage for the site and the building hereby approved, using sustainable drainage methods (SuDS) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The scheme shall include a detailed design for the flood mitigation area and SuDS features. It shall detail the range of SuDS components to be used at source, site and regional control levels for each part of the development and shall be in

accordance with best practice as laid out in the CIRIA Guidance manuals and any adopted National and Local SuDS Standards, with consideration given in the first instance to utilising water management through soft features and at ground level. The maintenance and management plan shall include details of the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and/or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime; and easements to enable maintenance to be shown on the general arrangement drawings.

Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the development being brought into use, and shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance plan throughout the lifetime of the development. The detailed drainage design shall be informed by the following general arrangement drawings included within the approved Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy:

- Drawing: 06-C-DR-0012, Rev P4 – Overall Drainage Strategy (Rail & Non Rail);
- Drawing: 06-DR-C-0009, Rev P1 – Northern Site Proposed Development;
- Drawing: 06-DR-C-0011, Rev P1 – Surface Water Attenuation & Schematic Drainage Layout;
- Drawing: 08-C-DR-0166, Rev P6 – Land Ownership and Access Rights WCC/NR;

- l) Notwithstanding the submitted details, the development hereby approved shall not commence until drainage plans for the disposal of foul water have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is first brought into use;**
- m) Prior to the development hereby approved being brought into use, details of the measures to protect the culverts with the application site from blockages shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved**

details;

Design

- n) **Notwithstanding the submitted details, no development of the Public Right of Way Bridge shall take place until the detailed design and a schedule and/or samples of the materials, colours and finishes for the Public Right of Way Bridge have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;**
- o) **Notwithstanding the submitted details, no development of the railway station building and interchange bridge shall take place until the detailed design and a schedule and/or samples of the materials and finishes for the railway station building and interchange bridge have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;**
- p) **Notwithstanding the submitted details, within 6 months of the date of this permission, details of all surfacing materials including the Public Rights of Way within the application site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;**
- q) **Notwithstanding the submitted details, within 6 months of the date of this permission, details of all walls, fences and other means of enclosure, including the provision of permanent trespass fencing adjacent to Network Rail's land shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;**

Highways

- r) **The development authorised by this permission shall not be brought into use until the applicant has entered into an agreement with Highways England pursuant to Section 6 of the Highways Act 1980 providing for a detailed signage**

strategy which shall include local network directional signage and directional signage from the M5 Motorway. The detailed design of all highway signage on the M5 Motorway and M5 Junction 7 shall comply with the requirements of the Design Manual for Road and Bridges;

- s) Prior to commencement of development hereby approved, a Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority in consultation with Highways England. The approved scheme shall be adhered to for the duration of the construction period;
- t) Before the development hereby approved is brought into use the layout of the car parking spaces shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Thereafter the scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved detail;
- u) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the access, turning area and parking facilities shown on the approved drawings have been properly consolidated, surfaced, drained and otherwise constructed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing to the County Planning Authority and these areas shall thereafter be retained and kept available for those users at all times;
- v) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, the engineering details and specification of the proposed roads and highway drains shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;
- w) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the road works necessary to provide access from the B4084, including the roundabout have been completed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority;
- x) Notwithstanding the submitted details, within 9

months of the date of this permission, the approved Travel Plan shall be updated to include a measure to promote the development hereby approved to employers in the area; and shall include real time information for passengers within the bus stops on site, and shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority in consultation with Worcestershire County Council's Travel Plan Co-ordinator. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

Electric Vehicle Charging Points

- y) **Electric charging points shall be installed in 25 of the allocated parking spaces for the opening of the development hereby approved, and an additional 25 made ready for charging point installation at a future date. The charging points must comply with BS7671. The socket shall comply with BS1363, and must be provided with a locking weatherproof cover;**

Cycle Parking Facilities

- z) **Notwithstanding the submitted details, full details of the cycle parking facilities, including locations, type of rack, spacing, numbers, method of installation, access to cycle parking and schedule of the materials and finishes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority prior to the development hereby approved being brought into use. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;**

Materials Management

- aa) **Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a Site Waste Management Plan, Materials Management Plan and Soils Resource Plan, including all areas to be used for temporary soil storage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;**

Contaminated Land

- bb) Following the completion of the measures identified in the remediation scheme (areas of clean cover) a validation report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority;**
- cc) In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the development hereby approved that was not previously identified, it must be reported in writing immediately to the County Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken and where necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared, and these shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Following the completion of any measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a validation report must be prepared and submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority prior to the development hereby approved being brought into use;**

CCTV

- dd) Details and locations of all external CCTV cameras shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority prior to the development being brought into use. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;**

Protection of Railway Lines and Embankments

- ee) Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, should any excavations, earthworks or temporary site compounds be proposed adjacent to the railway line, or should vibro-compaction or displacement piling plant be used in the construction of the development hereby approved, a Method Statement detailing how the structural integrity of the railway embankment, retaining walls and bridges shall be maintained, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority in consultation with Network Rail. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;**

- ff) Any scaffold which is to be constructed adjacent to the railway must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles or cranes over-sail or fall onto the railway. All plant and scaffolding must be positioned that in the event of a failure it will not fall onto Network Rail's land; and**

Artwork

- gg) Details of the proposed public artwork within the station forecourt hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority in consultation with Wychavon District Council. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

The meeting ended at 11.45am

Chairman