

Name of Applicant Type of Certificate	Proposal	Map/Plan Policy	Plan Ref. Expiry Date
D. C. Lambe Limited 'B'	New industrial units for B1, B2 and B8 use - Land at Sugarbrook Mill, Buntsford Park Road, Bromsgrove - (as augmented by ecological information received 14.08.07)	EMP	B/2007/0704 26.09.2007

RECOMMENDATION: that permission be **GRANTED**.

Consultations

WCC(HP)	Consulted - views received 19.07.07: No objection.
ENG	Consulted - views received 09.07.07: No objection subject to Conditions.
Natural Environment Officer	<p>Consulted - views received 09.07.07:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection • The resubmission of this application includes this original Phase 1 habitat survey report, with the addition of a bullet point list of ecological mitigation which will be included in the site. • The original report noted the potential for numerous protected species on site. Species noted as likely to be on or using the site were otter, bats and kingfisher, with the possibility of white-clawed crayfish, grass snake and slow worm, and habitat suitable for water vole being noted. These species are afforded varying degrees of protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, with bats and otters being European Level Protected Species, protected by the EC Habitats Directive 1992. • The original report recommended that further surveys be carried out to establish the presence of protected species and their use of the site and in order to evaluate any implications for the development and possible mitigation measures to ensure their protection. The report specifically recommended further surveys for bats, otter, white-clawed crayfish and water vole. These have not been carried out. • Without having these more detailed surveys, there is no evidence to prove that the protected species will not be compromised by the development. While the implementation of the buffer zone should ensure that the aquatic and riparian species are protected, further evidence is needed to prove that the development will not impact upon bats and reptiles, and to prove the effectiveness of the suggested mitigation. • Without a detailed bat survey, it is impossible to know what species are present and what their use of the site is. Therefore, providing the right mitigation and enhancement becomes very difficult. For example, the type of artificial roost provided will be dependant on the species of bat present, and boxes may not be suitable for all. Although the report states that there is no potential for bat roosts, no detailed surveys have been carried out. Trees to be affected by the

development should be surveyed to make sure that no roosts are disturbed or damaged, and thus ensure compliance with the relevant wildlife legislation and planning guidance. These checks should be carried out by a suitably qualified and experienced professional, and at the appropriate time of year. The proposed bat and bird boxes should be included in the development, with the type and numbers to be informed by a more detailed bat survey and to be approved by the Local Planning Authority through a condition. The low level lighting proposed should be implemented through a planning condition in order to minimise disturbance to bats.

- Carrying out further surveys for reptiles should also be considered, in order to ensure compliance with the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. The Act makes it illegal to intentionally kill or injure both slow worms and grass snake. As the original report considered it probable that these species are present, causing their death or injury would be considered to be intentional under the provisions of the Act, and would therefore be a prosecutable offence.
- Without the information provided by these surveys, the development does not meet the requirements of national, regional and local planning policies. PPS9 requires decisions to be based on up-to-date information about the environmental characteristics of their area. It requires developments to maintain, enhance, restore or add to biodiversity interests, an integral part of which is ensuring appropriate weight is attached to protected species. Policy QE7 of the RSS requires developments to encourage the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity resources, with priority given to sites and species which receive statutory protection. In addition, policy C11 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan requires that due regard be paid to the specific requirements of statutorily protected fauna and flora.
- The surveys recommended are needed 'up front' in order to aid the decision making process. If they were carried out as part of a planning condition, and then mitigation were found to be impossible, the planning permission would not be able to be implemented without infringements under the Habitats Directive 1992 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.
- At it stands the proposed development will result in the loss of a valuable habitat which could support several protected species. The loss of this habitat and the species which it supports has significance outside of the site boundaries, as it could result in the degradation of the functioning of the existing wildlife corridor and Special Wildlife Site. Although the provision of a buffer zone should protect the existence of the wildlife corridor, the development may still affect protected species and this will have an adverse effect upon the successful functioning of the wildlife corridor and the SWS. The recommendation for further surveys of protected species has not been followed. Without these surveys to back this up, the mitigation proposed can not be proved to offset the loss of this habitat and to adequately protect the species on site. Therefore, the requirements

of the Local Plan policies C10, C11 and C12, the RSS policy QE7 and PPS9 have not been met and the development should be refused.

Reconsulted on additional information - views received 24.08.2007:

- The justification as to why further protected species surveys have not been carried out is valid.
- It is felt that while the existing mitigation proposal goes some way towards meeting the requirements of the relevant planning policies, a more varied scheme which is in line with the recommendations of the Countryside Consultants Ltd. Ecological Survey supplied by the applicant would take better account of the variety of species potentially using the site, and their habitat requirements. These measures should not be difficult or costly to include, and could be easily accommodated within the proposed buffer zone or the surrounding landscaping. Information on this could be supplied through the suggested landscape design scheme and Nature Conservation Management Plan. It may be possible to agree these features as a planning condition, but that is for the case officer to decide.
- Provided that the landscaping scheme and NCMP are satisfactory at implementing the mitigation measures proposed by Betts Ecology on 21st June 2007, with the addition of some of the other measures recommended by the Countryside Consultants Ltd. Ecological Survey, the development should be in compliance with PPS9, policy QE7 of the RSS and Local Plan policies C11 for statutorily protected species and habitats and C12 for wildlife corridors.

Tree Officer

Consulted - views received 20.08.2007:

- All retained trees to BS5837-05.
- Conditions C9-C19.

EHO
Contaminated
Land
EDO

Consulted - views received 26.07.2007: No objection subject to Conditions.

Consulted - views received 06.07.2007:

- Economic Development supports the application.

EA

Consulted - views received 30.07.2007:

- No objection subject to conditions.
- We understand that the application is a revised submission of planning application B/2006/1032.
- The application resolves the flood risk issues that were raised on our letter of 10th November 2006. We are therefore now in a position to remove our objection to the proposals on flood risk grounds.
- Build development is now 8 metres from the top of the bank of the Sugar Brook. This has been achieved by losing 131 square metres of built development / altering the design of Unit C.

- The applicant has made a commitment to comply with our comments in our letter of November 2006 on the surface water drainage strategy and use of sustainable drainage techniques at the site.
- We are encouraged by the proposed use of rainwater harvesting (from 1140 square metres of roof area), permeable paving and other proposed techniques including soakaways and swales that will ensure greenfield runoff rates (including climate change) are not exceeded.
- With regard to the planting of native species within the 8 metre easement, we encourage the planting of the native species as they will help to improve bank stability and also the local biodiversity but they should not impede access for maintenance vehicles.

Worcestershire
County Council
Rights of Way
Ramblers
Association

Consulted 20.06.2007: views awaited

Consulted - views received 10.07.2007:

- Objection - views as per B/2006/1032.
- The proposed development is on the area of untended land between the brook and footpath. If it proceeds, the footpath will be hemmed in by the wall and industrial units and an embankment on one side and the proposed units on the other side, the existing green and open outlook will be lost and in places the path will almost be in a tunnel.
- If I have interpreted the drawing correctly, the space allocated to the right of way appears to be less than 2 metres in many places. At one point, it seems to be pinched into about a metre, considering the nature of the surrounding this would make the path feel claustrophobic.
- It may be possible to look at changing the route of the path from the point where it leaves the brook so that it follows the course of the brook to rejoin the existing route beyond the development. The development could provide an opportunity to increase the amenity of this valuable route to the countryside.

WWT

Consulted - views received 02.08.2007:

- Objection.
- The WWT would reiterate the views expressed by the Natural Environment Officer.

Stoke PC

Consulted - views received 18.07.2007:

- This is a floodplain which regularly floods.
- The storm water from roofs is likely to enter the brook and cause more problems downstream.

Publicity

1 letter sent 29.06.2007: no response received (expires 20.07.2007).
2 site notices posted 13.07.2007: no response received (expire 03.08.2007).
1 press notice published 06.07.2007: no response received (expires 27.07.2007).

The site and its surroundings

This application relates to an area of land measuring some 0.43 hectares located on the eastern side of Buntsford Park Road and to the north of Buntsford Hill. A public right of way runs to the western boundary of the site connecting Buntsford Hill to Buntsford Park Road. The site is located to the east of the existing commercial units within the Buntsford Park Road development and is set at a lower level than these units. A watercourse runs to the eastern boundary. The undeveloped site is densely vegetated with scrub growth and a number of immature and mature trees within the main body of the land in addition to the watercourse edge. The site is located within a recognised Employment Zone.

Proposal

The proposals relate to the clearance of the site and the erection of three industrial units for B1, B2 or B8 uses. Unit A has dimensions 28.4 metres by 17.6 metres with a maximum height of 9 metres (due to site height differentials). Unit B and Unit C are joined with maximum dimensions 48.2 metres by 13.5 metres with a height of 7 metres. The site is proposed be accessed from a continuation of one of the access spurs serving the existing industrial units located on Buntsford Park Road. The scheme proposes 34 car parking spaces. A landscaping belt is proposed to all boundaries, with an enhanced area to the eastern boundary adjacent the watercourse.

A Design and Access Statement, Flood Risk Assessment and Ecological Survey and Mitigation Summary Report have accompanied the application.

Relevant Policies

WMSS	QE1, QE2, QE3, QE6, QE7, QE9
WCSP	SD.2, CTC.1, CTC.10, CTC.12, CTC.13, CTC.14, T.1
BDLP	C10a, C11, DS13, E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, E9, ES1, ES2, ES4, ES5, ES6, ES7, ES8, ES14, ES16, TR1, TR11, TR12
Others	PPS1, PPS7, PPS9, PPG14, PPS23, PPG24, PPS25, Circular 06/05

Relevant Planning History

B/2006/1032	New industrial units for B1, B2 and B8 use: refused 08.12.2006
B/1998/0192	Industrial units (outline): approved 15.06.1998

Notes

The main issues to consider in the determination of this application are:

- (i) The appropriateness of the development in this location;
- (ii) Amenity issues and highway safety and egress;
- (iii) Flooding issues;
- (vi) Environmental and ecological effects.

Policy E4 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan sets out a number of criteria that proposals for the expansion, consolidation or expansion to existing commercial uses in non-Green Belt locations should meet. These relate to issues such as the

appropriateness of the scale and nature of the activity to the area, traffic and parking implications, landscaping and environmental disturbance to nearby residences. Paragraph 11.5 of policy E4 states that such schemes can offer an increased source of employment and thus contribute to a more sustainable pattern of land use. Such schemes, however, must not conflict with other land use objectives. Policy E9 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan reflects the guidance contained in policy E4 for new employment development.

Amenity and Highway Issues

The site is located in a designated employment zone and is bounded by the Buntsford Park Road development comprising commercial B1, B2 and B8 premises to the west and north-west boundary. Sugarbrook Mill comprising a number of commercial and industrial uses is located to the southern boundary. The locality is, therefore, predominantly commercial and industrial in context. As such, it is my view that in principle the erection of commercial units for B1, B2 or B8 uses would not be so demonstrably harmful in this location. The functional design of the buildings would be reflective of the commercial buildings located on Buntsford Park Road.

The WCC(HP) has raised no objection to the scheme. The EHO has also raised no objection subject to the imposition of suitable conditions.

Flooding Issues

Policy ES2 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan states that proposals involving new development will not normally be permitted where there is a known risk of flooding, or where the Environment Agency indicate there are potential problems. A Flood Risk Assessment has accompanied the application and the EA has raised no objection to the scheme, subject to conditions.

Ecological Issues

A baseline phase 1 habitat survey was previously submitted to the Local Planning Authority for consideration in relation to B/2006/1032. The applicant has resubmitted this report, together with the addition of a bullet point list of ecological mitigation which will be included in the site. A response to the views of the NEO was submitted to which the NEO has responded.

For the reference of Members, the Habitats Regulations implements the requirements of the Habitats Directive for species listed in Annexe IV of the Directive (European Protected Species). Stricter provisions than those contained in the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 apply for these species and regulation 3(4) of the Habitats Regulations places a duty on local planning authorities, in the exercise of their functions, to have regard to the requirements of the Directive so far as they might be affected by those functions. All European protected species are also separately protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. For clarity, the Common Otter, Horseshoe Bat and Typical Bat are European protected species. The Water Vole, Barn Owl and Kingfisher are protected under Schedule 5 and Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) respectively.

Policy QE7 of the West Midlands Spatial Strategy, policies CTC.12 and CTC.13 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan and policies C10a and C11 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan all refer to the nature conservation and biodiversity and the presence of statutorily protected species in the development control process. These policies reinforce the philosophy of both PPS9 and Circular 06/05.

The NEO considers that while the existing mitigation proposal goes some way towards meeting the requirements of the relevant planning policies, a more varied scheme which is in line with the recommendations of the Countryside Consultants Ltd. Ecological Survey supplied by the applicant would take better account of the variety of species potentially using the site, and their habitat requirements. These measures should not be difficult or costly to include, and could be easily accommodated within the proposed buffer zone or the surrounding landscaping. Information on this could be supplied through the suggested landscape design scheme and Nature Conservation Management Plan (NCMP).

Provided that the landscaping scheme and NCMP are satisfactory at implementing the mitigation measures proposed by Betts Ecology on 21st June 2007, with the addition of some of the other measures recommended by the Countryside Consultants Ltd. Ecological Survey, the development should be in compliance with PPS9, policy QE7 of the RSS and Local Plan policies C11 for statutorily protected species and habitats and C12 for wildlife corridors. On this basis, the NEO raises no objection to the scheme on ecological or biodiversity grounds, subject to the imposition of suitable conditions.

Conclusions

Members will note that this site contains a now expired consent for the redevelopment of the site. I am of the view that, since that approval, planning policy has altered to deal with planning issues arising from such sites. This is with direct reference to flooding and ecological issues advocated by PPS25 and PPS9 and policies within the West Midlands Spatial Strategy, the Worcestershire County Structure Plan and the Bromsgrove District Local Plan.

Part IV of Circular 06/05 relating to the Conservation of Protected Species by Law is implicit in stating that the presence of a protected species is a material consideration when a local planning authority is considering a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat (paragraph 98).

The development in principle is acceptable in this employment zoned location. In this resubmitted application, I am of the view that the application has been sufficiently redesigned to reflect the environmental sensitivities of the site and to have adequately mitigated for the presence of protected species. The issue of potential flooding has also been overcome.

RECOMMENDATION: that permission be **GRANTED**.

1. Time
2. C39
3. No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provisions of surface water drainage works has been submitted to an

approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage works shall be completed in accordance with the details and timetable agreed.

4. No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision and implementation of a surface water run-off limitation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved programme and details.
5. There must be no new buildings, structures (including gates, walls or fences) or raised ground levels within 8 metres of the top of any bank or watercourse inside or along boundary of the site, unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
6. Prior to the commencement of works, a desk top study shall be carried out and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This study shall include the identification of previous site uses, potential contaminants that might reasonably be expected given those uses and other relevant information. The desk top study shall contain a diagrammatical representation (conceptual model) based on the information above and shall include all potential contaminant sources, pathways and receptors.
7. A site investigation for the site shall be designed using the information obtained from the desk top study. This should be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the investigation being carried out. The investigation must be comprehensive enough to enable:
 - (a) a risk assessment to be undertaken relating to the proposed end uses of the site and other receptors on and off the site that may be affected, and
 - (b) refinement of the conceptual model, and
 - (c) the development of a Method Statement detailing the remediation requirements.

The site investigation shall be carried out in accordance with details approved by the Local Planning Authority and a risk assessment undertaken.

8. A method statement detailing the remediation requirements using the information obtained from the site investigation shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. This should be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the remediation being undertaken. The development of the site should be carried out in accordance with the approved Method Statement.
9. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed by in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority, for an addendum to the Method Statement. This addendum to the Method Statement must detail how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and from the date of approval the addendum(s) shall form part of the Method Statement.
10. Upon completion of the remediation detailed in the Method Statement a Validation Report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority that provides verification that the required works regarding contamination have been carried out in accordance with the approved Method Statement(s). Post remediation sampling and monitoring results shall be included in the report to demonstrate that the required remediation has been fully met. Future monitoring proposals and reporting shall also be detailed in the report.

11. Any facilities above ground for the storage of oils, fuels or chemicals shall be sited on impervious base and surrounded by impervious bund walls. The volume of the bunded compound shall be at least equivalent to the capacity of the tank plus 10%. All filling points, vents, gauges and sight glasses must be located within the bund. The drainage system of the bund shall be sealed with no discharge to any watercourse, land or underground strata. Associated pipework should be located above ground and protected from accidental damage. All filling points and tank overflow pipe outlets should be detailed to discharge into the bund.
12. H13
13. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the applicant has submitted to and had approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a travel plan that promotes sustainable forms of access to the site. This plan thereafter will be implemented and updated in agreement with Worcestershire County Council's Travel Plan Co-ordinator.
14. Notwithstanding the scheme drawing site plan (SHDC/06/01/03D), a scheme of landscaping to include (a) full details of all existing physical and landscape features on the site including the position, species and spread of all trees and major shrubs clearly distinguishing between those features to be retained and those to be removed and (b) full details of all proposed fencing, screen walls, hedges, floorscape, earth moulding, tree and shrub planting where appropriate shall be submitted to, and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The approved scheme shall be implemented within 12 months from the date when any of the buildings hereby permitted are first occupied. Any trees / shrubs / hedges removed, dying, being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased within 5 years of the date of the original planting shall be replaced by plants of similar size and species to those originally planted.
15. All trees including conifers over 90cm in height shall from the time of planting be properly secured to a suitable stake with one or more flexible tree ties. Deciduous trees to be planted as part of the landscaping scheme shall be planted as standard trees (as defined by British Standard BS.3936 part 1 1965).
16. The new trees and / or shrubs and / or hedges shall be protected to prevent them being damaged by grazing and by vermin.
17. The existing trees / hedges / shrubs shall be retained and shall not be felled, lopped or topped, or otherwise removed without the previous written consent of the Local Planning Authority. Any trees / hedges / shrubs removed without such consent or dying or being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased shall be replaced with trees / hedges / shrubs of such size and species as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
18. Before any materials are brought on to the site or any development commenced the developer shall erect protective fencing as illustrated by BS 5837 :2005 Fig 2 on a line concurrent with Section 5 of BS 5837:2005 subject to the approval of the Local Planning Authority. The developer shall maintain such fences to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority until all development, the subject of this permission, has been completed. The level of the land within the fenced areas shall not be altered without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

19. The destruction by burning of any materials shall not take place within 10 metres of the furthest extent of the canopy of the trees to be retained on the site or on land adjoining.
20. No materials whatsoever shall be stored, or temporary buildings for use in connection with the construction of the development erected, beneath the canopy of any tree, which is to be retained.
21. No oil storage tank or concrete mixing plant shall be emptied or otherwise allowed to drain on to land beneath the canopy of any trees to be retained.
22. Where trees to be retained are subject to tree surgery, damage by machinery or damage which results in a part of the bark of the tree being cut away, then the resultant wound shall be treated with a fungicidal sealant.
23. Where it is necessary to carry out excavations beneath the canopy of any tree to be retained on the site or on adjoining land, none of the trees roots of a diameter of one inch or more shall be severed. The excavation shall be hand dug and backfilled with good quality topsoil. All works will be in accordance with NJUG 10 + BS5837:2005.
24. Notwithstanding the mitigation and enhancement proposals set out in the Betts Ecology Mitigation Summary Report (June 2007) and the Countryside Consultants Limited Ecological Survey (October 2006), prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a scheme for wildlife mitigation and enhancement of the site (to include annotated plans) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall include the installation of bird and bat boxes, and the creation of an appropriate matrix of habitat types, to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority. The approved mitigation and enhancement measures shall be implemented in full and maintained as such in perpetuity with no deviation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
25. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a Nature Conservation Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
26. Before the commencement on site of any works which are the subject of this permission, full details of any external lighting to serve the development, to include positioning and lux value of such lighting, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No further lighting other than that detailed shall be erected on the site without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reasons

3. To prevent the increased risk of flooding by ensuring the provision of a satisfactory means of surface water disposal.
4. To prevent the increased risk of flooding.
5. To maintain access to the watercourse for maintenance or improvements and provide for overland flood flows.
6. To prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with policies ES1 and ES7 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and policy CTC.9 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan.

7. To prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with policies ES1 and ES7 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and policy CTC.9 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan.
8. To prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with policies ES1 and ES7 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and policy CTC.9 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan.
9. To prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with policies ES1 and ES7 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and policy CTC.9 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan.
10. To prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with policies ES1 and ES7 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and policy CTC.9 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan.
11. To prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with policies ES1 and ES7 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and policy CTC.9 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan.
13. To reduce the number of trips to the site in conformity with the sustainability objectives of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan.
14. In order to protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the site in accordance with policies DS13 / C17 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 and policies CTC.1 and CTC.5 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001.
15. In order to protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the site in accordance with policies DS13 / C17 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 and policies CTC.1 and CTC.5 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001.
16. In order to protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the site in accordance with policies DS13 / C17 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 and policies CTC.1 and CTC.5 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001.
17. In order to protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the site in accordance with policies DS13 / C17 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 and policies CTC.1 and CTC.5 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001.
18. In order to protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the site in accordance with policies DS13 / C17 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 and policies CTC.1 and CTC.5 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001.
19. In order to protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the site in accordance with policies DS13 / C17 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 and policies CTC.1 and CTC.5 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001.
20. In order to protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the site in accordance with policies DS13 / C17 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 and policies CTC.1 and CTC.5 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001.
21. In order to protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the site in accordance with policies DS13 / C17 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan

- January 2004 and policies CTC.1 and CTC.5 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001.
22. In order to protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the site in accordance with policies DS13 / C17 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 and policies CTC.1 and CTC.5 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001.
 23. In order to protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the site in accordance with policies DS13 / C17 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 and policies CTC.1 and CTC.5 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001.
 24. To ensure sufficient mitigation measures to address the presence of protected species on site in accordance with policies CTC.12 and CTC.13 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan and policies C10a and C11 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan.
 25. To enhance the wildlife value of the site in accordance with policies C11 and C12 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and policy CTC.13 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan.
 26. To ensure a well planned development in accordance with policies E4 and E9 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan.

Notes

Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 and the Land Drainage Byelaws, the prior written consent of the Agency is required for any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank of the Sugar Brook, designated a main river.

There must be no interruption to the surface water drainage system of the surrounding land as a result of the operations on the site. Provisions must be made to ensure that all existing drainage systems continue to operate effectively and that riparian owners upstream and downstream of the site are not adversely affected.

The developer should incorporate pollution prevention measures to protect ground and surface water. The Environment Agency has produced a range of guidance notes giving advice on statutory responsibilities and good environmental practice which include Pollution Prevention Guidance Notes (PPGs) targeted at specific activities. Pollution prevention guidance can be viewed at:

<http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/444251/444731/ppg/>

This decision has been taken having regard to the policies within the West Midlands Spatial Strategy (WMSS) June 2004, the Worcestershire County Structure Plan (WCSP) June 2001 and the Bromsgrove District Local Plan (BDLP) January 2004 and other material considerations as summarised below:

WMSS QE1, QE2, QE3, QE6, QE7, QE9

WCSP SD.2, CTC.1, CTC.10, CTC.12, CTC.13, CTC.14, T.1

B/2007/0704-DMB - New industrial units for B1, B2 and B8 use - Land at Sugarbrook Mill, Buntsford Park Road, Bromsgrove - D. C. Lambe Ltd.

BDLP C10a, C11, DS13, E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, E9, ES1, ES2, ES4, ES5, ES6, ES7,
ES8, ES14, ES16, TR1, TR11, TR12
Others PPS1, PPS7, PPS9, PPG14, PPS23, PPG24, PPS25, Circular 06/05

It is the Council's view that the proposed development complies with the provisions of the development plan and that, on balance, there are no justifiable reasons to refuse planning permission.