

## Planning and Regulatory Committee

### Tuesday, 27 March 2018, County Hall, Worcester - 10.00 am

		<b>Minutes</b>
<b>Present:</b>		Mr R C Adams (Chairman), Ms P Agar, Mr R M Bennett, Mr G R Brookes, Mr P Denham, Mr I D Hardiman, Mr P B Harrison, Mrs A T Hingley, Dr C Hotham, Mr C Rogers and Mr P A Tuthill
<b>Also attended:</b>		Mr S M Mackay, Mr P Middlebrough, and Mr T A L Wells attended as local councillors for Agenda item 5.
<b>Available papers</b>		The Members had before them: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A. The Agenda papers (previously circulated);</li><li>B. A copy of the summary presentations from public participants invited to speak (previously circulated); and</li><li>C. The Minutes of the meeting held on 5 December 2017 (previously circulated).</li></ul>
<b>981</b>	<b>Named Substitutes (Agenda item 1)</b>	None.
<b>982</b>	<b>Apologies/ Declarations of Interest (Agenda item 2)</b>	Apologies were received from Mr A Fry, Mr J A D O'Donnell, Mrs J A Potter, and Prof J W Raine.  Dr C Hotham declared an interest in Agenda item 5 as a member of the Cycle Touring Club
<b>983</b>	<b>Public Participation (Agenda item 3)</b>	Those presentations made are recorded at the Minute to which they relate.
<b>984</b>	<b>Confirmation of Minutes (Agenda item 4)</b>	<b>RESOLVED</b> that the Minutes of the meeting held on 5 December 2017 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.
<b>985</b>	<b>Proposed construction of Worcester Southern Link</b>	The Committee considered an application under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 1992 (as amended) for proposed construction of Worcester Southern Link Road Phase 4 (SLR4), including dualling of A4440 between Ketch and

**Road Phase 4 (SLR4), including dualling of A4440 between Ketch and Powick Roundabouts with foot and cycleway improvements, new road bridges alongside existing Powick Common Viaduct and Carrington Bridge and cycle/footbridge at Hams Way, Worcester Southern Link Road, A4440 Temeside Way, Worcester (Agenda item 5)**

Powick roundabouts with foot and cycleway improvements, new road bridges alongside existing Powick Common Viaduct and Carrington Bridge and cycle / footbridge on land at Hams Way at Worcester Southern Link Road, A4440 Temeside Way, Worcester.

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 Development Manager's comments in relation to alternatives, water environment and impact upon the floodplain, traffic and highway safety and impacts upon the Public Rights of Way, ecology and biodiversity, landscape character and visual impact, residential amenities (air quality, dust, noise, vibrations and lighting), historic environment, and other matters – economic impact, tourism, crime, contaminated land, materials and waste, loss of agricultural land and common land, impacts upon services, cumulative effects, consultation, and Human Rights Act 1998.

The Development Manager concluded that the principle of the proposed development in this location was acceptable and accorded with Planning Policy SWDP 4 I(i) of the South Worcestershire Development Plan; and there was a compelling need for the proposal.

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

The applicant had outlined the main alternatives studied and the main reasons for the choice made; taking into account the environmental effects, therefore, the approach taken to the consideration of alternatives was considered to be acceptable.

As flood levels were dominated by the existing flow constraints provided by the two viaducts, the proposed works to the south of Temeside Way (A4440) would have limited effect on the baseline flooding conditions. Subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions relating to surface water, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), detailed design of the flood compensation area, detailed design of the Carrington Bridge, impacts on siltation and navigation hazards modelled, and assessment of channel hydrography and a SuDS Management Plan, it was considered that the

proposal would not have an unacceptable impact upon the water environment. It was considered that the planning application accorded with Policies SWDP 28 and SWDP 29 of the adopted South Worcestershire Development Plan, relating to flooding and the protection of the water environment.

The proposal would lead to increased average speeds along the A4440 and reduced queuing, resulting in significant journey time savings. Worcester city centre would experience reduced traffic congestion due to a redistribution of traffic to the A4440. The Development Manager was satisfied that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact upon Public Rights of Way, traffic or highway safety, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, in accordance with Policy SWDP 4 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan.

Direct impact had been identified on a pipistrelle bat roost within an oak tree identified to be removed. The Development Manager considered that the "derogation tests" in the Habitats Directive could be met, and that the proposal would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on ecology and biodiversity at the site or on the surrounding area, including the nearby River Teme SSSI and LWS and River Severn LWS, and distant Severn Estuary and River Clun SACs subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, as recommended by the County Ecologist and Worcestershire Wildlife Trust. The Development Manager considered that the formation of the flood compensation area wetland habitat was fundamental to achieving a net-gain for biodiversity, and this would be dependent upon the detailed design and implementation of a landscape and planting scheme and a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) for the flood compensation area.

The proposal would require the removal of trees and vegetation, in particular a 2 metre strip along the top of the northern embankment of Temeside Way (A4440) to facilitate the construction of the proposed widened shared cycleway / footway. The most notable change would be the removal of all vegetation along the southern embankment of the A4440 to facilitate the construction of the dual carriageway. The proposal would also introduce a new built structure into the landscape in the form of the Hams Way Cycle / Footbridge, The Development Manager considered that subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, the proposal would not have an unaccepted adverse or detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the local area, including

views to and from the Malvern Hills AONB, in accordance with Policies SWDP 21 and SWDP 25 of the adopted South Worcestershire Development Plan.

It was considered that the proposal would have a net positive impact on air quality in the wider Worcester city area. During construction there would be potential for significant short-term noise impacts at a small number of properties located within 125 metres of the proposal. The vibration impacts would be minor to moderate and limited to a small number of caravans located at the Ketch Caravan Park and Moorings due to piling operations associated with the construction of the new Carrington Bridge and Powick Common Viaduct. Due to the distance from these sensitive receptors this was not expected to cause damage. A CEMP was proposed, which would outline a range of environmental management controls in order to minimise noise and vibration effects. With regard to the operational noise impacts of the scheme, it was considered that on opening of the development the proposal would result in a small number of additional properties experiencing noise impacts, but in the long-term it was considered that the proposal would result in a reduction of affected properties.

Based on the advice of Worcestershire Regulatory Services and Public Health England, the Development Manager considered that, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, the proposal would have an acceptable impact in terms of air pollution, dust, noise vibration or light impacts on residential amenity and that of human health.

A number of designated heritage assets were located within the context of the application site, in particular the Grade I Listed Structure and Schedule Monument of Powick Old Bridge, Grade II\* Listed Building of Powick Mills, Grade II Listed Structure of Powick New Bridge, Register Battlefield and Riverside Conservation Area and Powick Conservation Area.

Having regard to Historic England's comments, the Development Manager considered that the proposals, in particular the impact of the Hams Way Cycle / Footbridge, would lead to 'less than substantial' harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets outlined above. Notwithstanding that this harm was less than substantial, the harm must still be given considerable importance and weight, and considerable weight must be given to the desirability of preserving the setting of these designated heritage assets.

Consequently, the fact of harm to a designated heritage asset was still to be given more weight than if simply a factor to be taken into account along with all other material considerations. It must be recognised as the Court of Appeal emphasised in *East Northamptonshire District Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government* [2015] (also known as the *Barnwell Manor* case): "the finding of harm to the setting of a Listed Building or to a Conservation Area gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted. The presumption was a statutory one. It is not irrebuttable. It can be outweighed by material considerations powerful enough to do so".

Having given special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Powick and the Riverside Conservation Areas (Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990)) and having special regard to the desirability of preserving the Listed Buildings and Structures or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess (Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990)), and paragraph 134 of the NPPF, it was considered that the public benefits of the scheme were powerful material considerations, which outweighed the less than substantial harm to rebut the strong presumption against causing any harm to these heritage assets.

Overall, it was considered that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact upon heritage assets, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, in accordance with Policies SWDP 6 and SWDP 24 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan.

With regard to impacts upon crime, West Mercia Police had been consulted and had raised no objections, subject to the imposition of conditions requiring the detailed design of the underpass and a lighting scheme. Conditions were recommended to this effect and would need careful consideration in consultation with the County Landscape Officer and County Ecologist.

The Development Manager did not consider that the cumulative impact of the proposed development would be such that it would warrant a reason for refusal of the application.

Other matters such as tourism, contaminated land, waste

and materials, loss of agricultural land and common land, impacts upon services, consultations and notification of the planning application and human rights had been considered and in the Development Manager's view the proposal would not result in unacceptable impacts, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

Taking into account the provisions of the Development Plan and in particular Policies WCS 17 of the Adopted Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy, Policies SWDP 1, SWDP 2, SWDP 4, SWDP 6, SWDP 7, SWDP 21, SWDP 22, SWDP 24, SWDP 25, SWDP 28, SWDP 29, SWDP 30, SWDP 31, SWDP 32, SWDP 38 and SWDP 45 of the adopted South Worcestershire Development Plan and Policies K12 and K15 in the Adopted Neighbourhood Plan for Kempsey, 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 Development Manager introduced the report and commented that members had received a presentation by the applicant and visited the site. On the visit members observed the site of the registered battlefield to the north of Temeside Way, a number of listed buildings (primarily clustered around Powick Mill, Powick Old Bridge and Powick New Bridge), the common land to the south of the scheme and a number of public rights of way. Members observed the scheme from the Ketch Viewpoint and noted the location of the Severn Motor Yacht Club. Members walked along the Ketch underpass, noting the steep access ramps. Members travelled along the scheme to Powick Roundabout and viewed the impact of the proposed Hams Bridge cycleway on the local heritage assets (with the help of photo-montages) at Powick Old Bridge. Members visited Powick Church to view the application site from the conservation area and observe the location of the flood compensation area. Members visited Temeside Cottage and observed the location of the Powick Viaduct and the trees that were proposed to be removed. Members were also shown the location of the proposed construction access to the south-east of Powick.

Since the publication of the agenda, a further letter of representation had been received expressing similar concerns to those set out by Mr Taggart in his presentation.

The following amendment was proposed to condition f):

"xix) Design and details of the temporary site access to the main site compound and office area, as shown on Drawing Numbered: Figure 2.5, Titled: 'Scheme Proposal – Construction Compounds'"

Mr Gerry Taggart, an objector to the application addressed the Committee. He commented that Diglis Bridge had been designed for 30,000 crossings per year. But 460,000 cross it on foot and wheels (1,200 a day): twelve times more than planned. The design of Powick Roundabout showed a bridge over only half of it. Cyclists and pedestrians, would still have to run the gauntlet of a road level crossing. There would be conflict with motorised vehicles – even with traffic lights.

There was an opportunity to build an elegant bridge at Powick. It could be a feature, to be proud of - just like Diglis Bridge. An elevated view-point on its superstructure could make travellers stop and view the cluster of heritage sites: two historic bridges, a pioneering hydro-power station and the SSSI River Teme.

The proposed pathway towards Malvern ended abruptly at Powick Village Centre. It was on the unfinished National Route 46, so it should continue to Malvern as the "Route to The Hills". The county should contribute to this National Project. If the route was not joined-up, the Powick Bridge was not infrastructure. It was just structure.

Before finalising these designs, there should firstly be a re-design of the half-bridge at the Roundabout – to ensure a joined up and safe crossing; and secondly. safe segregated pedestrian and cycle pathway between Powick and Malvern. Engineers and architects should be challenged to come up with a solution to bridging the Powick roundabout and its part in the "Route to the Hills".

In response to Mr Taggart's presentation, the representative of the Development Manager commented that paragraph 233 of the report addressed his point about the cycle pathway between Powick and Malvern. The County Highways Officer had confirmed that the County Council had identified a potential cycle route to link Malvern and Worcester and were actively seeking Section 106 contributions from developers towards its implementation. The improvement of the route was outside the scope of the application before the Committee. The application had been designed to enable a connection to be made with the existing cycle network. Mr Taggart's point about the redesign of the half-bridge at

Powick Roundabout had been addressed in paragraph 236 of the report. An additional bridge was not part of this application and the Committee could only consider whether the existing application was acceptable or not. In addition, as the proposal was EIA development, any variations to the proposed cycle bridge, including a proposed second bridge would need to be re-assessed. A reassessment would be necessary taking into account a number of constraints in that location including the site of the civil war battlefield, flood culverts, and the impact on heritage assets.

Mr Mark Broomby, Mr Richard Bruten and Mr Mark Gorry attended on behalf of the applicant. They did not wish to make a presentation but answered the following questions:

- Had the applicant assessed the likely impact of the construction works on traffic movement/flows and congestion in the area? Richard Bruten responded that it was anticipated that there would be 100 vehicle trips (not all HGVs) per day bringing various materials on site. Wherever possible, materials would be brought along Hams Way using Powick Roundabout in its current configuration, turning left onto the site. It was proposed to install a temporary turning point prior to Powick Village thereby avoiding the A4440 and the need for vehicles to travel through Powick Village
- What impact would the potential lane closure and the rerouting of traffic, during the different phases of the construction works have on the normal flow of traffic? Mark Gorry responded that the construction work had been designed to take place on the south side without breaking into the existing road. The majority of the construction work would be carried out off-line including the construction of the two new bridges. There was a gap between the new bridge and the existing bridge that meant the new bridge could be constructed without the need to introduce traffic control measures which would impact on traffic flows on the existing road. On the completion of the new carriageway, one of the new lanes would be used to take traffic travelling west and the other to take traffic travelling east. This would allow the introduction of barriers and appropriate signage and other works to widen the footways. There would also be a cross-over point to direct traffic between the new road and the existing



road

- Material would be transported by road from quarries in Presteigne and Leominster. The road from Leominster was particularly difficult and dangerous. In addition, there was only a short distance between the Powick Roundabout and the construction site access. Bearing this in mind, the application should include more details about the route planner and the traffic management arrangements for construction vehicles. Richard Bruten commented that it was intended to use the existing roundabout system to access the site but every effort would be made to move vehicles outside peak traffic periods. Construction vehicles would not be stopping on the highway to make a left turn. Temeside Way and Carrington Bridge had been considered as possible sites for the construction compound but had been ruled out due to negative impacts on the traffic flows. Mark Corry added that consideration had been given to using materials from on-site or brought in by the river however this material was insufficiently dense to be viable for the construction of the flood embankment
- In response to a query about the legibility of cycleway/pedestrian access and signage, Mark Gorry commented that a large part of the scheme had been designed to improve access for cyclists/pedestrians. Footpaths and cycleways would be widened and improved to ensure that they could be used safely with the removal of the outbreak crossing on the A4440. The north arm of the road leading to Worcester had a 40mph speed limit and an existing at-grade crossing with traffic control together with a large island in the middle which operated well. A signage strategy would form part of the scheme
- Concern was expressed about the number of sub-contractors that would be used and the associated responsibility for traffic management on site. There was a potential for bottle-necks to develop where vehicles were waiting to enter or exit the construction compound. Richard Bruten responded that Alun Griffiths would be the principal contractor and would take responsibility for the Method Statement and any planning matters. Alun Griffiths would also be responsible for the traffic management regulations and excavation works on the site. All the earth works, drainage works and surface works would be carried out by Alun Griffiths. Sub-contractors

would be brought in to undertake concrete works and supply steel beams for the bridge structure but the majority of that work would take place off-site. A communications plan would be implemented to keep everyone up-to-date on progress. One hundred vehicle trips represented a relatively small number for a scheme of this size. The construction method was relatively simple with a linear scheme for bringing materials on site. The site was only an hour away from the location of the source materials. All parties were aware (including the suppliers) of the potential impact of vehicle movements at peak periods and if necessary, vehicles would be re-routed. Mark Gorry added that the construction compound had been designed with the capacity to allow a large number of vehicles off-road to avoid any potential highway issues on the A4440

- In response to concerns raised about the impact of the access to the proposed housing development on the Ketch Car-Boot field, Mark Gorry explained that the existing entrance to the Car-Boot field was closer to the Ketch roundabout than the proposed access for the housing development which was further south on the A449. This entrance had been assessed and taken into account in the design of the Ketch Roundabout
- Had the impact on traffic flows after the Carrington Bridge been taken into account? Mark Gorry indicated that Phase 4 linked in with the existing phases of the Southern Link Road. It was anticipated that Phase 4 would allow traffic to flow more freely and encourage traffic to use the link road rather than travelling through the Worcester city centre
- How many HGVs was the construction compound capable of holding at any one-time? Richard Bruten responded that there was capacity to hold vehicles for the length of the haul road (2km). However, careful planning of vehicle movements would avoid causing congestion and ensure that materials would be brought onto the site only when required. In the unlikely event that an issue arose, vehicles would be prevented from approaching the site
- Was there a danger that the revamp of the ketch underpass would encourage further anti-social behaviour? Mark Gorry explained that the existing underpass was not well used because of its steep slopes, poor surface and anti-social behaviour.

The improvements to the underpass and the visitor car park were aimed at improving the amenity of the area and increase public use. The improved lighting scheme would make the area safer and more comfortable to use without any adverse environmental impact. It would also enable cyclists/pedestrians to travel along a shallow open gradient without the need to cross the road. The applicant had met representatives of West Mercia Police to ensure that the design addressed public safety concerns

- The local councillor for the Worcester - St Peters Division queried whether the percentage reduction of traffic through Worcester City Centre as a result of this scheme had been estimated. Mark Gorry indicated that by 2030 as a result of the dualling, on average there would be a 33-54% reduction in journey times for motorists travelling along the A4440 making it a better option than travelling through the City Centre. As a result traffic would be drawn out of the City Centre onto the link road. The dualling and widening of the road and the introduction of dedicated lanes would mean that traffic would flow more freely around the roundabouts.
- The local councillor for the Worcester - St Peters Division queried whether there were any plans for a designated left turn lane on the Ketch roundabout to help vehicles travelling up Bath Road accessing the dual carriageway. Mark Gorry advised that the creation of a left-turn lane or a further widening the road would be constrained by the proximity of housing at St Peters.

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

- The local councillor for the Croome Division commented that it was important for local residents and businesses that this proposal was right especially when the proposals for new residential development in the area were taken into account. He highlighted Kempsey Parish Council's request for traffic lights at the Ketch Roundabout at peak periods due to increased traffic speeds. Although officers had ruled this option out, he requested that some ground works be incorporated in the scheme to allow future resilience. He welcomed the improved design of the Ketch underpass although he would wish to

see a condition to ensure a daily cleaning routine, maintenance programme and CCTV installation. He requested that drivers/sub-contractors who failed to abide by the traffic movement arrangements be penalised in some way. In response, the representative of the County Highways Officer commented that the Parish Council's concerns about the Ketch junction had been noted but at this stage traffic lights were not deemed appropriate. However ducting was being put in place should traffic lights be required in the future. In the context of the size of the project and the local road network, the proposed level of construction vehicle movements was relatively light and therefore she was comfortable that the proposed traffic management plan would be satisfactory. Richard Bruten added that any traffic issues resulting from construction vehicle movements would be addressed as they arose

- The local councillor for the Powick Division commented that he was surprised that Sustrans had not commented on the footpath/cycleway proposals. He hoped that the contractor and client would ensure that the relevant safety audits were undertaken before the project went live. The flood modelling and compensatory measures meant that the EA had no objection and did not see an increased likelihood of flooding further downstream. He welcomed the proposed traffic signalling at the Powick Roundabout and hoped that the traffic modelling would take account of the proposed additional housing to the south and west of Worcester. He argued that commuter cyclists would be more inclined to save time using the Powick Roundabout rather than taking the longer option to use the various toucan crossing points. The location of the proposed Toucan crossing should be examined to ensure that motorists understood that a green light did not signify that it was safe to enter the roundabout. Had alternative designs for the cycleway been considered, including a possible tripod bridge formation or an underpass? The proposal should be observed in the context of the cycleway link between Malvern and Worcester. He would wish to see a condition establishing a liaison group involving the three local councillors and representatives of the parish councils to work with the contractors during the construction period to provide a conduit for local residents' concerns
- The representative of the Development Manager

advised that a flood compensation area had been set aside to ensure that there was no impact on any sensitive receptors. The proposals for housing development had been included in the Environment Impact Assessment and transport assessment. The representative of the County Highways Officer added that the housing developments to the south and west of Worcester as well as in north-east Malvern had been taken account of in the transport modelling. Mark Gorry commented that an underpass at Powick Roundabout had been considered but was not sustainable due to flooding concerns

- In relation to the request for a liaison group, Richard Bruten commented that a public relations officer would be assisting the applicant to create a communications plan however the establishment of a formal liaison group would be welcomed
- It was proposed that a condition be added to establish two groups of councillors (for the Ketch and Powick) to liaise with the County Highways Officer and developers to monitor the work on site. The Development Manager responded that it was not normal practice to consult councillors in relation to the implementation of conditions. Further to the Development Manager's comments, it was considered unnecessary to establish formal arrangements for the involvement of councillors in the monitoring of conditions
- In response to a request for an additional condition, the representative of the County Highways Officer commented that the proposed traffic management scheme included the conversion of the existing signalised crossing into a Toucan crossing on the A449 at Powick Roundabout
- The Committee could only consider the benefits/disbenefits of the application before it. It was noted that the Environment Agency were content with the flood alleviation proposals subject to conditions. Concern had been expressed about the impact of the construction work on traffic flows but this was to be expected for a project of this size. The modelling of the impact on traffic congestion and air quality in Worcester was too optimistic. It was likely that the traffic flow capacity would be reached well in advance of the predicted date of 2030
- Could a liaison group be conditioned to meet on a

3 monthly basis during the construction period? In response, it was commented that these types of groups tended to work better when they met on an ad hoc basis as required. The representative of the Development Manager advised that it was possible to add a condition to establish a community liaison group

- The impact of the Hams Bridge on the heritage environment was minimal. The community good of this project therefore outweighed the damage to heritage assets. The provision of a new viewing platform at the Ketch Roundabout was also welcomed
- Would the bunding of the construction compound create an increased flood risk at Cromwells Restaurant? Mark Gorry responded that the flood modelling included a site assessment and as a result a flood mitigation pool would be constructed before the works began
- In response to a query about dust mitigation measures, Richard Bruten explained that the CEMP would address issues relating to nuisance and would take account of the impact of dust at all key receptors. The CEMP would be monitored by the environmental clerk of works on site who would liaise with the project manager
- It was agreed that a condition be added to the recommendation to establish a liaison group linking with local councillors, highways officers and the contractor. The wording of the condition would be determined by the Development Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee.

**RESOLVED** that having taken the environmental information into account planning permission be granted for the proposed construction of Worcester Southern Link Road Phase 4, including dualling of A4440 between Ketch and Powick roundabouts with foot and cycleway improvements, new bridges alongside existing Powick Common Viaduct and Carrington Bridge and pedestrian / cycle bridge at Hams Way at Worcester Southern Link Road, A4440 Temeside Way, Worcester, subject to a condition requiring a community liaison group to be established - the wording to be agreed by the Development Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee and subject to the following conditions:

- a) The land to which this permission relates is

that shown edged in red on Drawing  
Numbered: Figure Number 1.3, titled: Land  
Ownership Plan;

- b) The development must be begun not later than  
the expiration of three years beginning with  
the date of this permission;
- c) The development hereby approved shall be  
carried out in accordance with the details  
shown on the submitted Drawings, except  
where otherwise stipulated by conditions  
attached to this permission:
- Figure Number 1.1 Location Plan;
  - Figure Number 1.2 Scheme on Aerial  
Photograph;
  - Figure Number 1.3 Land Ownership  
Plan;
  - Figure Number 2.1 Environmental  
Constraints Plan;
  - Figure Number 2.2a General  
Arrangement Plan Sheet 1 of 3;
  - Figure Number 2.2b Powick  
Roundabout Sheet 2 of 3;
  - Figure Number 2.2c Ketch Roundabout  
Sheet 3 of 3;
  - Figure Number 2.4a New Powick  
Common Viaduct Detail;
  - Figure Number 2.4b New Carrington  
Bridge Detail;
  - Figure Number 2.5 Construction  
Compounds;
  - Figure 9.6 Vegetation To Be Lost;
  - Figure 9.7a Landscape Mitigation  
Measures Sheet 1 of 3;
  - Figure 9.7b Landscape Mitigation  
Measures Sheet 2 of 3;
  - Figure 9.7c Landscape Mitigation

**Measures Sheet 3 of 3;**

- **Figure 9.7d Landscape Proposal for Ketch Viewpoint;**
- **Figure 14.2a Public Rights of Way and Key NMU Routes (Construction) Sheet 1 of 2;**
- **Figure 14.2b Public Rights of Way and Key NMU Routes (Construction) Sheet 2 of 2;**
- **Figure 14.3 Public Rights of Way and Key NMU Routes (Operation);**
- **Figure 17.1 Environmental Mitigation Plan;**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CH-101000-1 – Series 0100 – Preliminary Site Location Plan;**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CD-105000-2 – Series 0500 – Storm Water Drainage – General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-PRB-HWY-DR-CD-305000-2 – Series 0500 – Storm Water Drainage – General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-KRB-HWY-DR-CD-805000-2 – Series 0500 – Storm Water Drainage – General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CD-105050-2 – Series 0500 – Storm Water Drainage – Standard Details (SH 1);**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CD-105051-2 – Series 0500 – Storm Water Drainage – Standard Details (SH 2);**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CD-105052-2 – Series 0500 – Storm Water Drainage – Standard Details (SH 3);**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CD-105053-2 – Series 0500 – Storm Water Drainage – Standard Details (SH 4);**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CD-105054-1 – Series 0500 – Storm Water Drainage –**



Standard Details (SH 5);

- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CE-106000-2 – Series 0600 – Earthworks General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-KRB-HWY-DR-CE-806000-2 – Series 0600 – Earthworks General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-PRB-HWY-DR-CE-306000-2 – Series 0600 – Earthworks General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CH-101006-2 – Series 0100 – Preliminary General Arrangement A4440 Carriageway;**
- **SLR4-BUR-PRB-HWY-DR-CH-101007-2 – Series 0100 – Preliminary General Arrangement Powick Roundabout;**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CH-101008-2 – Series 0100 – Preliminary General Arrangement Ketch Roundabout;**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CH-103050-2 – Series 0300 – Fencing Construction Details;**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CH-103000-2 – Series 0300 – Fencing General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-PRB-HWY-DR-CH-303000-2 – Series 0300 – Fencing General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-KRB-HWY-DR-CH-803000-2 – Series 0300 – Fencing General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CH-107000-2 – Series 0700 – Road Pavements General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-PRB-HWY-DR-CH-307000-2 – Series 0700 – Road Pavement General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-KRB-HWY-DR-CH-807000-2 – Series 0700 – Road Pavements General Arrangement;**

- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CH-107011-2 – Series 0700 – Road Pavements Cross Sections (SH 1);**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CH-107012-2 – Series 0700 – Road Pavements Cross Sections (SH 2);**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CH-107013-2 – Series 0700 – Road Pavements Cross Sections (SH 3);**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CH-107014-2 – Series 0700 – Road Pavements Cross Sections (SH 4);**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CH-107010-2 – Series 0700 – Road Pavements Long Sections;**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CH-130000-2 – Series 3000 – Landscaping General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-PRB-HWY-DR-CH-330000-2 – Series 3000 – Landscaping General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-KRB-HWY-DR-CH-830000-2 – Series 3000 – Landscaping General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-KRB-HWY-DR-CH-812000-2 – Series 1200 – Traffic Signs and Road Markings General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CH-112000-2 – Series 1200 – Traffic Signs and Road Markings General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-PRB-HWY-DR-CH-312000-2 – Series 1200 – Traffic Signs and Road Markings General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-KRB-HWY-DR-CH-811000-2 – Series 1100 – Kerbs, Footways and Paved Areas General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-PRB-HWY-DR-CH-311000-2 – Series 1100 – Kerbs, Footways and Paved Areas General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CH-111000-2 –**

**Series 1100 – Kerbs, Footways and Paved Areas General Arrangement;**

- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CH-111050-2 – Series 1100 – Kerbs, Footways and Paved Areas Construction Details;**
- **SLR4-BUR-PRB-HWY-DR-CH-304000-2 – Series 0400 – Road Restraint System General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-KRB-HWY-DR-CH-804000-2 – Series 0400 – Road Restraint System General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CH-104000-2 – Series 0400 – Road Restraint System General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-PRB-HWY-DR-CH-313000-2 – Series 1300 – Street Lighting General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-KRB-HWY-DR-CH-813000-2 – Series 1300 – Street Lighting General Arrangement;**
- **SLR4-BUR-ALL-HWY-DR-CH-101005-2 – Series 0100 – Preliminary General Arrangement Overview Plan;**
- **SLR4-COW-CBR-SUP-DR-CB-718000-2 – Carrington Bridge General Arrangement Plan & Elevation;**
- **SLR4-COW-CBR-SUP-DR-CB-718005-2 – Carrington Functional Cross Section;**
- **SLR4-COW-PBR-SUP-DR-CB-518000-2 – Powick Common Viaduct General Arrangement Plan and Elevation;**
- **SLR4-COW-PBR-SUP-DR-CB-518005-2 – Powick Common Viaduct Functional Cross Section;**
- **643\_220, Rev 01 – Hams Way Bridge – Ground Level Plan;**
- **643\_221, Rev 01 – Hams Way Bridge – Deck Level Plan;**
- **643\_222 – Hams Way Bridge – Reflected**

Ceiling Plan;

- 643\_230, Rev 01 – Hams Way Bridge – Elevations;
- 643\_240, Rev 01 – Hams Way Bridge – Cross Section;

d) The developer shall notify the County Planning Authority of the start date of commencement of the development in writing within 5 working days following the commencement of the development;

*'Commencement of Development' for the purposes of this planning permission means any works to implement the Permission by the carrying out of a material operation as defined in Section 56 (4) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, but not including the 'Enabling Works' described below.*

*'Enabling Works' for the purposes of this planning permission means the removal of trees and vegetation clearance, dismantling of the existing overhead electricity pylon and construction of the overhead electricity pylon and installation of an artificial sett.*

- e) Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to commencement of enabling works, a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) for the enabling works, in accordance with Worcestershire Regulatory Services "Code of Best Practice for Demolition and Construction Sites" shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. The CEMP shall include details of all tree and vegetation clearance and mitigation measures in relation to noise, dust, lighting, water environment and biodiversity relevant to the enabling works and shall outline the working hours. The approved Enabling Works CEMP shall be implemented for the duration of the enabling works;
- f) Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to commencement of development hereby approved, excluding the enabling works, a Development CEMP, in accordance with Worcestershire Regulatory Services "Code of

***Best Practice for Demolition and Construction Sites*** shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. The approved Development CEMP shall be implemented for the duration of the construction works. The Development CEMP shall address the following:

**Hours of Working**

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

**Biodiversity**

- ii. Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities;
- iii. Identification of “biodiversity protection zones”;
- iv. Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction to be provided as a set of Method Statements for invasive species, bats, badgers and reptiles;
- v. The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
- vi. The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works;
- vii. Responsible persons and lines of communication;
- viii. The role and responsibilities on site of a suitably competent Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW);
- ix. Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs;
- x. Details of all tree and vegetation clearance;

**Lighting**

- xi. Details of the proposed construction lighting;

**Dust and Air Quality**

- xii. A scheme to minimise and mitigate the impacts of dust emissions and impacts to air quality;

**Noise and Vibration**

- xiii. A scheme to minimise and mitigate

the impacts of noise and vibration;

**Contamination**

- xiv. A Method Statement for the control of unexpected contamination;

**Water Environment**

- xv. Measures to be undertaken to ensure that any pollution and silt generated by the construction works shall not adversely affect groundwater, the River Severn, River Teme and any other surface waterbodies;

**Highways**

- xvi. The hours that delivery vehicles shall be permitted to arrive and depart, and arrangements for unloading and manoeuvring;
- xvii. Measures to ensure that vehicles leaving the site compounds do not deposit mud or other detritus onto the public highway;
- xviii. Details of site operative parking areas, material storage areas and the location of site operatives facilities;
- xix. Design and details of the temporary site access to the main site compound and office area, as shown on Drawing Numbered: Figure 2.5, Titled: 'Scheme Proposal – Construction Compounds'

**Ecology and Biodiversity**

- g) Notwithstanding the submitted details, within 6 months of the commencement of the development hereby approved, a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the LEMP shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details;
- h) Oak Tree 2 as shown on Drawing Titled: 'Bat Roost Features Location Plan within Appendix 8.3a CH2M Bat Survey Report', shall not be felled until details of its removal have been

submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the felling of Oak Tree 2 shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

- i) Within 3 months of the commencement of the development hereby approved, a Biodiversity Monitoring Strategy shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. A report describing the results of monitoring shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority at intervals identified in the Strategy. The report shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed with the County Planning Authority, and then implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme. The Biodiversity Monitoring Strategy shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details;
- j) All vegetation clearance at the site shall be undertaken outside the bird nesting season which generally extends between March and September 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;

**Pollution**

- k) Any facilities for the storage of oils, fuels or chemicals shall be sited on impervious bases and surrounded by impervious bund walls. The volume of the banded compound shall be at least equivalent to the capacity of the tank plus 10%. If there is multiple tankage, the compound shall be at least equivalent to the capacity of the largest tank, vessel or the combined capacity of interconnected tanks or vessels plus 10%. All filling points, associated pipework, vents, gauges and site glasses must be located within the bund or have separate

secondary containment. The drainage system of the bund shall be sealed with no discharge to any watercourse, land or underground strata. Associated pipework shall be located above ground and protected from accidental damage. All filling points and tank/vessels, overflow pipe outlets shall be detailed to discharge downwards into the bund;

**Noise**

- i) The new carriageway along Temeside Way (A4440) hereby approved shall be constructed from low noise surfacing materials, details of which shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. The new carriageway shall be surfaced in accordance with the approved materials;**

**Landscaping**

- m) All existing trees, shrubs and hedgerows indicated to be retained shall be protected by suitable fencing in accordance with BS5837:2012. No materials shall be stored, no rubbish dumped, no fires lit and no buildings erected inside the fence. In the event of any trees, shrub or hedgerows being damaged or removed by the development, they shall be replaced in the next planting season;**
  
- n) Notwithstanding the submitted details, within 9 months of the commencement of the development hereby approved, a landscape and planting scheme to include species, sizes, numbers, spacing, densities; locations; planting specification, and a timetable for implementation shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. 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 species;**
  
- o) Notwithstanding the submitted details, within 6 months of the commencement of the development hereby approved, a landscape and planting scheme and specification for the**



SuDS features to include species, sizes, numbers, spacing, densities; locations and a timetable for implementation shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. 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 species;

- p) Notwithstanding the submitted details, within 1 month of the commencement of the development hereby approved, a landscape and planting scheme for the Flood Compensation Area to include species, sizes, numbers, spacing, densities; locations; planting specification, and a timetable for implementation shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. 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 species;
- q) Notwithstanding the submitted details, no development of the Hams Way Cycle / Footbridge including the approach ramps shall take place until a detailed landscape and planting scheme for the Hams Way Cycle / Footbridge has been submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

**Restoration**

- r) Notwithstanding the submitted details, within 12 months of the commencement of the development hereby approved, a restoration scheme for the reinstatement of Public Rights of Way and land affected by the construction works, including land used for construction compounds and haul roads shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval

in writing. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

**Highways**

- s) Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to the installation of at-grade controlled highways crossings, details of the highways crossings shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;
- t) Prior to commencement of development hereby approved, excluding the enabling works and works to the Flood Compensation Area as required by condition hh), a Construction Traffic Management Plan, including the routing of construction vehicles shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. The approved scheme shall be adhered to for the duration of the construction period;
- u) Prior to commencement of development hereby approved, excluding the enabling works and works to the Flood Compensation Area as required by condition hh), the engineering details and specification of the mini roundabout at Powick, shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;
- v) Within 12 months of the commencement of the development hereby approved, a scheme for the reinstatement of the highway and land following the removal of the mini roundabout at Powick shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the reinstatement shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;
- w) Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to works commencing to the alterations of the Ketch Roundabout, the detailed design of the Ketch Roundabout shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved

details;

- x) Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to works commencing to the alterations of the Powick Roundabout, the detailed design of the Powick Roundabout shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

**Lighting**

- y) Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to the development being brought into use, a highways lighting scheme shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. 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), the times when the lighting would be illuminated, any measures proposed to mitigate impact of the lighting or disturbance through glare and upon protected species and habitats, in particular bats and otters. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

**Soil Handling, Materials Management and Waste**

- z) Within 1 month of the commencement of the development hereby approved, excluding the enabling works, 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 the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

**Design**

- aa) Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to the construction of the New Powick Common Viaduct, detailed design of the Viaduct, including the design of the slip roads, shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in

accordance with the approved details;

bb) Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to the construction of the New Carrington Bridge, detailed design of the New Carrington Bridge including the air draft above the River Severn shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

cc) Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to the construction of the New Carrington Bridge, detailed design, including lighting of the Ketch Roundabout Underpass and its approaches shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

dd) Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to the construction of the Ketch Viewpoint, the detailed design of the viewpoint and access shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

ee) Notwithstanding the submitted details, no development of the Hams Way Cycle / Footbridge including the approach ramps shall take place until the detailed design, samples of the materials, colours and finishes and all lighting for the Hams Way Cycle / Footbridge have been submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

**Interpretation Strategy**

ff) Within 12 months of the commencement of the development hereby approved, an interpretation strategy for cultural heritage, landscape and biodiversity shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. The Strategy shall include the content, design and location of any interpretation panels. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

**Water Environment**

gg) Within 6 months of the commencement of the development hereby approved, a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) Management Plan shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. This shall include details on future management responsibilities, maintenance schedules for all SuDS features and associated pipework, and the strategy that shall be followed to facilitate the optimal functionality and performance of the SuDS scheme throughout its lifetime. Thereafter, the SuDS shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details;

hh) Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, excluding the enabling works, the detailed design of the Flood Compensation Area including the proposed final levels, topography and volume and a timetable for its implementation shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

ii) Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to the construction of the Carrington Bridge, a scheme to minimise any impacts on siltation and navigation hazards shall be modelled and an assessment on channel hydrography of the River Severn shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing, in consultation with the Canal and River Trust. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

**Archaeology**

jj) Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to the commencement of the enabling works, a programme of archaeological work for the enabling works, including a Written Scheme of Investigation shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

i. The programme and methodology of

- ii. **site investigation and recording.**
- iii. **The programme for post investigation assessment.**
- iv. **Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording.**
- v. **Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation.**
- vi. **Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation.**
- vii. **Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation;**

**kk) Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, excluding the enabling works, a programme of archaeological work, including a Written Scheme of Investigation shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:**

- vii. **The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording.**
- viii. **The programme for post investigation assessment.**
- ix. **Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording.**
- x. **Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation.**
- xi. **Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation.**
- xii. **Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation; and**

**ll) The development shall not be brought into use until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under conditions jj) and kk) and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive**

**deposition has been secured.**

The meeting ended at 12.05pm.

Chairman .....