

## Planning and Regulatory Committee

### Tuesday, 26 March 2019, County Hall, Worcester - 10.00 am

		Minutes
<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, Mrs J A Potter, Prof J W Raine, Mr C Rogers and Mr P A Tuthill
<b>Also attended:</b>		Mrs E B Tucker attended as a local councillor for Agenda item 6.
<b>Available papers</b>		The members had before them:  A. The Agenda papers (previously circulated);  B. A copy of the summary presentations from public participants invited to speak (previously circulated); and  C. The Minutes of the meeting held on 4 December 2018 (previously circulated).
<b>1010</b>	<b>Named Substitutes (Agenda item 1)</b>	None.
<b>1011</b>	<b>Apologies/ Declarations of Interest (Agenda item 2)</b>	Apologies were received from Mr A Fry and Mr J A D O'Donnell.
<b>1012</b>	<b>Public Participation (Agenda item 3)</b>	Those presentations made are recorded at the minute to which they relate.
<b>1013</b>	<b>Confirmation of Minutes (Agenda item 4)</b>	<b>RESOLVED</b> that the Minutes of the meeting held on 4 December 2018 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.
<b>1014</b>	<b>Planning application made under Section 73 of</b>	The Committee considered a planning application made under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to vary condition 3 of Planning Permission Reference: 10/000032/CM (Planning Inspectorate Ref: APP/E1855/V/11/2153273) (as

**the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to vary condition 3 of Planning Permission Reference: 10/000032/CM (Planning Inspectorate Ref: APP/E1855/V/11/2153273) (as amended) to increase throughput of the Envirecover Energy from Waste (EFW) Facility from 200,000 to 230,000 tonnes per annum at Mercia Envirecover, Plot H600, Oak Drive, Hartlebury Trading Estate, Hartlebury, Worcestershire (Agenda item 5)**

amended) to increase throughput of the Envirecover Energy from Waste (EFW) Facility from 200,000 to 230,000 tonnes per annum at Mercia Envirecover, Plot H600, Oak Drive, Hartlebury Trading Estate, Hartlebury, 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 need; location of the development (including Green Belt); residential amenity (including air pollution and quality, human health and litter impacts); traffic and highway safety; and other matters (alternatives, project vulnerability to major accidents/disasters, other environmental impacts, planning consultation, and EIA team and expertise).

The Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy concluded that the applicant had stated that the proposed change was being sought for the following principal reasons:

- It would allow the EfW facility to operate at its maximum potential capacity and, in doing so, increase the amount of energy, including renewable energy, that would be produced
- It would allow a greater volume of non-hazardous residual waste to be managed further up the waste hierarchy, than would otherwise be the case, and
- It would enable Mercia Waste Management and the Joint Authorities to maximise revenues from both the additional waste that would be treated, and the additional energy that would be generated.

The application was accompanied by an Environmental Statement Addendum and new Non-Technical Summary. The application was also accompanied by the original Environmental Statement and Non-Technical Summary, and Regulation 19 further information submissions.

It was considered that there was a both a national and local need for 'other recovery' capacity for the treatment of residual non-hazardous waste and that this proposal would contribute towards meeting this need. Furthermore, the proposal would make a positive contribution towards national energy needs, including the need for more renewable energy generation.

The principle of the development in this location had already been established and the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy considered that the proposed development accords with Policies WCS 4 and WCS 6 of Worcestershire Waste Core.

With regard to impacts upon the Green Belt, the applicant had confirmed that the proposal would not result in any new built development or modification to the EfW facility and primarily arose from the plant being able to operate for more hours in a given year than was originally planned. In view of this, it was considered that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt and did not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.

Based on the advice of the Environment Agency and Worcestershire Regulatory Services, it was considered that the proposal would have no adverse air quality, noise or litter impacts upon residential amenity or that of human health, subject to the imposition of conditions as imposed on the extant planning permission.

The proposal would increase the total number of daily HGVs servicing EnviRecover by approximately 15 HGV movements per day from approximately 178 to 193 HGV movements per day. The County Highways Officer had raised no objections, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions. In view of this, the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy was satisfied that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact upon traffic and highway safety, subject to the imposition of conditions as imposed on the extant planning permission.

Taking into account the provisions of the Development Plan and in particular Policies WCS 1, WCS 2, WCS 4, WCS 6, , WCS 8, WCS 9, WCS 10, WCS 11, WCS 12, WCS 13, WCS 14 and WCS 15 of the Adopted Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy and Policies SWDP 1, SWDP 2, SWDP 4, SWDP 5, SWDP 6, SWDP 8, SWDP 21, SWDP 22, SWDP 24, SWDP 25, SWDP 27, SWDP 28, SWDP 29, SWDP 30 and SWDP 31 of the Adopted South Worcestershire Development Plan, it was considered the proposal would not cause demonstrable harm to the interests intended to be protected by these policies or highway safety.

The representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy introduced the report and commented that

members had visited the site and had been shown the control room which had a view of the bunker hall where the waste was brought into the facility before entering the furnace. Members received an explanation of the process at the plant and the proposed changes as a result of this application. Members also received a tour around the exterior of the facility. Since the publication of the report, Stone Parish Council had indicated its support for the proposal.

In the ensuing debate, the following points were raised:

- In response to a query, the representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy explained that there would be 15 additional HGV movements per day in and out of the site as a result of this application. These additional movements were not considered significant as the total number of vehicle movements would not exceed the originally approved projected numbers
- Were drivers visiting the site aware of the appropriate route to follow and was adequate signage in place? The representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy advised that since the plant had become operational, HGVs accessing the plant had complied with the routing agreement with the very odd exception. In addition, the Council had additional controls through its relationship with the district council refuse collection service. The local parish council had not reported any issues at community liaison group meetings. The representative of the County Highways Officer added that there was appropriate signage to the plant along Crown Lane and she reiterated that the HGV drivers were adhering to the original routing agreement
- It was good to see that the plant was operating more efficiently than originally planned. The additional electricity generated by this proposed application was also welcomed. Was there any potential to use the heat generated by the plant locally, for example for use by new or existing businesses on the trading estate? The representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy responded that efforts had been and continued to be made to find end-users for the heat but to date, the search had been unsuccessful. Paddy Kelly (EnviRecover General Manager) added that as part of the requirements of the Environmental Permit, he had to consider possible heat and power options every

two years. The facility was ready to supply a heat output but to date no viable network to supply the heat had been identified. He had also spoken to the Hartlebury Estate manager who would inform any new businesses of the availability of the source of heat

- Were any of the traffic control suggestions put forward by the objectors being implemented? The representative of the County Highways Officer advised that the increase in the traffic associated with this application would still keep traffic numbers below that approved by the Secretary of State and therefore it would not be reasonable to put in place any of the suggested measures. In addition, the Council would not wish to introduce a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) due to the extensive and lengthy nature of the TRO process with no guarantee of success. She therefore suggested that any concerns be reported to the local councillor
- Under the revised proposals, the number of days when the plant would be idle to undertake maintenance work would reduce from 41 days to 14 days. How was it possible to keep the plant running with fewer maintenance days or was the plant idle due to the applicant being constrained by the capacity agreed as part of the original planning permission? Fernando Capelastegui, a Director of Severn Waste Services advised that the intention was to future-proof the facility because it was possible that as technology advanced, the plant could run at 100% capacity and might only need to be shut down for maintenance every 2-3 years. Paddy Kelly added that for the foreseeable future there was no plan to change the existing procedure which allowed for an annual shutdown as well as addressing any unplanned shutdowns as they occurred
- The bunker hall had a limited capacity of 4k tonnes of waste therefore what happened to the waste produced during the shut down period? Paddy Kelly advised that a proportion of the waste during the shut down period would go to landfill however every effort was made to keep the plant open for deliveries by refuse collections. In exceptional circumstances, the bunker hall was able to accept up to 12k tonnes of waste although operationally that would be challenging and not best practice
- Had any consideration been given to moving waste to and from the site by rail to reduce the

number of HGV movements? Fernando Capelastegui advised that unless a rail-head facility existed right next to the facility, such a proposal would be extremely expensive, create rail timetable issues and require rail-head facilities to be introduced at the waste delivery points.

**RESOLVED** that, having taken the environmental information into account planning permission be granted for the carrying-out of development pursuant to planning permission reference number 10/000032/CM (Planning Inspectorate Ref: APP/E1855/V/11/2153273) (as amended), without complying with condition 3 (waste throughput) of that permission so as to increase the throughput of the EnviRecover Energy from Waste (EfW) Facility from 200,000 to 230,000 tonnes per annum at Mercia EnviRecover, Plot H600, Oak Drive, Hartlebury Trading Estate, Hartlebury, Worcestershire, subject to the following conditions:

- a) The development hereby approved shall only be carried out in accordance with the following documents and drawings, except for where measures are required by the conditions set out elsewhere in this permission which shall take precedence over those documents listed here:

**Documents:**

- The Planning Application Document Volume 1 and 2 (April 2010)
- The Environmental Statement Volume 1: Main Report and Volume 2: Technical Appendices (April 2010)
- The Transport Assessment (April 2010)

**Drawings:-**

- 1204 PL0002 Planning Application Boundary Plan (April 2010)
- 1204 PL0003 Rev F Proposed Site Plan (August 2016)
- 1204 PL0004 Rev E Proposed Traffic Plan (August 2016)
- 1204 PL005 Rev E Proposed Basement Floor Plans (August 2016)

- 50053010 Rev 3.0 Ground and First Floor Level General Arrangement (February 2015)
- 50053012 Rev 3.0 Second and Third Floor Level General Arrangement (February 2015)
- 50053014 Rev 3.0 Fourth and Fifth Floor Level General Arrangement (February 2015)
- 1204 PL0009 Rev B Proposed Roof Plan (August 2016)
- 1204 PL0011 Rev F Proposed Site Sections AA and BB (August 2016)
- 1204 PL0012 Rev E Proposed North Elevation (August 2016)
- 1204 PL0013 Rev E Proposed East Elevation (August 2016)
- 1204 PL0014 Rev E Proposed South Elevation (August 2016)
- 1204 PL0015 Rev E Proposed West Elevation (August 2016)
- 1204 PL0016 Rev E Proposed Turbine Building Elevations (August 2016)
- 1204 PL0017 Rev D Proposed Weighbridge Plan and Elevations (August 2016)
- 1202 PL0018 Virtual Samples Board (April 2010)
- 1506-01-001 Rev O Landscape Scheme (August 2016)
- 1506-01-002 Rev J Soft Landscape Details (August 2016)
- 1506-01-003 Rev G Hard Landscape Details (August 2016)
- Figure 12: Transport Assessment – Proposed Site Access Arrangements and Internal HGV Queuing Space (August 2016)
- 50052200 Rev 0.0 Section on GLD Indicating Base, Louvre and Capping Detail (September 2014);

**b) The operator shall ensure that the amount of wastes treated at the facility hereby approved does not exceed 230,000 tonnes per year;**

- c) No material shall be accepted at the site directly from members of the public, and no retail sales of waste or processed materials to members of the public shall take place at the site;

**Highway Safety and Access**

- d) The only means of access and egress to the site shall be from Oak Drive as shown in drawing number 1204 PL003 Rev F 'Proposed Site Plan and Figure 12: Transport Assessment – Proposed Site Access Arrangements and Internal HGV Queuing Space (August 2016);
- e) The route to be used for vehicular access during operation of the development hereby approved shall only be in accordance with the document titled: 'Site Operational Travel Plan', dated April 2016;
- f) All loads of waste materials carried on HGV into and out of the development hereby approved shall be enclosed or covered so as to prevent spillage or loss of material at the site or on to the public highway;
- g) Heavy goods vehicles associated with operation of the development hereby approved shall only enter or exit the site between 06:00 hours and 19:00 hours;
- h) The development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the document titled: 'Hard Standing Construction Details', dated May 2016. The driveway, parking for site operatives and visitors and vehicular turning spaces shall be retained and kept available for those uses at all times;

**Materials, Design and Layout**

- i) The development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the document titled: 'Condition 12 Colour Study', by Studio E LLP, dated April 2014. The curtain walling, glazing and mesh shall be as shown on the approved drawing titled: 'Virtual Samples Board', numbered: 1204 PL0018, dated April 2010; and the following samples submitted to the County Planning Authority on 26 March and 15 April 2014:-
- Cladding Material A and B – Vertically orientated trapezoidal panel, Ref: Euroclad

- 32/1000 Reverse, Corus HPS200 Ultra;
- Wall Cladding Material C – Colour coated composite steel cladding panels, Ref: Eurobond Rockspan;
  - Stack colour – Colorcoat HPS200 Ultra, Albatross colour;
  - Building Base Plinth – Staffordshire Slate Blue Engineering Brick;
  - Flat Roofing – Single ply membrane system, Ref: FLAG, FLAGON EP/PR RAL 7012; and
  - Fencing – Weld mesh security fencing, polyester powder coated green by Zaun Limited;

**Landscaping**

- j) The development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with drawing number: 1506-01-001 Rev O, titled: 'Landscape Scheme'; drawing number: 1506-01-002 Rev J, titled: 'Soft Landscape Details'; and drawing number: 1506-01-003 Rev G, titled: 'Hard Landscape Details'. Any plants which within five years of planting or seeding die, are removed, damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species;
- k) The development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the document titled: 'Condition 15: Soil Management Plan', by Axis, dated March 2014;

**Lighting**

- l) The development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with document titled 'Condition 16: Operational Lighting Scheme', dated August 2016; and amended drawing numbered: P-3225, DBS-ROH-70080401, Rev 2.2, titled 'External Lighting LUX Plot – Overall', as amended by drawing numbered: DBS-AFN-70080398, Revision 1.1, titled: 'External Lighting'. No lighting or illumination shall be affixed to or emitted from the chimney stack higher than the level of the boiler house roof. Any lighting that is fixed to the chimney stack shall relate to emissions monitoring only and shall be switched off when not in use. The approved scheme shall be implemented for the duration of the development;

**Nature Conservation Management Plan**

- m) The development shall be carried out and

maintained in accordance with document titled: 'Condition 17 Nature Conservation Management Plan', Version 4, by Argus Ecology, as amended by Figure 2: 'Landscape Plan', and drawing number: 1506-01-001 Rev O, titled: 'Landscape Scheme'. The approved scheme shall be implemented for the duration of the development;

**Pollution**

- n) Clean, uncontaminated rock, subsoil, brick rubble, crushed concrete and ceramic only shall be permitted as infill materials;

**Emissions**

- o) The development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with document titled: 'Vehicle Alarms' dated May 2016. Only such approved alarms shall be used for the duration of the development;
- p) All vehicles, plant and machinery operated solely within the site shall be maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specification at all times, this shall include the fitting and use of effective silencers;
- q) The development shall be carried out in accordance with document titled: 'Dust Management Plan', dated April 2016. The approved scheme shall be implemented for the duration of the development;
- r) All doors to the building shall be kept closed except to allow entry and exit;
- s) No handling, deposit, processing, storage or transfer of waste shall take place outside the confines of the building hereby approved with the exception of the movement of Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA) from the ash bay to IBA disposal lorries. The IBA disposal lorries must only receive IBA when parked adjacent to the ash bay illustrated on drawing 1204-PL003 Rev A and 1204-PL005 rev B (or subsequently approved revised drawings which illustrate the location of the ash bay);

**Noise**

- t) Throughout duration of operations of the development hereby approved noise from the site shall not exceed the levels set out below at the

receptor locations identified at Figure 12.1 of the Environmental Statement, Volume 1, Main Report when measured in terms of an LAeq 1 hr level (free field) based on the BS4142 rating levels plus 5dB, between the hours of 07.00 and 22.00:

- Manor Lane: LAeq, 1-hour 37 dB.
- Crown Lane: LAeq, 1-hour 46 dB.
- Walton Road: LAeq, 1-hour 39 dB.
- Ryeland Lane: LAeq, 1-hour 35 dB;

u) Throughout operation of the development hereby approved noise from the site shall not exceed the levels set out below at the receptor locations identified at Figure 12.1 of the Environmental Statement, Volume 1, Main Report when measured in terms of night time criteria levels (5-minutes), based on the BS4142 rating level plus 5dB between the hours of 22.00 and 07.00:

- Manor Lane: LAeq, 5-min 35dB
- Crown Lane: LAeq, 5-min 39dB
- Walton Road: LAeq, 5 min 35dB.
- Ryeland Lane: LAeq, 5-min 35 dB;

v) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the documents titled: 'Condition 28 - Noise Monitoring', dated May 2016 and 'Noise Compliance Report', dated 10 February 2017. The approved scheme shall be implemented for the duration of the development;

#### **Drainage**

w) There shall be no discharge of foul or contaminated drainage from the development hereby permitted into either the groundwater or any surface waters, whether direct or via soakaways;

x) Surface water from vehicle parking and hard standing areas shall be passed through an interceptor of adequate capacity prior to discharge. Roof drainage shall not be passed through any interceptor;

y) Soakaways shall only be used in areas on site where they would not present risk to groundwater;

z) Water pipes used to serve the development shall not be susceptible to residual contamination on

the site and buried services must be laid within a 0.5m surround of clean sand in areas of ash and graphite fill;

- aa) The development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with document titled: 'Mercia EnviRecover EfW – Drainage Design Statement', Numbered: 50041038 Rev 2.0, dated 28 November 2016. The approved scheme shall be implemented for the duration of the development;
- bb) The development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with document titled: 'Ordinary Watercourse Maintenance Scheme', dated May 2016. The approved scheme shall be implemented for the duration of the development;

**Other Matters**

- cc) The operator shall maintain the connection to the district network to enable electricity generated by the facility to be supplied to the district network;
- dd) On permanent cessation of the development hereby approved, the operator shall inform the County Planning Authority within 30 days in writing that all operations have ceased. Thereafter the site shall be restored within a period of 24 months in accordance with a scheme to be submitted for the written approval of the County Planning Authority prior to the cessation of operations. This shall include for the removal of all buildings, chimney stack, associated plant, machinery, waste and processed materials from the site; and
- ee) The development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with document titled: 'Condition 39 Great Crested Newt Mitigation Strategy, Version 2', dated January 2013; as amended by document titled: 'LICENCE – Mitigation Licencing', Natural England ref: 2014-3824-EPS-MIT-2, dated 18 June 2015; Document titled: 'E3.2 Hartlebury EnviRecover – Note on minor alterations to site layout required to facilitate diversion of existing surface drainage pipes', dated 21 April 2015; Figure 2: 'Landscape Plan', drawing number: 1506-01-001 Rev O, titled: 'Landscape Scheme'; drawing numbered: E4a revised, titled: 'Amphibian Exclusion Fence Plan', dated 1 December 2014; and document titled: 'Ecological Clerk of Works', Numbered: ESPM

**1015 Proposed  
Pinvin Junction  
Highway  
Improvements  
at Pinvin  
Junction  
(Junction  
between A44,  
A4104 and  
B4082), Pinvin,  
near Pershore,  
Worcestershire  
(Agenda item 6)**

The Committee considered a proposal for Pinvin Junction Highway Improvements at Pinvin Junction (Junction between A44, A4104 and B4082), Pinvin, near Pershore, 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 Development Manager's comments in relation to: traffic, highway safety and public rights of way; visual impact and residential amenity; water environment; ecology and biodiversity; and other matters (contaminated land, utilities, and historic environment).

The Development Manager concluded that Worcestershire County Council was seeking to undertake highway infrastructure improvements at Pinvin Junction, near Pershore, Worcestershire. The proposed scheme sought to improve the traffic flow at the junction and comprised of junction widening and signal alterations to the existing signal controlled Pinvin Crossroads junction. The scheme design would complement the proposed Pershore Northern Link Road by prioritising the flow of traffic along A44 and thus reducing the green signal time on Terrace Road (A4014).

The proposed development gained policy support from Policy SWDP 47 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan. The Reasoned Justification for this policy stated that "in directing development to the north of the town it is important that infrastructure improvements are secured. These included improvements to the Pinvin crossroads junction...".

The proposed scheme allowed Pinvin junction to operate within capacity. The modelling result for 2019 peak periods indicated vehicle hours with the proposed scheme would reduce in both peaks. Vehicle kilometres would also decrease slightly in both peak periods, and average speed increased by 20.3% in the AM peak and 6.7% in the PM peak. Delays at the junction decreased significantly by 64% in the AM peak and by 62% in the PM peak. The County Highways Officer had been consulted and raised no objections to the proposal. In view of this, the Development Manager considered that the proposal would result in immediate capacity

improvements to the Pinvin junction and was satisfied that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact upon traffic, highway safety or Public Rights of Way.

The application was accompanied by a Noise Assessment that assessed the change in noise levels at 37 Spion Kop, which was identified by the Assessment as the one most likely to experience a change in noise levels. The Assessment concluded that there was predicted to be an increase in noise of about 0.4 dB(A), which would be a magnitude of negligible and would not be a significant effect.

The proposed scheme would require the removal of 4 trees, 3 hedgerow trees and approximately 80 linear metres of native hedgerow. To compensate for the loss, the applicant was proposing to plant a new section of species rich hedgerow, which would measure approximately 70 linear metres, new areas of native tree and scrub planting, the planting of 11 hedgerow trees, 6 individual trees, and 130 square metres of native shrub mix.

Based on the advice of Worcestershire Regulatory Services and the County Landscape Officer, the Development Manager considered that subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, the proposal would not have an unacceptable adverse or detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the local area and would have an acceptable impact in terms of air quality and noise impacts on residential amenity.

The applicant was proposing surface water attenuation in the form of geo-cellular storage units and some additional attenuation within a landscape swale. The Development Manager considered that subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, there would be no adverse effects on the water environment.

Based on the advice of Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and the County Ecologist, the Development Manager considered that subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions that reflected the recommendations of the submitted Ecological Assessment that the proposed development would have no adverse impacts on the ecology and biodiversity at the site or in the surrounding area.

Taking into account the provisions of the Development Plan and in particular 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, and SWDP 47 of the adopted South Worcestershire Development Plan, it was considered the proposal would not cause demonstrable harm to the interests intended to be protected by these policies or highway safety.

The representative of the Development Manager introduced the report and commented that members had visited the site and noted the proximity of the nearest residential properties to the junction, notably New House and were shown the proposals for the new junction arrangements and the location of the new spur/link road. The applicant had submitted a revised construction plan and it was now proposed that construction works would commence in September 2019. There was a correction to paragraph 101 of the report which should read "In relation to the Noise Insulation Regulations, the predicted noise level at this dwelling is below the qualifying level of 68 dB LA10,18h (predicted to be 58 dB(A) LA10,18h), and would, therefore, be negligible". An additional condition was proposed in relation to lighting.

Mr Boyden, an objector to the application addressed the Committee. He commented that he was unable to understand how straightening this junction back again and the addition of an extra entrance into this junction was not going to recreate the dangerous aspects that caused the staggered junction to be installed in the first place. The planned scheme proposed to increase the speed on Main Street, by moving the 40mph limit into the village towards the access to the first 4 properties. These properties would have their view of oncoming traffic from the crossroads restricted due to the new line of the road and the traffic's ability to react to oncoming traffic reduced even further by potentially increasing the speed of the traffic. Currently, traffic regularly raced the lights at Pinvin, straightening the road and increasing the speed of the road would not help the community of Pinvin find a resolution to the most complained about detrimental aspect of life in Pinvin.

He had monitored in excess of 15% of traffic through the village as being HGVs, this traffic would regularly exceed the 30mph limit of the village, especially in the early morning. The section of Main Street at Pinvin Memorial Hall was not wide enough for 2 HGV vehicles to pass each other easily without mounting the pavement. Considering this narrowing in the road was not sign posted and was between Pinvin Community Pre-school and Pinvin First School, it was not an appropriate place for HGV traffic to mount the pavement. Straightening and

making Main Street in Pinvin more attractive to HGV traffic, would not persuade the HGV traffic accessing Throckmorton Airfield to use the highways approved and signposted route through Lower Moor.

In the ensuing debate, the following points were raised:

- The local councillor welcomed the proposed improvements to Pinvin Junction and its relevance to the project for the Pershore Northern Link Road. The A44 had become a strategic route for the area and the route for local villages into Pershore. The proposed reconfiguration of the junction seemed sensible and should help reduce delays. When the northern link road was completed, she hoped that plans would be considered to address the traffic problems experienced on Terrace Road
- Were traffic signals proposed for either end of the spur/link road and how safe would the traffic be turning on and off it? Mark Mills, County Highways (the applicant) responded that give way signs for traffic were proposed at either end of the spur/link road with a pedestrian crossing with a central refuge half way along the spur/link road. A full highway safety audit had been carried out and it was considered that the give way signage was appropriate. The representative of the County Highways Officer added that the proposed reconfiguration would not reduce the amount of traffic using the junction. However it would create efficiencies and reduce delays, easing driver frustrations and lessening the possibility for poor driver behaviour. On the completion of the northern link road, traffic levels would reduce in the area and the new junction configuration would be able to operate to maximum efficiency.
- Who would be responsible for the maintenance of the proposed landscaping features? The representative of the Development Manager responded that a condition had been added to the proposed permission for a maintenance scheme which would be the responsibility of County Highways
- In response to a query about the blockages caused by vehicles waiting to turn right or left at the junction, Mark Mills explained that as part of the traffic signals plan, there would be a right turn only phase planned for traffic exiting both Pinvin and Terrace Road. When the northern link road was completed, it was anticipated that there would

less demand. It was considered that undertaking the improvements to the Pinvin junction prior to completion of the northern link road would provide immediate benefits to motorists. The completion of the link road was necessary in order for the junction to be deemed fully compliant

- In response to a request to replant the daffodils on site, Mark Mills commented that as many plants and shrubs as possible would be retained as part of the scheme
- As mentioned by the objector, the speed limit through Pinvin was 40mph which had serious safety implications for pedestrians trying to cross the road. Mark Mills commented that there was no intention to change or extend the speed limits going into Pinvin off the A44. New signalised crossing points would be introduced and as a result the 30mph plate would be moved back towards Pinvin to give a clear indication to motorists that they were entering a 30mph zone. It was also intended to install gateway red bitumen roundels on the road
- The design of the scheme with the introduction of a slip road seemed to be unnecessarily harmful to the natural environment
- Had an assessment been carried out on the use of the pedestrian crossing points? The representative of the Development Manager commented that there was limited use of the crossing by pedestrians. However, pedestrians had been observed walking along the verge to the industrial estate hence the proposed improvements for access by pedestrians and cyclists. Mark Mills added that the signalling plan had been designed to facilitate pedestrian crossing without negatively impacting on the flow of traffic. The local councillor added that local residents from Pinvin used the junction to access the local shops, the school and Pershore town centre
- Concern was expressed about the safety of children using the crossing given the proximity to the local school. It was queried whether the school had been consulted on the plans. Mark Mills explained that an initial consultation event had been held at the local school and representatives of the school had been present. The proposed signalling arrangements at the junction would make it as safe as possible for children to cross. There was only one uncontrolled crossing point which enabled pedestrians to cross a single lane

of traffic at a time

- Would the safety impacts of the proposed road traffic configuration be reviewed? The representative of the County Highways Officer responded that performance would be kept under review as part of the safety audit arrangements and any necessary changes would be implemented.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted for proposed Pinvin Junction highway improvements at Pinvin Junction (Junction between A44, A4104 and B4082), Pinvin, near Pershore, Worcestershire, subject to the following conditions:

**Commencement**

- a) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission;

**Approved Drawings**

- b) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on submitted Drawings Numbered: HGN-01-DR-C-0042, Rev P01; HGN-01-DR-C-0043, Rev P02; HGN-01-DR-C-0044, Rev P02; HGN-01-DR-C-0045, Rev P01; HGN-01-DR-C-0046, Rev P01; HGN-01-DR-C-0047, Rev P01; HGN-01-DR-C-0048, Rev P02; HGN-01-DR-C-0054, Rev P02; EGN-01-DR-EN-0006, Rev P01; EGN-01-DR-EN-0007, Rev P01; EGN-01-DR-EN-0008, Rev P01; and EGN-01-DR-EN-0009, Rev P01, except where otherwise stipulated by conditions attached to this permission;

**Construction Hours**

- c) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of the construction hours shall be submitted to and approved in writing to the County Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme;

**Biodiversity**

- d) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for Biodiversity shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The CEMP

**(Biodiversity) shall include:**

- i. identification of 'biodiversity protection zones';**
- ii. practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements);**
- iii. the location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features;**
- iv. the times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be on site to oversee works;**
- v. responsible persons and lines of communication;**
- vi. the role and responsibilities on site of an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) or similarly competent person; and**
- vii. use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.**

**Thereafter, the approved CEMP shall be implemented during the construction of the development;**

- e) Notwithstanding the submitted details, within 3 months of commencement of the development hereby approved, method statements detailing creation of semi-natural habitats, and tree, hedgerow and scrub planting and establishment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The method statements shall include:**

- i. purpose and objectives for the proposed works;**
- ii. detailed designs and working methods necessary to achieve the stated objectives;**
- iii. extent and location of proposed works shown on appropriate scale maps;**
- iv. timetable for implementation;**
- v. persons responsible for implementing the**

- works; and
- vi. initial aftercare and long-term maintenance.

Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and implemented within the first available planting season (the period between 31 October in any one year and 31 March in the following year) on completion of the development. Any new trees or shrubs, which within a period of five years from the completion of the planting die, are removed, or become damaged or diseased, shall be replaced on an annual basis, in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species;

- f) Where it is intended to create semi-natural habitats, all species used in the planting proposals for grassland, scrub, hedgerow and trees shall be locally native species of local provenance;

**Contamination**

- g) In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the development hereby approved that was not previously identified, it must be reported in writing immediately to the County Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11' and where remediation is necessary, a remediation scheme must be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority in advance of the scheme commencing. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the County Planning Authority prior to development commencing other than that required to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of remediation;
- h) Should any soils or soil forming materials be brought on to the site for use in soft landscaping, filling or level raising, details must be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing prior to the import of soils or soil formal

materials on to the site. Details shall include details of the donor site, proposals for contamination testing including testing schedules, sampling frequencies and allowable contaminant concentrations (as determined by appropriate risk assessment). Where the donor site is unknown or is brownfield the material must be tested for contamination and suitability for use on site. The approved testing must be carried out and validatory evidence (such as laboratory certificates) submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority prior to any soil or soil forming materials being brought on to the site;

**Drainage**

- i) Notwithstanding the submitted details, no development shall commence until detailed design drawings for surface water drainage have been submitted to, and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;**
  
- j) No works in connection with site drainage shall commence until a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) management plan which shall include details on future management responsibilities, along with maintenance schedules for all SuDS features and associated pipework has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. This plan shall detail the strategy that will be followed to facilitate the optimal functionality and performance of the SuDS scheme throughout its lifetime. The approved SuDS management plan shall be implemented in full in accordance with the agreed terms and conditions and the SuDS scheme shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved maintenance plan thereafter; and**
  
- k) Details of any new lighting to be installed at the site shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing prior to being erected. These details shall include:
  - i. Height of the lighting posts;**
  - ii. Intensity of the lights;****

- iii. **Spread of light (in metres);**
- iv. **Any measure proposed to minimise the impact of the lighting or disturbance through glare;**
- v. **Any measures to minimise the impact of lighting upon protected species and habitats; and**
- vi. **Times when the lighting would be illuminated;**

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

The meeting ended at 11.35am.

Chairman .....