

## Planning and Regulatory Committee

### Tuesday, 1 November 2016, County Hall, Worcester - 10.00 am

	<b>Minutes</b>	
<b>Present:</b>	Mr R C Adams (Chairman), Ms P Agar, Mrs S Askin, Mr P Denham (Vice Chairman), Mrs A T Hingley, Mr I Hopwood, Mr A P Miller, Mr D W Prodger MBE and Mr R J Sutton	
<b>Also attended:</b>	Mrs S L Blagg attended as a local councillor for Agenda item 5.	
<b>Available papers</b>	<p>The Members had before them:</p> <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);</li><li>C. A copy of the presentation by Mrs S L Blagg, the local councillor for agenda item 5 (previously circulated); and</li><li>D. The Minutes of the meeting held on 20 September 2016 (previously circulated).</li></ul> <p>A copy of documents A – C will be attached to the signed Minutes.</p>	
<b>957</b>	<b>Named Substitutes (Agenda item 1)</b>	None.
<b>958</b>	<b>Apologies/ Declarations of Interest (Agenda item 2)</b>	Apologies were received from Mr A Amos, Mr P Bridle and Mr S Clee.
<b>959</b>	<b>Public Participation (Agenda item 3)</b>	Those presentations made are recorded at the Minute to which they relate.

**960 Confirmation of Minutes (Agenda item 4)**

**RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the meeting held on 20 September 2016 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**961 Proposed construction and operation of an Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA) Recycling Facility accepting 120,000 tonnes per annum along with ancillary/welfare facilities and operation of mobile equipment at Sandy Lane, Wildmoor, Bromsgrove, Worcestershire (Agenda item 5)**

The Committee considered a County Matter planning application for the proposed construction and operation of an Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA) recycling facility accepting 120,000 tonnes per annum along with ancillary / welfare facilities and operation of mobile equipment at Sandy Lane Quarry, Wildmoor, Bromsgrove, 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 Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy's comments in relation to the waste hierarchy, alternatives, location of the development, Green Belt, landscape character and visual impacts, residential amenity (noise, dust and odour), traffic, highway safety and impacts upon public rights of way, the water environment, ecology and biodiversity and other matters – economic impact including provision of secondary aggregates, heritage impacts, public consultation, cumulative effects and the Human Rights Act 1998.

The Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy concluded that the proposal would provide a small number of direct employment opportunities, as well as contributing to the wider growth aspirations for the county through the supply of secondary aggregates to the construction market. Therefore, it was considered that the proposal would provide substantial sustainable economic development benefits to the local economy in accordance with the NPPF, which stated that "significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system". The proposed development would also enable waste that would otherwise be landfilled to be recycled and put to a beneficial use as a secondary aggregate; therefore, it would comply with the objectives of the waste hierarchy. The Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy recognised the positive contribution the proposed facility would make to the provision of secondary aggregates should it be granted planning permission.

The application site was located within the West Midlands Green Belt. The proposal would be

inappropriate development within the Green Belt and therefore, very special circumstances needed to be demonstrated, which justified an exception to Green Belt policy. It was considered that the proposal would significantly reduce the openness of the Green Belt in as much as development would be present where it did not exist before, conflicting with the fundamental aim of Green Belts, which was to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. It would encroach into the countryside, develop greenfield land and further erode the Green Belt and therefore, would conflict with three of the five main purposes of including land within the Green Belt. The Head of Economy and Infrastructure considered that the reasons set out above, when considered individually or as a whole do not amount to very special circumstances, which outweighed the harm to the Green Belt caused by the inappropriate development itself. As such, the proposed development was contrary to the NPPF Section 9, Policy WCS 13 of the Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy and Policies DS1, DS2 and DS13 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan, and Policy BDP4 of the Draft Bromsgrove District Local Plan.

The proposed development would be located on the floor of an operational sand quarry. Policy WCS 6 of the Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy directed waste management development to land with compatible uses. Active mineral workings or landfill sites were considered acceptable by the Policy where a clear operational relationship was demonstrated. Greenfield land was identified as not a compatible land use. The applicant had not submitted any substantive evidence to demonstrate an operational link between the proposal and the active quarry. The NPPF confirmed that quarries with an approved restoration scheme, such as this application site, constituted greenfield land. As a result, the proposed development was considered to be in an unacceptable location contrary to Policy WCS 6 of the Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy.

With regard to the consideration of alternatives, the applicant considered two main alternatives involving either the 'Do Nothing Scenario' and alternative sites. The Alternative Site Assessment assessed 139 sites within 60 miles (97 kilometres) of Veolia's Staffordshire ERF and Shropshire EfW, focussing on Staffordshire, the Black Country, Birmingham and Worcestershire. Whilst local residents, County Councillor Sheila Blagg and the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy raised some questions regarding the matrix and weighting of the

Alternative Site Assessment, overall it was considered adequate for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2015 (as amended).

The location of the proposal situated within an active quarry void, together with the height of the proposed structures and screening afforded by mature vegetation and bunds would result in very little visibility from the surrounding area, with glimpsed views of the proposal available from the Public Right of Way BB-680, situated immediately to the north of the proposal. The County Landscape Officer also raised no objections, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

Notwithstanding the above and the significant level of screening offered by the quarry void and established vegetation, the proposed development of the 2.3 hectare site would significantly encroach in to the open countryside, resulting in the loss of greenfield land. The area of hardstanding would be extensive measuring approximately 1.5 hectares in area. The proposed new building would measure about 41.1 metres long by 26.4 metres wide by a maximum of 14 metres high (to the apex), equating to about 1,085 square metres in area. The applicant also proposed cabins to provide welfare and office facilities for staff, mobile equipment, dust control units (consisting of fixed and mobile sprinklers), skips, a generator facility, surface water management elements, a weighbridge and car park. Furthermore, the raw and processed IBA aggregate would be stockpiled externally to a maximum height of 15 metres, therefore, it was considered that the proposal represented an undesirable intrusion of development into the open countryside, contrary to a core principle of the NPPF as set out at paragraph 17 bullet point 5 and Policy WCS 12 of the Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy. Additionally, the lack of visibility did not mean that the openness of the Green Belt would be preserved.

With regard to air pollution, noise or dust impacts, it was acknowledged that paragraph 122 of the NPPF stated that "local planning authorities should focus on whether the development itself was an acceptable use of the land, and the impact of the use, rather than the control of processes or emissions themselves where these were subject to approval under pollution control regimes. Local planning authorities should assume that these regimes would operate effectively".

It was noted that the Environment Agency had raised no

objections and that a bespoke Environmental Permit had been issued for the site by the Environment Agency, which controlled emissions and contained an air quality impact assessment, noise assessment and dust management plan would be a requirement of the Environmental Permit. In view of this, it was considered that subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions relating to operating hours, requiring a detailed lighting scheme and implementation of the mitigation measures outlined in the submitted Air Quality and Noise Assessment chapters of the Environmental Statement, there would be no adverse air pollution, noise or dust impacts on residential amenity or that of human health.

With regard to traffic and highway safety and impacts upon adjacent Public Rights of Way, based on the advice of the County Highways Officer, County Footpath Officer, Ramblers Association and County Landscape Officer, the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy was satisfied that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact upon traffic, highway safety and users of the surrounding Public Rights of Way, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

A key concern to local residents and objectors was that of the impacts upon the aquifer which underlays the site. Based on the advice of North Worcestershire Water Management, the Environment Agency and Severn Trent Water Limited, the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy considered there would be no adverse effects on the water environment, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

With regard to impacts upon ecology and biodiversity and the historic environment, based on the advice of Natural England, County Ecologist, Historic England, Bromsgrove District Conservation Officer and the County Archaeologist, it was considered that subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, the proposed development would not have any adverse effects upon heritage assets, ecology and biodiversity at the site and surrounding area.

The Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy 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.

On balance, it was considered that permitting the proposed development of an IBA recycling facility at Sandy Lane, Wildmoor, Bromsgrove would be

unacceptable in the proposed Green Belt location contrary to Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies WCS 6, WCS 12 and WCS 13 of the adopted Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy and Policies DS1, DS2 and DS13 of the adopted Bromsgrove District Local Plan, and Policy BDP4 of the Draft Bromsgrove District Local Plan.

The representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy introduced the report and commented that members had visited the site, observing the waste management facilities along Sandy Lane and the site itself from the base of the quarry and from the adjacent landfill. Members had also observed the neighbouring eastern quarry which had planning permission for inert landfill. Photographs of the site taken by a member of the public from the adjacent landfill site had been shared with members of the Committee on the site visit as well as to the applicant. The photographs showed the site with water in the bottom of the quarry. Further photographs of a similar nature had been submitted by a member of the public and had been made available for members and the applicant. A further letter of objection had been received expressing concerns about mud on the road and the traffic impact. The applicant had emailed a document to members of the Committee justifying the reason for this application being sited in the Green Belt. He confirmed that the photographs on display in the meeting room were not those provided by the member of the public.

The representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy added that the applicant had indicated in a communication to members of the Committee that there would be no uncertainty in their view that Hartlebury EFW IBA would be processed at Sandy Lane. In response the operator of the Hartlebury EFW facility had confirmed that there was no commercial agreement between Mercia Waste Management and Ballast Phoenix Ltd or Veolia relating to where IBA should be processed and they had been advised that the best option was to dispose of IBA at Hill and Moor Landfill Site. The Council's Waste Management team had advised that arrangements for the disposal of IBA were set down in the contract between the participating councils and showed that IBA was being disposed at Hill and Moor Landfill site. The Hartlebury EFW was not dependent on this application being granted permission.

Mr Danks, an objector to the application addressed the Committee. He commented that the applicant was aware

of the policies within the Waste Core Strategy but had ignored key policies within it. The application site was located in a Zone level 5 area, and was identified by Table 7 of Policy WCS 6 as not being a compatible land use for the purpose of this application. Their alternative site assessment process was based on very limited and self-derived criteria, and included applying invalid scores for the Sandy Lane site. It resulted in the short listing of six sites.

He added that the Wildmoor Residents Association letter of objection examined the six sites, considering transport costs and carbon dioxide emissions and found that the applicant's assessment was flawed. This study showed that the Wildmoor site would result in the highest levels of transportation cost and carbon dioxide emissions. The applicant proposed to handle 120,000 tonnes of IBA per annum at the Wildmoor Site, which was a 'secondary' or 'other recovery' process, 78,000 tonnes of which would be imported from their Shropshire and Staffordshire plants. The Waste Core Strategy recognised the inevitable cross boundary movements of some waste. However, he queried why Worcestershire County Council should be put in the position of having to accept 78,000 tonnes from other counties in a secondary recycling process which need not be located in Worcestershire at all.

He argued that the applicant's 'Alternative Site Assessment' lacked cooperation, objectivity and completely ignored the Requirements and Policies of the Waste Core Strategy, it was also now three years out of date and the applicant's statement that "the lack of alternative sites is considered to amount to 'Very Special Circumstances' was rejected. Secondly, the Western Quarry site was located within the Green Belt and also within a landscape protection area. A restoration agreement was in place for this site and the local community desired that this should be carried out in its entirety.

He commented that the NPPF made clear that the Green Belt existed in part to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. Whilst Wildmoor and this part of North Worcestershire was well used to sand extraction, it did not mean that the Green Belt should accommodate a new factory building, of over 1,000 square metres in floor area. The applicant acknowledged that their proposal was contrary to the six exceptions listed in Section 9 of the NPPF. Their 'Planning Application Supporting Statement' stated – "It is clear that the development does

not fall within the listed exceptions” and continued – “whilst the proposed development is not mineral extraction it does have many of the same requirements and characteristics of this type of development”. All of these statements by the applicant were extremely disingenuous and did not equate to the existence of ‘Very Special Circumstances’. The application did not seek to improve or sustain the green belt, it sought only to exploit it and would bring with it irreparable harm.

He concluded that the applicant had not demonstrated ‘Very Special Circumstances’ in regard to their site selection and alternative site assessment, which was flawed. This application was not compatible with the Waste Core Strategy hierarchy for site selection, it contravened the policies and requirements of the NPPF and the District Council’s Local Plan. It was inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

Mr Dimond, a representative of the applicant addressed the Committee. He commented that the decision should be based on national policy, balanced and assess whether there were very special circumstances to justify this development in the Green Belt. The planning balance involved firstly assessing what the harm was to the Green Belt, secondly assessing whether there was any other harm and thirdly assessing the benefits and whether they amounted to very special circumstances. He considered that there was no other harm as a result of environmental impacts to justify refusal. The permission was for an open land use. The buildings represented 10% of the operational area. The development was at the base of the quarry, 20 metres below surrounding levels and bordered by trees with no visual impact. There would be no encroachment or loss of openness of the wider Green Belt countryside. Loss of openness was very small and should be weighed against the many benefits of the development.

He argued that sustainable waste management meant reducing landfill, recycling more and using waste as a resource. The new energy recovery facilities in the West Midlands were key infrastructure and their residues (IBA) were also recovered for reuse. Additional IBA processing was urgently required and IBA was being sent to remote facilities. The facility at Castle Bromwich, serving the Birmingham energy recovery facility, had been lost to the HS2 development and no replacement found therefore there was a real danger that IBA from the region would be sent to landfill. This site was located close to its main market and had good access to the strategic road



network.

He added that IBA replaced natural aggregates such as crushed rock. Worcestershire was a net importer of crushed rock. IBA would reduce the need to find new extraction sites. This was the best available site. A regional facility reduced the need to find additional sites and provided economies of scale. Temporary permission could be granted and still allow for restoration of the site in the future. Enhanced restoration of the eastern quarry and increased public access would meet national policy objectives for the Green Belt. These reasons amounted to special circumstances and outweighed the harm to the Green Belt.

The following queries were raised with Mr Dimond:

- The applicant had stated that other sites had been considered. Was the next best site in the Green Belt and if it was not, why was it rejected in favour of the application site? Mr Dimond commented that the next best site was not in the Green Belt. Various sites had been scored similarly to the application site but had been rejected on the basis that they were in semi-derelict urban areas in the Black Country. They were either very close to more sensitive uses and the road access was poor and passed through residential areas. He acknowledged that the choice of site was a subjective process but the application site was on the A491 with links to the Strategic Lorry Network and the M4
- Did the fact that this site was in the applicant's ownership make it an easier option? Mr Dimond explained that the ownership of the site was a key factor in bringing this application forward for consideration. A number of the other alternative sites were not available and where they were located in major development areas, this type of land use was not seen as compatible with other industrial land uses in the area
- On an annual basis, how many times was the site tested for pollution? Mr Dimond commented that the extraction operations did not create a pollution hazard. There was also ongoing monitoring of the surrounding area in relation to the levels of ground water contamination. In addition it would be a condition of the EA Environmental Permit to carry out monitoring of the groundwater below and surrounding the concrete slab for pollutants

- Had the applicant taken into account average rainfall levels and as a result determined the number of tankers needed to remove water from the site annually? Mr Dimond stated that as part of the Environmental Permit requirements a detailed examination of meteorological data had been undertaken which took into account climate change and flood risk modelling. These calculations determined the size of the lagoon necessary on site and to forecast how often water needed to be tankered off site. He could not provide a specific number annually but there would be a low number of events requiring water to be tankered away. The EA, as part of the permit requirements, had confirmed that the information provided and the assurances given about the size of lagoon was satisfactory
- In response to a query about the impact on the Green Belt, Mr Dimond argued that it was possible to have development in the Green Belt, even inappropriate development. In this case, it was only the building that was inappropriate, the rest of the application was open land use. It was akin to a quarry and there would only be a small impact on the loss of openness of the Green Belt. In addition, it would not result in settlements merging
- The applicant had ruled out other alternative sites as less suitable on the basis that they were near residential areas and other industrial uses and yet the IBA facility in Sheffield was located near to residential area and industrial units. Mr Dimond acknowledged that the Sheffield IBA site had an industrial character. It was possible to operate these facilities to a high standard with residential areas nearby. However he argued that it was the impact of vehicle movements on local residents that was a particular difficulty for people living nearby. Sites in Staffordshire and Birmingham had been examined but were either too small or unsuitable in one way or another.

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

- The local councillor commented that she and residents had been made aware of the applicant's intention for the further development of the Sandy Lane site in April 2013. Consultation and communication with the local community included instruction about their plans and business

managers were available to answer specific questions. Local residents subsequently visited the Castle Bromwich site and she had visited the Sheffield site with other officers. This application was unchanged, except for the addition of an Environmental Permit. In April 2013, the Government revoked Regional Strategies in favour of Local plans reflecting the importance Government attached to the involvement of local communities as the keystone of the planning system. Green Belt policy was strengthened and not weakened by this approach. Relevant policies were the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy, Hereford and Worcestershire Minerals Local Plan, and Bromsgrove District Local Plan and the Draft District Plan. A fundamental principle of the NPPF was that it was “plan led”. The NPPF stated, as the first of its core planning principles that “planning should be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings, with succinct local and neighbourhood plans setting out a positive vision for the future of the area”. Key strategic documents had to take account of National Planning Guidance so that future planning permissions could be balanced with local district plans and the needs of the local area. Locational recommendations for both minerals and waste development were contained within these adopted and emerging documents. Proposals for any new waste management facilities would be permitted where it was demonstrated that they were located on a type of land that was identified as ‘compatible’. Compatible was defined in the policy. Sandy Lane was a greenfield site within Green Belt and was defined within NPPF Guidance as a mineral site with an approved restoration scheme that would be returned to Green Belt. Sandy Lane was land that was not recommended for waste management development, unless it could be strongly justified to do so. WCS 6 directed waste management development to land with compatible uses, including industrial land, contaminated derelict or employment land and redundant agricultural land. The applicant owned the Sandy Lane site and stated that a site that was available and was not subject to any competing interest and stated that the IBA contracts Veolia had would facilitate economies of scale in the market place. The

ownership of the land was not a material planning consideration and the potential value of IBA in the market place and the value it had relative to sand, should be given limited weight in the determination of this application. The aim of Green Belt policy was to maintain the openness of the land. The current permission at the Sandy Lane site was permitted development in the Green Belt by way of very special circumstances because sand was a site specific primary aggregate and could only be quarried at a location where it was found. The Sandy Lane / Wildmoor area was rich in sand, a primary aggregate. The planning permission was considered a temporary development until the resource was exhausted and land could be restored to agriculture. The applicant related bottom ash to the same very special circumstances as mineral extraction and this was incorrect. IBA was the material from a waste recovery facility, which was not land or site specific. IBA aggregate was a secondary aggregate that could be processed in any location where it was appropriate to build a processing plant. The processing plant was small relative to a sand quarry and the material had to be transported to that processing plant and for that reason was probably best and easier located as close as possible to the original recovery processing facility. The NPPF continued to support the protection of the Green Belt and “inappropriate development” remained harmful by definition. The harm that would be caused to the Green Belt was absolute in the case of this proposed development. The introduction of built structures, the introduction of industrial processing and the recycling of a waste product were activities that were not acceptable use of Green Belt land. If a structure were considered appropriate within the Green Belt it would have been allowed because the current planning permission required that structure. There was no operational link to the current sand quarry permission and the proposed building. There was no compatibility between the current mineral extraction and a built structure was not needed to fulfil the terms of the current planning permission. There was no clear relationship between the proposed land use and the existing land use. Building a structure in Green Belt was introducing a structure that would otherwise not be there. The

applicant had not demonstrated very special circumstances existed to build a structure in the Green Belt, had not shown compatibility with the existing and past planning permissions and the development did not share the same characteristics or have the same requirements as a primary aggregate that required extraction at source. Planning policies at National and Local level sought to maintain the openness of the countryside and would not compromise that aim unless it could be proved that an essential facility could not be accommodated other than in the open Green Belt. The very definition of openness meant an absence of built development regardless of the size and height or the description being very limited, very small or temporary. The applicant had not given consideration to national policy or local plans and strategies relevant to the Green Belt

- In response to a query, the local councillor commented that the PROW network was well used by local residents. She added that a query was raised with her about the number of residents within the vicinity of the site and she had checked the electoral roll and reported that there were 86 adult residents in total residing along Sandy Lane, in Stoneybridge and along Madley Road
- Was it intended that the IBA from the Hartlebury EfW plant would be sent to Hill and Moor Landfill site? The representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy commented that currently IBA from the EFW facility at Hartlebury was being taken to the Hill and Moor Landfill site. It was being stockpiled in a landfill cell and Mercia Waste Management might recycle the IBA in the future but that was dependent on the receipt of the necessary planning permission. At the moment planning permission only allowed for the IBA to be disposed at Hill and Moor. In response to a query, he confirmed that it would be more sustainable to recycle IBA than send it to landfill
- Bearing mind the recommendation for refusal and the arguments put forward by the applicant, how confident were officers that the reasons put forward for refusal would be upheld by the Planning Inspector at Appeal? The representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy stated that the recommendation to refuse the application had been given careful consideration and he was confident that the

- decision would be upheld at a subsequent appeal
- As the applicant indicated this application should be determined balancing the planning arguments for and against it. Having listened to the arguments for and against and the views of the statutory consultees, on balance, the application should be refused because it was contrary to the Waste Core Strategy, policies in the NPPF, was located in the Green Belt and the applicant had failed to demonstrate very special circumstances for such development in the Green Belt
  - The Green Belt buffer zone between Birmingham and Bromsgrove was paramount and needed to be protected. Sandy Lane had become a major motorway junction and the congestion there was enormous therefore to add 65 additional lorry movements per day would exacerbate the problems already experienced by local residents. The site in Staffordshire had been ruled out by the applicant due to HS2 development and yet HS2 would open up opportunities for this kind of facility
  - It was appropriate that members visited the site. This was a prime wildlife site and it would have been beneficial for the restoration of wildlife and biodiversity to have been achieved over a longer period to allow it to become more established. The trees that had grown in the location were as a result of self-seeded rather than a planting scheme. This proposal was not in keeping with the original restoration scheme. The concrete slab was necessary because of the need to contain contaminates on the site but was not the right location for this facility
  - This was a difficult application to determine on balance and although none of the statutory consultees had objected, the relevant planning policies and the principles regarding development in the Green Belt were the key issues. In particular it should be noted that if planning permission was granted, development would exist where it did not exist before and additionally a lack of visibility did not mean that the openness of the Green Belt would be preserved
  - There was a need for a facility of this kind in the county because otherwise IBA would be sent to landfill and landfill was taxed and capacity was running out. In addition, it would mean that less aggregate would need to be extracted. Although the Sheffield facility was noisy inside, there was very little noise outside and therefore a well-

screened facility of this nature was desirable, particularly as the county was a net importer of aggregates. However the crux of the argument was that the site was in the Green Belt and although there would be minimal visual impact on walkers and motorists, it remained an ugly building set in a green location. There were serious policy objections to the proposal and the applicant had failed to put forward a convincing argument to explain why this was the best location for the facility.

**RESOLVED** that having taken the environmental information into account, planning permission be refused for the proposed construction and operation of an Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA) recycling facility accepting 120,000 tonnes per annum along with ancillary / welfare facilities and operation of mobile equipment at Sandy Lane Quarry, Wildmoor, Bromsgrove, Worcestershire, for the following reasons:

- a) The proposal is considered to be inappropriate and accordingly harmful to the Green Belt contrary to Section 9 ("Protecting Green Belt land") of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy WCS 13 of the adopted Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy, Policies DS1, DS2 and DS13 of the adopted Bromsgrove District Local Plan and Policy BDP4 of the draft Bromsgrove District Local Plan in relation to development within the Green Belt;
- b) The proposal is considered to be in an unacceptable location contrary to Policy WCS 6 of the adopted Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy; and
- c) The proposal is considered to have an unacceptable impact upon the open countryside contrary to a core principle of the National Planning Policy Framework as set out at paragraph 17 bullet point 5 and Policy WCS 12 of the adopted Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy.

The meeting ended at 11.30am.

Chairman .....

