

## Planning and Regulatory Committee

### Tuesday, 2 February 2021, Online - 10.00 am

#### Present:

#### Minutes

Mr R C Adams (Chairman), Mr R M Bennett, Mr G R Brookes, Mr B Clayton, Mr P Denham, Mr A Fry, Mr I D Hardiman, Mr P B Harrison, Mrs A T Hingley, Mrs F M Oborski, Mr J A D O'Donnell, Mrs J A Potter, Prof J W Raine, Mr C Rogers and Mr P A Tuthill

#### Available papers

The Members had before them:

- A. The Agenda papers (previously circulated);
- B. A copy of the summary presentations from the public participants invited to speak (previously circulated); and
- C. The Minutes of the meeting held on 1 December 2020 (previously circulated).

**1060 Named Substitutes (Agenda item 1)**

None.

**1061 Apologies/ Declarations of Interest (Agenda item 2)**

None.

**1062 Public Participation (Agenda item 3)**

Those presentations made are recorded at the minute to which they relate.

**1063 Confirmation of Minutes (Agenda item 4)**

**RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the meeting held on 1 December 2020 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**1064 Proposed replacement of existing staggered junction with a 4-Arm**

The Committee considered an application under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 1992 for the Proposed replacement of existing staggered junction with a 4-arm roundabout at A38 / A4104 Junction, near Upton-upon-Severn, Worcestershire.

**Roundabout at  
A38 / A4104  
junction, near  
Upton-Upon-  
Severn,  
Worcestershire  
(Agenda item 5)**

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 Planning and Transport Planning's comments in relation to Traffic, Highway Safety and Public Rights of Way, Landscape Character, Visual Impacts and Historic Environment, Residential Amenity (including noise impacts), Ecology and Biodiversity, Water Environment, Other Matters - Utilities including Pipeline, Consultation, Future Development, Importation of Soils, Waste and other matters.

The Head of Planning and Transport Planning concluded that she was satisfied that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact upon traffic, highway safety or Public Rights of Way subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions relating to construction details; signage information and existing Public Right of Way connection details as well as diversion routes, and an updated Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).

As the proposal would help to alleviate problems with queuing and provide more efficient traffic flows, as well as providing a safer junction for vehicles and pedestrians, it was considered that the public benefits of the proposal outweighed the less than substantial harm to heritage assets. The proposal would not have an unacceptable adverse or detrimental impact upon landscape character, visual impact or the historic environment subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions relating to a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) and a programme of archaeological work, including a written scheme of investigation.

The proposal would have no adverse noise, vibration, dust, light or air quality impacts upon residential amenity or that of human health, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions relating to an updated Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) and a Lighting Design Strategy.

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, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions relating to an updated CEMP, Lighting Design Strategy, Ecological Design Strategy and a LEMP.

The proposal would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the water environment or flooding, subject to the imposition of conditions relating to foul and surface water drainage scheme and management plan.

Taking into account the provisions of the Development Plan and in particular Policy WCS 16 of the adopted Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy and Policies SWDP 1, SWDP 4, SWDP 5 SWDP 6, SWDP 7, SWDP 21, SWDP 22, SWDP 23, SWDP 24, SWDP 25, SWDP 28, SWDP 29, SWDP 30, SWDP 31 and SWDP 33 of the adopted SWDP as well as Policy WCS 16 of the adopted WCS, the Head of Planning and Transport Planning 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 Planning and Transport Planning introduced the report and added that since the report was published, the Government had published a consultation on the draft revisions of the NPPF. This consultation was open until 27 March 2021. In light of the fact that this consultation had not yet closed or a revised NPPF published, it was considered that very little weight should be afforded to the draft version of the NPPF in determining this application.

He added that Earls Croome Parish Council had submitted a further letter of representation objecting to the proposal. It largely reflected their previous comments albeit with additional comments regarding noise, the contract, and the cost of the development. Further comments had also been received from a local resident stating that if the concerns of local residents about the development were ignored and development proceeded, it was hoped that lines of communication would remain open to find solutions to the issues raised.

Ms Courtman, an objector to the application addressed the Committee. She commented that whilst the junction was in need of modernisation, the proposed development would have a negative impact on residents in the immediate vicinity, especially for homes located in the Bluebell Farm complex. The scheme had been designed without any consideration of the concerns of the local community and with limited consultation.

She added that traffic flowed freely at this junction most of the time, the exemption being for a limited number of local events. She was aware that smaller, less expensive

but equally as effective alternative schemes had been proposed. The opportunity to increase safety for local residents and pedestrians appeared to have been disregarded as there were no plans to reduce the speed limit on the approach to the roundabout or introduce designated pedestrian crossing points. Access onto the A4104 from the Bluebell Farm complex would be increasingly hazardous due to the increased traffic speed to the roundabout.

She stated further that the construction work would cause noise and dust pollution and potential structural damage to homes as well as impacting on home-working. The traffic redirected from the A4104, turning south on the A38 and the additional lighting on the roundabout would cause increased noise and light pollution to local properties. There would be an impact on property values and house sales. The levels of stress and anxiety experienced by local residents would be increased. The size, cost and impact of this proposal outweighed its need.

Ms Courtman was then asked questions about her presentation:

- In response to a query about other proposed options for the design of the roundabout, Ms Courtman commented that she understood that the local parish council had been made aware of alternative plans for a smaller roundabout. She was particularly concerned about the size of the proposed roundabout and the impact on the local area
- Ms Courtman confirmed that she worked from home on a permanent basis hence her concerns about the noise and dust emissions.

Lynne Bonsall, the agent acting on behalf of the applicant addressed the Committee. She was accompanied by Jack Bauress and Steve Phillips. She commented that the existing intersection formed a critical route for users travelling from the M5 Motorway and provided access to destinations such as the Malvern Hills AONB as well as shows and festivals that were held in the surrounding area throughout the year.

She added that an Upton Junction Improvement Study had identified that the preferred option was a 4-arm roundabout which combined the existing staggered junction into a single roundabout junction. A business case study was then carried out which identified and

developed an additional option in the form of a signal-controlled junction. A review had been commissioned of both the Upton Junction Improvement Study report and the business case study. It concluded that the 4-arm roundabout option would provide additional resilience against future traffic levels. Furthermore, the introduction of traffic signals at the junction was considered to be an urban modification to an existing rural setting, whereas the roundabout option would reduce this impact.

She stated that the scale of roundabout had been based on capacity and safety measures and not by road speeds. However, in response to the public consultation, it was proposed that the speed limit on the western arm of the A4104 be reduced from the national speed limit to 50mph.

She added that a range of technical and environmental assessments had been carried out in support of the design of the application. It was acknowledged that there would be short-term localised impacts during the construction period and a range of mitigation measures had been proposed in the construction management plan and this plan would be updated before construction commenced. A significant planting scheme was also proposed to help integrate the roundabout into the landscape. Construction was anticipated to take around 25 weeks to complete, taking account of local events to minimise disruption. Approximately two thirds of the construction work would take place off the road line to reduce the impact on traffic flows. A public relations officer would be available to ensure effective consultation with local residents during the construction period

She concluded that the scheme complied with national and local planning policies, improved connectivity and safety and provided a reduction in traffic congestion at key times.

Lynne Bonsall and Jack Baures were then asked questions about the presentation:

- In response to a query, Jack Baures commented that the size of the roundabout had been determined by the entry path curvature, the existing carriageway alignment as well as the outcome of a capacity assessment of the junction. The speed of the carriageway did not dictate the size of the roundabout. Alternative options had been considered with different arrangements which gave the appearance of being smaller

- because they did not encompass the whole site
- In response to a query about improved landscaping, Lynne Bonsall explained that a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment had been carried out and a significant element of landscaping was proposed. A single lane of the redundant A4104 would be retained with planting including hedgerows and trees in keeping with the local area as well as the creation of an attenuation pond. The redundant area of the A38 would be removed and planted accordingly
  - Had any consideration been given to reducing traffic speed on the approach to the island? Jack Baures responded that based on the safety assessments, including accident data, it had been concluded that it was not necessary to reduce the speed limits on the A38
  - Why was a roundabout considered preferable to a traffic light controlled junction at this location? Jack Baures commented that the decision had been based on the ability of a roundabout to cope with future growth in traffic flows, following a capacity analysis of the junction. A traffic signal junction set up would be defined by the existing layout of the junction and although it was possible to use traffic signals to improve efficiency, it would only be for a limited period
  - In response to a query about the design of the roundabout, including the impact on the maximum entry speed and the introduction of a speed limit, Jack Baures indicated that the speed limit did not impact upon the size of the roundabout. The entry path curvature had been determined in accordance with Government standards. Its purpose was to create a deflection in the way vehicles moved which would ultimately reduce speed through the roundabout. It meant that drivers could not drive through the junction at excessive speeds. It was therefore considered unnecessary to specify a maximum speed limit
  - Was the applicant satisfied with the proposals for ensuring pedestrian safety, given that traffic would be approaching the roundabout at up to 50mph and that no form of signalised pedestrian crossing was proposed? Jack Baures responded that the existing junction did not have any form of constraint on vehicle speeds. One of the benefits of this scheme was that motorists would need to reduce speed to give way to traffic from the right on the approach to the roundabout. New pedestrian crossing points with pedestrian waiting

areas were proposed which meant pedestrians only had to concentrate on traffic from one direction when crossing the carriageway. These crossing points would be linked by three metre wide footways/cycleways

- How obvious were the proposed pedestrian crossing points to motorists approaching the roundabout? Jack Baures indicated that the design standards of the roundabout took account of lines of visibility. It was proposed to introduce signage on the westbound A4104 approach to warn of pedestrians crossing because that area had the least visibility
- It was queried why it was proposed to realign the Upton side of the A4104 rather than the Pershore side given that the roundabout could have been located further away from local residential properties. Lynne Bonsall responded that a noise impact assessment had indicated that the proposal would result in a very small increase in noise emissions of approximately 1db. A quieter road surface had therefore been proposed. Worcestershire Regulatory Services were satisfied with this assessment. Jack Baures added that the chosen site for the roundabout created the most efficient carriageway alignment possible. Moving its location further north or south would involve the realignment of both sections of the A4104, removing efficiencies and adding construction time and cost to the scheme
- Would access onto the redundant section of the A4104 be maintained for use by pedestrians and cyclists? Lynne Bonsall advised that access would be restricted to maintenance vehicles only. Jack Baures added that at the A38 end of the redundant road, the entrance would be completely closed off by a fence and a hedge. The Upton end would be gated for access by maintenance vehicles.

In the ensuing debate, the following points were raised:

- The local councillor commented that there was both support and opposition to this scheme. However, there was backing for this scheme from many statutory bodies across Worcestershire. Traffic flows on the A4104 had grown over a number of years and would continue to grow. Consequently, traffic congestion was an issue on the A4104 as the existing junction gave preference to traffic travelling along the A38. The

A38 was also a diversionary route when junctions 7 and 8 of the M5 Motorway were closed which caused even more congestion. The realignment of the A38 would move the road further away from neighbouring properties. He supported the proposal but requested that any lighting installed should be of an appropriate intensity for the location, speed limits onto the roundabout should be no more than 40mph from all four directions, public vehicular access to the redundant part of the A4104 must be banned but with safe access for pedestrians and cyclists and measures included to prevent anti-social behaviour. The construction of part of the roundabout off-line would minimise disruption to traffic. He had received assurances from the relevant Cabinet Member that residents and the parish councils would receive weekly updates on progress. This application would reduce congestion and CO2 pollution and improve road safety

- This existing junction was in need of improvement. It was important to note the significance of the A38 as a parallel road to the motorway for use whenever the motorway was shut. The local MP was also very supportive of this application
- It was proposed that a community liaison group be established. The representative of the Head of Planning and Transport Planning advised that generally, the Planning Inspectorate considered that conditions related to community liaison group arrangements did not pass the necessary test for conditions because they could be established without the need to impose a condition. Conditions were imposed to ensure that an application was acceptable. It could therefore be implied that without this condition, this development was unacceptable which was not the case. He could not advise against the imposition of such a condition but suggested that it would be more appropriate to arrange this by seeking an undertaking from the applicant
- The local councillor welcomed the suggestion of the establishment of a community liaison group which would probably only need to meet on a limited number of occasions during the construction period. He queried whether imposing a speed limit for motorists entering the roundabout should be the subject of a planning condition. He also queried how far the A38 would be realigned away from the Bluebell Farm complex. The County Highways Officer advised that setting a

speed limit would require a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). A TRO would be subject to consultation and therefore such a condition would fail the appropriateness test because it could not be delivered, especially if for example the Police objected. In addition, no concerns about traffic speed had been highlighted through the road safety audits. The road safety audit process would continue during the construction phase and after construction and the applicant would have to address any issues arising. In addition, the local councillor would be consulted throughout the process. The representative of the Head of Planning and Transport Planning added that the revised line of the A38 was approximately 20 metres away from its existing carriageway. The detailed layout design would need to be submitted to the Head of Planning and Transport Planning for approval

- In response to a query, the representative of the Head of Planning and Transport Planning confirmed that a caravan park was located on the Bluebell Farm complex which had access and egress from the A4104
- In response to a query, the representative of the Head of Planning and Transport Planning indicated, using the relevant plan, the exact location and type of pedestrian crossing points proposed on the roundabout
- In response to a query, the representative of the Head of Planning and Transport Planning explained that it was anticipated that construction work would commence in March 2021 with a construction period of 25-28 weeks. A proposed condition also required a scheme to mitigate the impact of dust emissions on the air quality to be submitted to the Head of Planning and Transport Planning for approval. On receipt of this scheme, WRS would be re-consulted
- Concern was expressed about the visibility of the proposed pedestrian crossings to motorists. What type of visible signage would be installed? The County Highways Officer responded that the pedestrian crossings would be uncontrolled without signal equipment or a zebra crossing. Dropped kerbed, tactile paving and central refuges would be installed. There would be signage, warning of a pedestrian crossing on the west arm of the A4104 because this was the point with the poorest visibility for motorists. These arrangements would be an improvement on the

existing arrangements on the A38 where the road was currently subject to a 50mph speed limit and pedestrians had to cross both carriageways in one go

- The temptation for pedestrians walking eastwards along the PROW onto the A38 would be to walk directly across the A38 to gain access to the redundant part of the A4104. Had this been anticipated or were pedestrians expected to turn right and walk up to the new pedestrian crossing on the roundabout? In addition, would it be safer to keep the redundant part of the A4104 open for public access? Jack Bauress commented that the redundant road had been originally considered as a potential footway link. However, a review revealed that it would not give any benefits to pedestrians over and above the proposals in this scheme and would add significant costs in terms of surfacing and maintenance works. It had therefore been discounted. The creation of a fence and hedge would make it very difficult for pedestrians to gain access to the redundant road from the A4104
- The existing junction arrangements enabled pedestrians to safely cross the carriageway when the traffic lights were on red. The proposed scheme would reduce this element of safety relying on the judgement of pedestrians and motorists. The proposed scheme would benefit from either the introduction of appropriate signage on all four crossing points or by some other means of increased visibility. The County Highways Officer responded that there was currently no facility or signals to enable pedestrians to cross safely at this junction. The proposal therefore represented an improvement on the existing uncontrolled arrangements
- This application was welcomed in terms of its positive impact on the local road network. The size of the roundabout would encourage vehicles to slow down to a greater extent than a smaller design. Certain aspects including the details of the lighting, pedestrian access and planting schemes should be determined by the Head of Planning and Transport Planning, in consultation with the local councillor and the community liaison group
- It was proposed that the application be approved subject to additional conditions relating to the creation of a community liaison group and additional signage to alert motorists about pedestrians crossing. The representative of the

Head of Planning and Transport Planning advised that conditions were proposed in relation to the detailed design of the roundabout which included signage. These detailed designs would also need to be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority before the relevant part of the work could begin.

- In response to a query, the representative of the Head of Planning and Transport Planning advised that it was not common practice for short projects of this nature to establish a community liaison group by condition. However, if members were so minded, he would advise that the detail of such a condition be determined by the Head of Planning and Transport Planning in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local councillor
- It was agreed that a condition be added to the recommendation to establish a community liaison group. The wording of the condition would be determined by the Head of Planning and Transport Planning in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee and local councillor.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted for the Proposed replacement of existing staggered junction with a 4-arm roundabout at A38 / A4104 Junction, Near Upton-upon-Severn, Worcestershire subject to a condition requiring a community liaison group to be established - the wording to be agreed by the Head of Planning and Transport Planning in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee and the local councillor subject to the following conditions:

**Commencement**

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

**Approved Plans**

- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans entitled 'Site Location Plan' Drawing Number B2367219-02-JAC-GEN-00-DR-C-0001 Rev P01; 'Existing and Proposed Site' Drawing Number B2367219-02-JAC-GEN-00-DR-C-0101 Rev P01; 'Red Line Boundary' Drawing Number B2367219-02-

JAC-GEN-00-DR-C-0102 Rev P02; 'General Arrangement Sheet 1 of 4' Drawing Number B2367219-02-JAC-HGN-00-DR-C-0101 Rev P02; 'General Arrangement Sheet 2 of 4' Drawing Number B2367219-02-JAC-HGN-00-DR-C-0102 Rev P02; 'General Arrangement Sheet 3 of 4' Drawing Number B2367219-02-JAC-HGN-00-DR-C-0103 Rev P02; 'General Arrangement Sheet 4 of 4' Drawing Number B2367219-02-JAC-HGN-00-DR-C-0104 Rev P01'; 'Utilities Diversion Plan' Drawing Number B2367219-02-JAC-VUT-00-DR-C-0002 Rev P01; 'Landscape Proposals' Drawing Number B2367219-02-JAC-VGN-00-DR-LE-0018 Rev P01, except where otherwise stipulated by conditions attached to this permission;

#### **Detailed Design**

- 3) Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, the detailed layout design of the Roundabout, including approach 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;
- 4) Detailed drawings at a scale of 1:100/1:500 of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority before the relevant part of work is begun:
  - i. Materials;
  - ii. Pedestrian crossing point construction details;
  - iii. Shared-use footway/cycle way construction details;
  - iv. Public Rights of Way connections;
  - v. Bus stop waiting areas;
  - vi. Signage; and
  - vii. Street lighting.

Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme;

#### **Construction Environmental Management Plan**

- 5) Notwithstanding any submitted details, the development hereby approved shall not

commence until an updated Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) in accordance with Worcestershire Regulatory Services "Code of Best Practice for Demolition and Construction Sites" has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The approved CEMP shall be implemented for the duration of the construction works. The CEMP shall include but not be limited to the following:

**Hours of Working**

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

**Dust and Air Quality**

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

**Noise and Vibration**

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

**Water Environment;**

- iv. Measures to be undertaken to ensure that any pollution and silt generated by the construction works shall not adversely affect groundwater and surface waterbodies;

**Contamination**

- v. A method statement for the control of unexpected contamination;

**Highways**

- vi. Measures to ensure that vehicles leaving the site do not deposit mud or other detritus on the public highway;
- vii. Details of site operative parking areas, material storage areas and the location of site operatives' facilities (including offices and toilets);
- viii. The hours that delivery vehicles will be permitted to arrive and depart and arrangements for unloading and manoeuvring; and
- ix. Details of any temporary construction accesses and their reinstatement.

### **Temporary Diversion of Footways and Permissive Routes**

- 6) The development hereby approved shall not commence until details of how existing footways and permissive routes affected by construction work would be kept open. Details should be provided to show temporary diversions, free from any obstruction, in a safe condition for use by members of the public and clearly signed. This should be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme;

### **Ecology and Biodiversity**

- 7) No development shall take place until the following method statements have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority:
- i. Great Crested Newt ('Mitigation Strategy');
  - ii. Bats (including construction phase lighting design);
  - iii. Terrestrial wildlife (including avoidance and mitigation measures for badgers, hedgehogs and nesting birds); and
  - iv. Habitat modification (including soil movement, tree and hedgerow protection, water course protection and pollution prevention measures).

The content of the method statement shall include the following:

- a. purpose and objectives for the proposed works;
- b. detailed design(s) and/or working method(s) necessary to achieve stated objectives (including, where relevant, type and source of materials to be used);
- c. extent and location of proposed works shown on appropriate scale maps and plans;
- d. timetable for implementation, demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of construction;
- e. persons responsible for implementing the

works; and

- f. disposal of any wastes arising from works.

On completion of the Method Statement works, a statement of conformity shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority confirming their successful implementation. The works shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

- 8) Prior to the development being brought into use, a lighting design strategy for biodiversity for areas to be lit shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The strategy shall:

- i. identify those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for bats and that are likely to cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging; and
- ii. show how and where external lighting would be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit would not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places.

Thereafter the scheme shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved details;

- 9) No development shall take place until an Ecological Design Strategy (EDS) addressing Great Crested Newt Mitigation and Enhancement Measures has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The EDS shall include the following:
  - i. Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed works;
  - ii. Review of site potential and constraints;

- iii. Detailed design(s) to be based on Drawing Number B2367219-02-JAC-VGN-00-DR-LE-0018 Rev P01 so as to illustrate the number and location of amphibian conservation measures to include set-back gulley-pots and gulley-pot ladders and their stated objectives;
- iv. Timetable for implementation demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of development; and
- v. Persons responsible for implementing the works.

The EDS shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and all features shall be retained in that manner thereafter;

- 10) Notwithstanding the submitted details, within 3 months of the commencement of the development hereby approved, a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to, and be approved in writing by, the County Planning. Thereafter, the LEMP shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details. The LEMP shall include the following:
- i. Description and evaluation of features to be managed;
  - ii. Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management;
  - iii. Aims and objectives of management;
  - iv. Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives;
  - v. Prescriptions for management actions;
  - vi. Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five year period);
  - vii. Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan; and
  - viii. Ongoing landscape and biodiversity monitoring and remedial measures.

On completion of the ecological mitigation and enhancement works, a statement of

conformity shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority confirming their successful implementation;

#### **Water Environment**

- 11) Notwithstanding the submitted Drainage Strategy, no development shall commence until detailed design drawings for surface water and foul 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;
  
- 12) No works in connection with site drainage shall commence until a Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) management plan which will 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 shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved maintenance plan and thereafter;

#### **Importation of Materials**

- 13) Full details of any soil or soil forming materials brought on to the site for use in soft landscaping, filling and level raising must be provided. Where the donor site is unknown or is brownfield the material must be tested for contamination and suitability for use on site. Full donor site details, proposals for contamination testing including testing schedules, sampling frequencies and allowable contaminant concentrations (as determined by appropriate risk assessment) must be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority prior to import on to the site;

The approved testing must then 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 site;

**Archaeology**

- 14) Notwithstanding any submitted details, no development shall take place until a programme of archaeological work including a Written Scheme of Investigation(s), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and**
- i. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording;**
  - ii. The programme for post investigation assessment;**
  - iii. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording;**
  - iv. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation;**
  - v. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation; and**
  - vi. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation;**
- 15) The development shall not come 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(s) approved under condition (14) and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.**

The meeting ended at 11.45am.

Chairman .....