

Name of Applicant	Proposal	Expiry Date	Plan Ref.
Redditch Gateway Infrastructure Ltd	Hybrid application comprising: Outline planning application (with matters of appearance, landscaping, layout, scale and details of internal circulation routes reserved) for the development on a phased basis of 32ha of employment land for business/industrial uses (Use Classes B1, B2, B8). The development shall include: landscaping, parking, associated infrastructure, utilities, drainage (including SUDS) and ground engineering works; and Full planning application for Phase 1 Ground Engineering works, and details of means of access to the site from the A4023.  Redditch Gateway, Land Adjacent to the A4023, Coventry Highway, Redditch, Worcestershire	31.10.2017	17/00701/OUT

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That **DELEGATED POWERS** be granted to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to GRANT planning permission subject to the applicant entering into a suitable legal mechanism to secure the following:

1. £200,000.00 to be paid on first occupation and held for a period of 15 years from its receipt in the form of a bond and management arrangement to support HGV routing.
2. biodiversity offset scheme for each phase of development and biodiversity monitoring contribution.

**1.0 Consideration and Determination of Cross Boundary Application**

- 1.1 Three identical applications have been submitted which include land within three LPA boundaries (Stratford, Bromsgrove and Redditch).
- 1.2 The consideration of the impacts of a development proposal are not altered by political boundaries and cannot be considered in isolation. Members need to consider the application as a whole, (not just that part of the development within its own administrative boundary) and come to a decision based upon that consideration. However, Members will only be determining the application in so far as it relates to the administrative boundary of Bromsgrove District. For reference this relates to land North of the Coventry Highway and Blacksoils Brook / east of Ravensbank Business Park.

- 1.3 The fact that the development proposal straddles three Local Planning Authority boundaries does however have a bearing upon each authorities responsibilities for enforcement of any planning conditions which may be imposed in the event that permission is granted by each Local Planning Authority. Whilst the purpose of some of the recommended conditions will be common to all three applications, others relating to specific areas of the development or issues which are confined or unique to particular parts of the site will only be imposed by the particular LPA within which those issues arise.

## 2.0 **Consultations**

### 2.1 **Beoley Parish Council**

Response awaited

### 2.2 **Mappleborough Green Parish Council (Stratford)**

Make the following comments:

- Insufficient time to consider the information submitted with the application
- Unable to provide consultation response until the end of October 2017
- Proposed scale was unknown until the public consultation organised by Stoford's
- Government describes site as 'regeneration' despite it being a greenfield site (23.08.2017)

Amended submission:

Object to the application for the following reasons:

- Significant impact
- Change character of area
- Increased traffic in both passenger and HGVs
- Removal of land from Green Belt would diminish open countryside and create an urban landscape
- Impossible to screen all buildings and associated structures – permanent loss of countryside
- Development would distract from nearby listed buildings
- Do not accept no significant change in number of trucks travelling through Mappleborough Green and Studley
- Traffic fundamental issue for various communities on the A435 corridor
- Local District and County Councillors do not support application
- People in Mappleborough Green generally against development
- Three Councils should commission long-term pollution and traffic volume measurements along the A435
- Question need – empty business units in Redditch. Brownfield sites should be developed first
- Low unemployment in Redditch – future employees would travel from outside the local area – increased pollution
- Referred to as 'Regeneration' but it is a greenfield site
- Great crested newts, bats and other species reside on the site
- Site and surroundings subject to flooding, and has a tendency to become waterlogged – associated impact on Ipsley Marsh SSSI
- Quote from North Worcestershire Economic Development and Regeneration, Redditch Eastern Gateway – Economic Impact Study June 2013 (20.10.2017)

**2.3 Studley Parish Council (Stratford)**

Object to the application for the following reasons:

- Adverse impact on visual amenity due to prominent nature of site
- Lighting visible from all over the district – detracting from open countryside
- Detrimental impact on listed Gorcott Hall and its setting
- No identified users, no identifies employment opportunities and no need for development – no shortage of employment opportunities in Redditch and surrounding area
- Isolated from residential areas in Redditch with no viable pedestrian or cycle access routes and no public transport links
- Redditch has ample brownfield sites within its boundaries which have existing infrastructure to facilitate construction
- Infrastructure not in place to support traffic from proposed development
- No public transport provision for the site
- No measures to reduce inevitable deterioration in air pollution that will impact on the Air Quality Management Area in Studley
- No proposal to alleviate HGV traffic along the A435 through Studley - measures should be put in place to deter HGV traffic along this route. Additional housing development in the area will mean workers travel along this route to the development (16.08.2017)

**2.4 Tanworth in Arden Parish Council (Stratford)**

No representation (07.08.2017)

**2.5 Spennall Parish Council (Stratford)**

None received

**2.6 Morton Bagot Parish Council (Stratford)**

None received

**2.7 Ullenhall Parish Council (Stratford)**

Object to the application for the following reasons:

- Infrastructure is not in place to support development
- Adverse impact on Ullenhall from excess traffic (04.08.2017)

**2.8 Beaudesert Parish Council (Stratford)**

None received

**2.9 Henley in Arden Parish Council (Stratford)**

None received

**2.10 Oldberrow Parish Meeting (Stratford)**

None received

**2.11 Sambourne Parish Council**

Object to the application for the following reasons:

- Strong environmental arguments against the development

- Detrimental visual effect on the area – what was Green Belt would disappear and Redditch would extend right up to the A435
- Increase in traffic, particularly of HGV movements along the A435 – increased level of congestion, noise and air pollution
- HGV routing plan is a vain hope – hauliers and carriers would use the most effective route. All discussions of alternative routing are ill-considered
- Minimal need – similar industrial units in Redditch lie empty
- Brownfield sites should be developed first
- Low level of unemployment in Redditch – future workers will travel from further afield - unsustainable
- SDC appears to have 'handed over' land to Redditch for development – when was this decided, by whom and where are the details?
- Unnecessary
- Detrimental effect (22.08.2017)

**2.12 Cllr George Atkinson (Stratford)**

- No comment

**2.13 Cllr Mike Gittus (Stratford)**

- No comment

**2.14 Cllr Justin Kerridge (Stratford)**

- The principle of development for employment purposes has already been agreed by Stratford Council

**2.15 Cllr Stephen Thirlwell (Stratford)**

- All development traffic should be monitored to ensure that it does not use any of the country lanes surrounding the Warwickshire villages in that area such as Ullenhall. Such village roads and lanes were not designed for the use of large HGVs.

**2.16 Cllr Hazel Wright (Adjacent Ward Member Studley with Sambourne, (Stratford) OBJECTION**

- Not clear how good design will be secured
- The site has been derived through loss of green belt
- The claim that the development will create jobs for local people is not substantiated
- The development would harm the setting of listed buildings
- Landscaping cannot screen the development
- The A435 will be impacted during the construction phase
- The HGV routing plan will only be as effective as its enforcement and how it will be enforced is unclear

## **2.17 Worcestershire Highway Authority and Warwickshire Highway Authority**

### ***Have prepared a joint response as follows:***

Both Highway Authorities have undertaken a full assessment this planning application. Based on the appraisal of the development proposals and the additional information which has been submitted, the Highway Authority has **no objection subject to conditions and financial obligations.**

Worcestershire Highway Authority as no objection to the TA and confirms it accords with national planning policy and guidance.

The document concludes that various mitigation is required to enable modal choice and overcome issues on the highway network, which will be secured and implemented through suitable conditions and financial obligations., which is acceptable. Warwickshire Highway Authority has also identified a need for a Highway Safety Improvement Scheme at the junction of the A435 Southbound / A4023 Coventry Highway. This would be conditioned and delivered under a Section 278 Agreement.

### ***Framework Travel Plan;***

The applicants have submitted a Framework Travel Plan, which has been prepared on their behalf by BWB.

The Highway Authorities support the principal shown within the document and will require the measures and incentives to be implemented on first occupation of the development proposals as set out in Section 7 of the document. In addition the Highway Authorities will also require the submission of the first staff travel surveys within 12 months of first occupation of the development, suitable conditions will be worded to this effect.

The Framework Travel Plan will be overseen and managed by Worcestershire County Council.

### ***Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) Routing Strategy;***

The applicants have submitted a potential HGV Routing Strategy as part of the Transport Assessment in Appendix H. The aim of this plan is to prevent HGVs routing south down the A435 impacting on Mappleborough Green and Studley, the latter which forms part of an Air Quality Management Area.

Both Highway Authorities support the principal shown within the document and will require a full HGV Routing Strategy to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authorities and to be implemented on first occupation of the development. In addition, both Highway Authorities will also require the submission of the first HGV routing surveys within 12 months of first occupation of the development, suitable conditions will be worded to this effect.

In addition, the Highway Authorities require a contribution of £200,000.00 to be secured via a s106 agreement to be submitted prior to first occupation and held for a period of 15 years, to allow the mitigation of HGVs on each Highway Authorities networks should they be deemed necessary.

\*The TA has been independently reviewed by Transport Consultants Mott MacDonald commissioned by Bromsgrove District Council. The findings of Mott MacDonald are discussed in Section 17 of this report.

The TA states that the impact of the proposed development is minimal. The review by MM finds no reason why this shouldn't be the case. MM note that Warwickshire County Council and Worcestershire County Council have been engaged throughout the process and has led to a well scoped assessment. MM agree with the findings of the Transport Assessment based on the information included within the TA. It should be noted that MM have not undertaken an independent review of the VISSIM or Paramics modelling; however, they understand that these models have been approved by Highways England and Warwickshire County Council respectively.

## **2.18 Highways England**

NO OBJECTION. Following comments raised:

- Following a review of the submitted Transport Assessment, the traffic arising from the development would have limited implications for the operation of the Highways England network
- Improvements to Junction 3 of the M42 is being Government funded and are currently under development (11.08.2017)

## **2.19 Coal Authority**

NO COMMENT. The site does not fall within the defined coalfield (08.08.2017)

## **2.20 CPRE (Warwickshire)**

OBJECTION

- The development would ruin the setting and approach to the town of Redditch on the A4023
- The proposal conflicts with Policies CS1 and CS9 of the SDC Core Strategy
- The proposed development would have an adverse impact upon the residents of Winyates Green as industrial development is not compatible with residential development
- The northern part of the site should remain open countryside
- There is no shortage of employment land for Redditch, so the development is not required

## **2.21 CPRE (Worcestershire)**

OBJECTION

- Loss of natural or semi-natural species rich meadow. No planted (or seeded) resource can ever properly replace a natural one. Any planted resource is inevitably artificial.
- Loss of hedgerows which are themselves an element of the historic environment

- Appropriate buffer zones will be needed along the edge of the wood to the northeast of the Ravensbank portion of the site to ensure that the wood (with protected species is not damaged)
- The Ravensbank bridleway along the edge of the site should be preserved.
- The site is upstream of Ipsley Alders Marsh Nature Reserve and particular care will be needed to prevent pollution of Blacksoils Brook which passes through the site.
- The setting of Gorcott Hall which is a Grade II\* listed building
- The northern part of the site is adjacent to the existing Ravensbank and Moons Moat industrial areas. If it is to be developed, industrial uses would be appropriate. This has long been acknowledged through the designation of the Bromsgrove part as an Industrial ADR. The northern part of the Winyates Triangle is a natural extension to this.
- Conversely the southern part of the Winyates triangle adjoins the Winyates Green housing area but could be developed for housing (provided the environmental and other constraints could be overcome)

## **2.22 Environment Agency**

NO OBJECTION subject to conditions (summary of main comments below)

- Flood risk - Although EA Flood Maps indicate that the site falls in Flood Zone 1, detailed modelling indicates that parts of the site lie within Flood Zones 3a and 3b – through rerouting and redesigning channels and removing structures, vast majority of site would be in Flood Zone 1 post-development with no increase in flood risk downstream
- Biodiversity - Biodiversity information lacking – content that this could be secured by condition
- Construction Environmental Management Plan - No impact from development in terms of groundwater pollution or levels subject to Construction Environment Management Plan and surface water drainage scheme secured by condition
- Groundwater and connectivity with SSSI – unlikely that development would significantly impact groundwater levels within SSSI
- Water resource and efficiency – encourage careful consideration of water use and sustainable water consumption during construction (26.09.2017)

## **2.23 Forestry Commission**

No objection (28.07.2017)

## **2.24 Historic England**

Make the following comments:

- A number of heritage assets close to the site – the most important being the Grade II\* listed Gorcott Hall which has historic fabric from the early 16<sup>th</sup> century onwards. There are also associated Grade II listed structures
- The Built Heritage Assessment provided as part of the application concludes that the development would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Grade II\* listed building – the harm is described as ‘moderate’, which is a reasonable assessment and a conclusion that HE endorse

- Involved in discussions at pre-application stage – the scheme was considerably improved at that stage; mainly by moving new buildings further away from Gorcott Hall and ensuring that they are kept as low as possible within the landscape
- However, further scope to reduce the impact of the proposals on the setting of the listed buildings which would be desirable in lessening their impact on the significance of these buildings
- Harm needs to be balanced against public benefits (16.08.2017)

Amended submission:

Do not wish to offer any comments (26.10.2017)

## **2.25 Natural England**

NO OBJECTION –

subject to appropriate mitigation being secured. Following comments raised:

- Without appropriate mitigation, the development would damage or destroy the interest features for which Ipsley Alders Marsh Site of Special Scientific Interest has been notified
- Water quality and quantity implications for Ipsley Alders Marsh should be taken into consideration which addressing site design, drainage and attenuation
- Construction Environmental Management Plan should be conditioned to avoid damage to SSSI
- Surface water drainage scheme should be conditioned
- Development should comply with CS.7
- Impact on public rights of way should be considered
- Agricultural Land Classification report submitted does not fully follow ALC Revised Guidelines and conclusion that the land is subgrade 3b and 4 is un-evidenced – new ALC survey should be submitted to include soil survey of the land (22.08.2017)

## **2.26 NWEDR (North Worcestershire Economic Development SUPPORT**

## **2.27 Ramblers Association**

NO OBJECTION in principle. There will be matters of detail upon which we may wish to comment but that may be best left until the reserved matters stage.

## **2.28 Worcestershire County Council Strategic Planning**

Object to the application for the following reasons:

- Minerals and Waste – full justification and detail of any bunds will be required at reserved matters stage and visual impact considered in any LVIA. Full planning application for Phase 1 does not appear to include any details of the amount of material to be deposited or heights of bunds created, nor any justification for requirement. Any bunds proposed should be treated as a proposal for landfilling. Holding objection until such time as sufficient information is provided to enable the landscaping proposals to be assessed in more detail. Levels should be



conditioned. Areas for waste collection should be incorporated at reserved matters stage

- Minerals – site is not in an area of identified mineral deposits. No formal comments to make
- Public Rights of Way – no objection in general however some existing public rights of way do not appear to be shown on submitted plans on their definitive lines, or are missing. Proposals incorporate diversion of PROW – application should be made to LPA. Clarification required on how footpaths around new road junction works are to be incorporated – conflict with landscaping works (pond and retaining wall). If PROW are to be shared with cycles, would normally require a width of 5m provided
- Ecology – clarification required prior to determination. Insufficient information to demonstrate no-net-loss of biodiversity. Biodiversity Impact Assessment required to demonstrate that offsetting is practical, deliverable and securable. The 'Hydrology Review Report'/'Eco-Hydrology Report' which is referenced has not been submitted – cannot be confident in conclusions drawn. No reference to Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Partnership's GI Concept Plan. Queries raised regarding author of ES Ecology chapter, reference to 'over-mature' trees, diversion of water channels, impacts on downstream SSSI, impacts on Ravensbrook Drive Bridle Track LWS, impacts on county boundary hedgerow, assertion that GCN unlikely to use grassland, creation of mammal pass
- Water Environment – essential that mitigation specifications proposed by hydrological expert have been evaluated and are supported by appropriately qualified and experienced ecologist. No evidence to support assertion that SSSI is fed from local spring water. Disconnect between Water Environment and Ecology chapters of ES. Unclear what 'moderate adverse impact' on groundwater contamination of SSSI is based on. De-culverting of Blacksoils Brook is welcomed but opportunity missed in achieving ecological betterment
- Draft Mitigation Enhancement Summary – provided in draft format which is inappropriate for a planning application. Queries raised regarding authors, specific mitigation measures, use of vague language, mitigation required for each bat species, implications of hedgerow clearance, 30 year habitat management plan. Lighting should be conditioned. Insufficient information to demonstrate 'no significant impact' on Alders Marsh SSSI or 'no significant impact on retained and newly created habitats'.
- Key recommendations, prior to determination:
  - Ecological Constraints and Opportunities Plan should be prepared and submitted
  - Biodiversity offsetting should be explicit
  - Suitably competent and experienced ecologist engaged which cohesively takes into account drainage recommendations
  - ES should be revised to address valuation of habitats (25.08.2017)

Additional comments:

- Satisfied that final detail of bunds could be considered at reserved matters stage
- Generally satisfied with proposals set out in outline element, subject to clarification on approach to screening of service yards for the Phase 1 part of development (12.09.2017)

## **2.29 Warwickshire Fire and Rescue Service**

NO OBJECTION

subject to a condition which secures provision of water supply and fire hydrants necessary for fire fighting purposes at the site. (16.08.2017)

## **2.30 Warwickshire Police (Crime Reduction and Community Safety)**

NO OBJECTION

- Subsequent reserved matters should ensure the specification for openings, roller shutters, doors and windows, are designed to deter crime.
- Introduction of features within road layout to discourage car cruising events
- Security of site offices, plant and equipment during the construction phase.

Amended submission:

No further observations (16.10.2017)

## **2.31 Worcestershire Regulatory Services (Bromsgrove and Redditch)**

Contaminated Land

Make the following comments:

- Contaminated land – assessment, which has been carried out in accordance with current guidance and best practice, considers site to be low risk in terms of risk from contaminated land. Agree with recommendation within submitted report that further investigation is required and this could be secured by condition
- Air quality – a number of shortcomings associated with submitted Air Quality Assessment (AQA). However, when considering the nature of the proposed development, its location and current air quality in the local area within Worcestershire, it is unlikely that refining the model further would result in different conclusions. The AQA concludes a “negligible” impact on air quality within Worcestershire which is considered to be reasonable. Conditions recommended (31.08.2017)

Amended submission:

Previous recommendations still apply (18.10.2017)

## **2.32 Woodland Trust**

**OBJECTION** to the application for the following reasons:

- Loss of two veteran oak trees T73 and T74 and proximity of development to two veteran oaks T46 and T92 whose root protection zones will be impacted
- All four veteran oaks are verified on the Ancient Tree Inventory
- Essential that no trees displaying ancient/veteran characteristics are lost as part of the development
- Intensification of recreational activity of humans
- Fragmentation as a result of separation of adjacent semi-natural habitats
- Noise and light pollution during both construction and operational phases
- Lopping/fellings where trees overhang public areas

- Safety issues threatening longer-term retention of trees
- Removal of T73 and T74
- Documentation incorrectly states that only one veteran oak tree is present on site (24.08.2017)

### **2.33 Worcestershire Wildlife Trust**

**OBJECTION** for the following reasons:

- Detrimental impact on Ipsley Alders SSSI and nature reserve – direct groundwater links between development site and the SSSI. Concern that some of the assumptions about the effectiveness of drainage and SUDS in the ES are incorrect. Potential impact on the main water source to the SSSI. Actual groundwater strikes as a result of land forming would open a direct pathway for pollution of the SSSI. Further clarification required
- Alter hydrology of adjacent Ravensbank Drive Local Wildlife Site – loss of two small watercourses which currently feed the LWS and the impact this would have. Further clarification required
- Habitat losses and impacts do not appear to be mitigatable onsite given the indicative layout – insufficient information to evidence that biodiversity offsetting can be done effectively. Value of some habitat features including grassland and over-mature trees have been undervalued in the ES. Further clarification required
- Surveys have shortcomings leading to inaccurate results – for example, assessment of species rich grassland, treatment of over-mature trees, bat survey methodology and great crested newt mitigation strategy (24.08.2017)

Amended submission:

Continue to object to the application for the following reasons:

- Insufficient detail on biodiversity offsetting
- Insufficient detail on proposals to mitigate harm to protected species
- Insufficient detail to determine impacts on Ravensbrook Drive LWS
- Additional information addresses previous concerns relating to SSSI
- Pleased to note species rich grassland is being retained
- Robust Construction Environmental Management Plan required (31.10.2017)

### **2.34 Warwickshire Flood Risk Management**

NO OBJECTION subject to conditions  
(29.08.2017)

Amended submission:

No additional comments (31.10.2017)

**2.35** North Worcestershire Water Management (LLFA)

NO OBJECTION subject to conditions. Following comments raised:

- Flood risk
  - Site specific modelling indicates that the channels on site typically become overwhelmed readily
  - Modelling following mitigation indicates that overland flows across the site would be virtually eliminated, exception being the 1000 year storm would still see some inundation from the Brooksoils Brook channel just upstream from Coventry Highway embankment. At lower return periods almost no overland flow at all, and almost all water held within proposed water course network
  - Hydrograph provided within model indicates that overall discharge post development is reduced compared to pre-development rates
- Groundwater and hydrology
  - Addendum to ES requested to clarify location of trial pits to establish extent to which infiltration from site contributes to groundwater
- Sustainable drainage scheme
  - As outline, no specific detail on design and layout of SUDs, however indicated features considered to be acceptable (26.09.2017)

**2.36** Worcestershire Water Officer

NO OBJECTION subject to condition (16.08.2017)

**2.37** **Warwickshire Wildlife Trust**  
**OBJECTION**

- Loss of priority habitat: lowland meadow – ecological survey of the grassland was carried out in September which is sub-optimal time of year given that many of the wildflowers have finished flowering and it can be very difficult to identify them. Survey still found relatively high diversity in wildflowers present. Warwickshire is lacking in lowland grassland
- Proposed mitigation for protected species: great crested newt and badger – developable area should be reduced to retain pond 3 and its surrounding habitat. Insufficient information to evidence that off-site mitigation can be achieved
- Mitigation and compensation for overall loss of biodiversity – Biodiversity Impact Assessment has not been submitted. EIA states that biodiversity offsetting will be required but no detail has been provided
- Impact on nearby Ipsley Alders Marsh SSSI – development site linked to SSSI via groundwater rather than by direct flow from onsite watercourses. Any changes to groundwater levels may adversely affect SSSI
- Mitigation for the impacts on neighbouring Local Wildlife Site – Ravensbrook Drive Bridle Track is a LWS that runs along the western boundary of the southern site area. Negative impact through adjacent road and diversion of watercourses
- Survey effort regarding protected species – bat surveys have not followed best practice guidance. EIA fails to consider the impact of light spill from the site affecting off-site roosts (24.08.2017)

Amended submission:

Maintain objection. Following comments raised:

- Retention of meadow grassland to south of site addresses one of the reasons for objection
- Maintains that insufficient information submitted to evidence that off-site mitigation can be achieved
- Insufficient information on proposed biodiversity offsetting (19.10.2017)

2.38 Stratford on Avon District Council Conservation Officer

Make the following comments:

- Extensive pre-application discussions – the application now submitted is broadly in line with the end product of the pre-application discussions
- Historic England involved with pre-application discussions and agree entirely with the consultation response received from them – further mitigating measures could further reduce the level of harm, and there may be some cope for this as part of any subsequent reserved matters process
- Significant degree of success in achieving, through those discussions, a lower level of harm with regard to the setting of the Grade II\* listed Gorcott Hall
- Main difference with last provisional plans discussed at pre-application stage is increase in height of units A and AA from 18m to 21m – they have an adverse impact on the setting of Gorcott Hall and increase in height exacerbates this adverse impact – slightly higher from a mid-point within the ‘less than substantial harm’ spectrum
- Agree with conclusions within the submitted Heritage Assessment – development will result in less than substantial harm to the significance of Gorcott Hall in the middle of the less than substantial threshold, low level of less than substantial harm to associated buildings and very low levels of less than substantial harm for other listed buildings
- Only building considered which is not focused on in the submitted Heritage Statement is the Grade II listed Church of the Holy Ascension – very low level of less than substantial harm
- Very significant public benefits required to outweigh less than substantial harm identified (25.08.2017)

Amended submission:

Make the following comments:

- Amendments slightly positive in that they would increase the distances from
  - a) Designated heritage assets (within SDC remit) to the southeast of the southern part of the site
  - b) Built form within nearest part of development site
- Assuming that there would not be an associated increase in height of the realigned built form, removals of substantive built form in the very south of the site is helpful in terms of ameliorating any adverse impacts on the setting of nearby listed buildings (18.10.2017)

### 2.39 Bromsgrove District Council Conservation

Make the following comments:

- Gorcott Hall, a Grade II\* listed building, comprises a small country house dating back to the 15<sup>th</sup> century, but with substantial additions and alterations taking place in the 16<sup>th</sup>, 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries
- The Heritage Statement submitted with the application concludes that the harm to the significance of Gorcott Hall is less than substantial, falling within the middle of that assessment, and would therefore be described as moderate
- Detailed pre-application discussions took place between Conservation Officers for Bromsgrove, stratford upon Acon and Hisotirc England
- The scheme largely mirror the draft scheme discussed in September 2016
- Development to the southwest of Gorcott Hall would be restricted to 9-12m in height and ground levels would be redcued to sink the units down into the landscape
- Combined with the landscape buffer visibility and impact on Gorcott Hall would be reduced
- Zone to the north of the brook has been increased to 21m from pre-app discussions at 18m which is disappointing
- Agree that harm to significance of Gorcott Hall would be less than substantial, and within that assessment, is at the very least moderate
- Imperative that at the reserved matters stage a great deal of thought is given to; materials and especially colour schemes, specifics of ground profiling, soft landscaping, hard landscaping, security, lighting, land management and photomontages from Gorcott Hall (25.08.2017)

### 2.40 Warwickshire Flood Risk Management

NO OBJECTION subject to conditions to control discharge of surface water and mitigate risk of its contamination.

### 2.41 SDC Governance and Community Safety

NO COMMENTS on the basis of the application being for industrial units (30.08.2017)

### 2.42 Warwickshire County Council ECOLOGY

Initial response

Objects to the application unless concern about the nationally important habitat of UK Priority Lowland Meadow is resolved. All other ecological concerns can be resolved through conditions and/or obligations:

- Protected species
  - – Bat surveys do not conform to the Bat Conservation Trust Guidelines, however indicate that hedgerows and brook are important flight-lines. Essential to ensure unbroken and unlit commuting routes from woodland.
  - Badgers on site would have reduced foraging areas – acceptable subject to landscaping planted to maximise foraging potential and connectivity for mammals in road junction layout.

- Barn owl, soldierfly and great crested newt can be resolved through landscaping reserved matters and conditions (constructional environmental management plan and lighting scheme)
- Protected habitat
  - Southernmost fields are Lowland Meadow UK Priority Habitat which is a rare and declining habitat that is of county importance where all remnant pastures need to be secured and enhanced. The retention and enhancement of these fields would reduce the ecological impact of the development
  - County important Ravensbrook Drive Bridle Track adjacent to the western boundary of the southern site and onsite Blacksoils Brook (both Local Wildlife Sites) would need to be buffered and secured from impacts from development including light spill
  - Veteran trees should be protected unless this cannot be avoided
- Biodiversity offsetting
  - Northern area has potential to provide a net biodiversity gain for habitats but a loss of linear features
  - Southern area would result in a significant loss of habitat and potential gain for linear features
  - Actual losses/gains unknown
  - Biodiversity impacts would need to be monitored throughout the build through biodiversity offsetting schedule within S106 legal agreement (25.08.2017)

List of recommended conditions and obligations provided (13.09.2017)

Amended submission:

OBJECTION REMOVED. Following comments raised:

- Conditions provided in initial response still applicable
- Suggested wording for legal agreement to secure biodiversity offsetting provided (31.10.2017)

**2.43 Worcestershire County Council ARCHAEOLOGY**

NO OBJECTION subject to standard condition relating to scheme and programme of site investigation and recording

- Broadly concur with approach suggested in section 8 of Cultural Heritage chapter of the ES but recommends that the standard percentage-based sampling approach form the basic requirement for the field evaluation strategy and should include an appropriate programme of geoarchaeological works and environmental/palaeoenvironmental sampling (04.09.2017)

**2.44 SDC Environmental Health**

Makes the following comments:

- Contaminated land – site considered to be ‘low risk’ based on assessments carried out to date. Further site investigation recommended, but could be dealt with by conditions

- Air quality – conclusions of applicant's transport consultant's noted in that traffic generated by development would be dispersed across the network and impacts on air quality in Studley are unlikely to be significant. Recommends that a quantitative air quality assessment be carried out so as to have a robust understanding of the impacts of the development on the Studley AQMA. Concerned with the advisory status of the HGV Routing Strategy and practicalities of implementation. Recommended that a robust HGV Routing Strategy be submitted which includes the construction phase of development
- Noise – Worcestershire Regulatory Services will take lead on noise and vibration matters on behalf of three Authority areas affected (05.09.2017)

Makes the following comments:

- As Studley is an AQMA, appropriate for impact to be robustly assessed prior to determination
- Report should include an assessment of impact without the proposed mitigation as concerned about alternative route in the VRMP – could potentially impact on air quality in Studley if impractical and therefore should be considered prior to determination (28.09.2017)

Amended submission:

No objection. Following comments raised:

- Maintains previous response with regards to air quality (24.10.2017)

## **2.45 Publicity**

541 letters sent on the 28th July 2017 (expired 24<sup>th</sup> August 2017)

18 site notices were posted on the 31st July 2017 (expired 24<sup>th</sup> August 2017)

Press adverts in the Bromsgrove Redditch Standard newspapers on 28<sup>th</sup> July 2017

541 re-consultation letters sent on the 13<sup>th</sup> October 2017 (expired 27<sup>th</sup> October)

## **2.46 Neighbour Representations**

**466** representations were received from local residents in Objection.

The following issues have been raised:

- **Principle/Need**

No need for the development

Brownfield land and vacant premises should be utilised first

Development should be located adjacent a motorway

Site should be developed for housing in preference to employment uses

The end users are not identified

- **Loss of Green Belt/Greenfield**

The development would result in the loss of greenfields, green belt and trees



- **Ecology/Biodiversity**

The proposal would have a detrimental impact upon ecology / wildlife  
Reports are out of date  
Harm to Ipsley/Alders SSSI

- **Transport/Highways**

The proposal would result in traffic congestion on roads which are already heavily congested  
The A4023 and A435 cannot cope with extra traffic  
HGV's will use inappropriate roads  
A bypass should be built for Studley  
HGVs should be banned from Studley  
Enforcement of HGV routing  
No vehicular access should be allowed from Farm Moor Lane  
The development would encourage 'rat running'  
Insufficient parking is proposed  
The development would lead to overspill parking in Far Moor Lane  
There is a lack of connections to public transport  
The new junction will cause traffic chaos  
The development would prejudice road safety

- **Amenity/Pollution**

The development would result in noise nuisance and consequent loss of amenity during and following construction  
The development would have an adverse impact upon air quality (especially in Studley)  
The development would have an adverse impact upon the quality of life of the local community  
The development would adversely affect health  
The development would cause light pollution  
The development would be visually intrusive and detract from the outlook enjoyed by occupiers of the adjacent residential development  
The development is too high and too close to Longhope Close  
The development would result in litter  
The buildings are too high  
There is no timescale of the development  
The hours of operation of the development should be restricted

- **Heritage**

The development would have an adverse impact upon the setting of listed buildings (particularly Gorcott Hall)

- **Flooding**

The development could cause or exacerbate local surface water flooding issues  
Surface water drainage is inadequate

- **The other following issues have also been raised:**

The proposal would result in an influx of migrant workers  
Precedent for further development  
The development would have an adverse impact upon house prices

Petition with 35 signatures received. Grounds for objection:

- Lasting impact
- Development would inevitably bring:
  - more heavy goods traffic
  - more pollution
  - more noise
  - effect the hydrology of the area
  - further development of green spaces

Petitions objecting to the application on the same grounds as above received for each of the following roads:

- Hollyberry Close – 101 signatures
- Illshaw Close – 73 signatures
- Kingham Close – 56 signatures
- Gateley Close – 21 signatures
- Flaxley Close – 47 signatures
- Furze Lane – 5 signatures
- Jays Close – 18 signatures
- Prestbury Close – 21 signatures
- Hindlip Close – 8 signatures
- Various – 140 signatures

### **3.0 Relevant Policies**

- 3.1 The adopted Development Plan setting out the planning policy provisions relevant to development on the site as a whole comprise the following:

Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy (2016)  
Bromsgrove District Plan (2017)  
Redditch Local Plan No.4 (2017)

### **3.2 Bromsgrove District Plan**

- BDP1 Sustainable Development Principles
- BDP5B Other Development Sites
- BDP6 Infrastructure Contributions
- BDP13 New Employment Development
- BDP14 Designated Employment
- BDP16 Sustainable Transport
- BDP19 High Quality Design
- BDP20 Managing the Historic Environment
- BDP21 Natural Environment
- BDP22 Climate Change
- BDP23 Water Management
- BDP24 Green Infrastructure
- BDP25 Health and Well Being

### **3.3 Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy (2016)**

Relevant Policies in the Development Plan for this application are

- CS.1 Sustainable Development
- CS.2 Climate Change and Sustainable Construction
- CS.3 Sustainable Energy
- CS.4 Water Environment and Flood Risk
- CS.5 Landscape
- CS.6 Natural Environment
- CS.7 Green Infrastructure
- CS.8 Historic Environment
- CS.9 Design and Distinctiveness
- CS.10 Green Belt
- CS.15 Distribution of Development
- CS.22 Economic Development
- REDD.1 Redditch
- REDD.2 Redditch
- CS.25 Healthy Communities
- CS.26 Transport and Communications
- CS.27 Development Contributions

### **3.4 Redditch Local Plan No.4 (2017)**

Policy 16 Natural Environment

Policy 22 Road Hierarchy

Policy 24 Development within Primarily Employment Areas

### **3.5 Others**

- NPPF National Planning Policy Framework
- NPPG National Planning Practice Guidance
  
- Worcestershire County Council Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3)
- Stratford on Avon District Design Guide (information guidance)
- Historic England Good Practice Notes 2105:
  - GPA 1 – The Historic Environment in Local Plans
  - GPA 2 – Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment
  - GPA 3 – The Setting of Heritage Assets
- Air Quality Action Plan for Alcester Road, Studley
- Warwickshire Local Transport Plan (2011-2026)
- Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines 1993
- Planning and Community Safety – Design and Crime Reduction 2006: Planning Advice Note (informal guidance)
- Green Infrastructure Study for Stratford on Avon District Council (2011)
- Stratford on Avon Employment Land Assessment 2011

- Corporate Strategy 2015-2019
- Stratford on Avon Business and Enterprise Strategy 2012-2015
- Stratford District Partnership 2026 Vision – Sustainable Community Strategy
- Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3)
- National Character Areas 17.07.2012
- Guidance on Transport Assessment published jointly by Department for Transport and Department for Communities and Local Government 2007

### **3.6 Redditch Borough Plan**

- 3.6.1 The Redditch Borough Local Plan 4 was adopted on 30 January 2017 for the period 2011-2031
- 3.6.2 Only a small part of the site providing pedestrian access into the main area of development lies within Redditch borough. However, the justification for the allocation of Redditch Gateway with Bromsgrove and Stratford-on-Avon is derived from the objectively assessed needs of Redditch. Redditch Gateway is therefore identified on the plan's key diagram.
- 3.6.3 BoRLPNo.4 Policy 23 identifies the employment land requirements for Redditch and notes that Redditch Gateway *is "a key initiative for employment provision to meet Redditch related employment needs."* Around 10ha is therefore allocated with Bromsgrove District adjacent to the existing Ravensbank development and further land in Stratford-on-Avon at Gorcott (c 7ha) and Winyates Green (c 12ha).
- 3.6.4 The policy continues that the development will provide a significant enhancement to the employment land supply through the creation of a "high profile and highly accessible" employment scheme that will benefit from links to the M42/M40 corridor, able to help support existing business in Redditch and provide opportunity to diversify the employment base.
- 3.6.5 Development requirements include the need for a comprehensive development on the basis of a phased Masterplan that provides for high quality employment in a landscaped setting and have a co-ordinated, Masterplan approach to delivering a new primary access.

### **4.0 Relevant Planning History**

This application has also been submitted to Redditch Borough Council and Stratford District Council

### **4.1 Redditch**

17/00700/OUT (Redditch) PENDING Consideration by Redditch Borough Council  
Scheduled committee date: 13<sup>th</sup> December 2017

## **4.2 Stratford**

17/01847 (Stratford) Pending Consideration by Stratford District Council  
Scheduled committee date: 6<sup>th</sup> December 2017

89/00702/FUL (northern parcel) A435 And A4023 Interchange Land to the north west of Adam Lane Mappleborough Green - Business And Science Park within Use Class B1 Withdrawn 07.02.1990

00/02173/OUT (southern parcel) Residential development (outline)  
Withdrawn 12.03.2002

## **4.3 Bromsgrove**

There is no relevant planning history for that part of the proposed site within Bromsgrove District.

## **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL**

### **5.0 Site Description**

- 5.1 The site extends to approximately 31.5 ha (78 acres) and is within two main land parcels to the north and south of the A4023 Coventry Highway, a main dual carriageway arterial road linking from the A435 which forms the eastern boundary of both parcels.
- 5.2 The site lies on the edge of the built-up area of Redditch, approximately 2.5 miles from the town centre. The land is presently in agricultural use.
- 5.3 To the north of the A4023, the northern parcel (10.28ha) increases in level in a north/easterly direction and is formed from a series of fields, currently grazed and defined by semi/mature hedgerows. Trees are generally confined to the hedgerows except for a few isolated specimens. The Blacksoils Brook bisects the northern parcel along an approximately north-east / south-west alignment. A former chalk pit is evident within one of the fields.
- 5.4 To the south of the A4023, the southern parcel (21.24 ha) is relatively flat and in a broadly triangular shape. As with the northern parcel, it is formed by a series of fields defined by hedges.
- 5.5 Land both immediately north and south of the A4023 is set lower than the level of the road. The A435, part of the strategic highway network, linking Birmingham and Evesham (via the A46 and crossing the M42) forms the eastern boundary. It changes from a dual carriageway to single carriageway towards the southern boundary of the site as it approaches Mappleborough Green.
- 5.6 Two public rights of way, namely 585(C) and 588(D) cross the northern part of the application site, (within Bromsgrove's jurisdiction), and emerge on the northern side of the A4023 Coventry Highway, where they intersect with rights of way

799(C) [running north west towards Ravensbank Drive] , 800(C) [running south east along the western edge of the site], and 641(C) [which links to Far Moor Lane just south of the Blue Inn].

- 5.7 The site is neither within nor adjacent to a Conservation Area and does not include any statutorily or locally listed buildings. The site is not subject to any Tree Preservation Orders.
- 5.8 The majority of the land to the north of the northern land parcel is formed by agricultural land and mature woodland. The exception to this is Gorcott Hall, a Grade II\* listed building and associated grounds (containing related listed structures) whose boundary with the site is formed by a mature hedge. The northern parcel is bounded to the west by existing employment developments including the Ravensbank Business Park. The southern boundary to the northern development land is formed by the A4023.
- 5.9 The A4023 and A435 also form the respective northern and eastern boundaries to the southern, development land parcel. To the west lies existing commercial development (hotel and car showrooms) and established residential development off Far Moor Lane. A pedestrian footpath 800(C) runs along the western and southern site boundaries, south of which is Longhope Close, including Lower House, a Grade II listed building. A screen of mature trees and hedgerow also runs along the eastern boundary. To the southeast of the site and on the other (eastern) side of the A435 are the School and Yew Tree and Church Cottages and the School House (formerly 1 and 2 School Cottages), which are Grade II Listed.

## **6.0 Proposal**

- 6.1 The application is a hybrid application through which:
- outline planning permission is sought for the whole site for the development of up to 90,000sqm of employment floorspace falling within Use Classes B1, B2 and B8. B1 use will be restricted to 10% of the total floorspace and will be a combination of ancillary floorspace within the B2/B8 buildings and freestanding smaller units
  - full planning permission is sought for Phase 1 of the ground engineering works

### Outline

- 6.2 A series of employment zones are proposed, accessed in the northern parcel from a central spine road that would run alongside a retained ecological and landscape corridor including the Blacksoils Brook. In the southern parcel, the development zones would be accessed from a new road that will run parallel to the western boundary. The proposed zones are identified on the Parameters Plan (ref 5372-205C), the Plot Area Plan (ref 2372-066E) and the Illustrative Masterplan (ref 5372-203 rev A).

- 6.3 Ground engineering works would be required to create the development plateau for each employment zone in the northern area. The precise levels changes would be dependent upon the size of the eventual buildings. The final ground levels are not therefore confirmed at this stage. Notwithstanding this, through the pre-application discussion with the three Councils there has been a requirement to ensure that the buildings do not exceed a certain height in order to ensure that the setting of Gorcott Hall is protected. The Parameters Plan therefore sets a maximum level above AOD beyond which the building heights will not be able to project.
- 6.4 The Parameters Plan also identifies that the building heights would be restricted to between 9m and 21m above development plateau ground level. The lower buildings would be sited at sensitive locations in relation to existing surrounding development.
- 6.5 The Parameters Plan also identifies zones for landscaping, planting and new features to be created as part of the sustainable drainage as well as green corridors between development plots. Principal amongst these green zones will be the area retained to the south west of Gorcott Hall to retain the setting of this listed building. Boundary hedgerows and trees plus the Blacksoils Brook and associated vegetation will be retained and enhanced through additional tree and hedge planting. Trees and hedges within the proposed development plots would be required to be removed. Compensatory planting would be secured as part of the future detailed landscaping proposals.
- 6.6 The proposal would require a diversion of public right of way number 585(C) under section 257 of the Town and Country Planning Act.
- 6.7 Internal roads do not form part of the current application proposals. Detailed designs for these would come forward as part of the subsequent submissions for reserved matters, if this application is approved. An illustrative layout plan (not for determination at this stage) shows an example of how the quantum of development might appear, if constructed within the tolerances proposed on the parameters plan.

#### Full Planning Permission

- 6.8 Approval is sought for the access into the site and the initial length of carriageway within the site. Access is proposed from a new signal controlled crossroads junction on the Coventry Highway (drwgs BMT/2116/100-01 rev P9 and 100-02 rev P2). The new junction would provide for all movements and require modification to the exiting lanes of the A4023 to create relevant lanes to access/egress the site.
- 6.9 The engineering works are required to facilitate the access into both the northern and southern parcels and to undertake the works necessary to create the first development phase. The overall area of works is approximately 2.47ha. Drawing BWB-HGT-01-DR-D-612 rev P1 outlines the extent of the area of works required, notably for the development platform and identifies the resulting contour levels. These would result in banking being created around the edges of the development

platform. The banking would be composed of soil with no requirement for retaining structures.

- 6.10 Drawing BWB-HGT-01-DR-D-637 rev P1 provides a north-south and east-west section through the proposed platform showing the existing and proposed profile. It is expected that 6336m<sup>3</sup> of soil will be disturbed by the cut and fill. Surplus material from the operation would be used to create the support for the proposed access. There would be no requirement for soil to be disposed of off-site.

## **7.0 Planning Judgement**

The main issues for consideration in this case relate to the following:

- 8.0 Principle of Development
- Economic Impact
- Visual Impact
- Residential Amenity
- Air Quality
- Traffic
- Parking
- Surface Water Drainage
- Built Heritage
- Biodiversity
- Public Rights of Way / Accessibility
- Loss of Agricultural Land

Each matter will be given consideration under a separate heading below along with any other material considerations.

## **8.0 Principle of Development**

- 8.1 The site is allocated for employment use in the Bromsgrove District Local Plan (adopted January 2017), the Redditch Borough Plan (adopted January 2017) and the adopted Stratford District Core Strategy.
- 8.2 The need for the development has been established through the preparation and Examination of the Redditch Local Plan.
- 8.3 BDC and its neighbouring Local Planning Authorities are required to identify sites to meet the employment needs during their respective plan periods.
- 8.4 The objective is to assist in meeting the employment requirements of Redditch.
- 8.5 The BDP includes a site specific policy BDP5 – Strategic Site Allocations, in particular, BDP5B – Other development Sites, which identifies sites outside of the town of Bromsgrove that will contribute towards the development requirements. That part of the application site situated within Bromsgrove is described as Ravensbank expansion site (for Redditch's needs)



8.6 The SADCCS and BDP are up-to-date adopted local plans and both allocate the site for employment development within classes B1, B2 and B8. The proposals therefore accord with the principal provisions of the land use allocation and SADCCS policies CS.22, REDD.1 and REDD.2 and BDP policy BDP5B

8.7 The site is allocated for employment uses within each of the three authorities' local plans, as follows:

***Redditch Local Plan 4 (Adopted January 2017)***

8.8 Only a small portion of the site providing pedestrian access to the development is contained within the administrative area of Redditch; however the justification for the allocation of the 'Gateway' is in order to meet the employment needs of Redditch.

8.9 BoRLP Policy 23 outlines the employment land requirements for Redditch and notes that the Redditch Gateway is a key initiative for employment provision to meet Redditch related employment needs.

8.10 The western edge of the site within Redditch Borough is a designated Special Wildlife Site to which BoRLP Policy 16 applies.

***Bromsgrove District Plan (Adopted January 2017)***

8.11 The Bromsgrove District Plan includes a site specific policy on the Redditch Gateway. Policy BDP5B, identifies that 10.3ha of employment land is allocated in order to meet Redditch's needs. The reasoned justification in Para 8.50 identifies that "This site is located to the South/East of the existing Ravensbank site and is approximately 10 hectares in area. The original employment site caters for Redditch Borough's needs and it is envisaged that this expansion site will provide additional capacity for Redditch's future needs on a similar basis."

***Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy (Adopted July 2016)***

8.12 The Core Strategy provides the strategic context for development with the District up until 2031 and includes two site specific policies pertaining to this particular site. The policies are REDD.1: Winyates Green and REDD.2: Gorcott Hill. These two policies reflect the areas of land to the north and south of the A4023 and comprise the balance of the 'Gateway' site. These site specific policies also seek the following from the development of the site:

- Provide for a minimum of 15% of total floorspace within Class B1(a) and Class B1(b) research and development uses;
- Vehicle access off A4023;
- Protect character and setting of Gorcott Hall
- Retain mature hedgerows and trees on the site
- Traffic management and mitigation measures on A435 as appropriate
- Pedestrian and cycle links across A4023 to adjacent residential areas
- Protect and enhance the Pool and Blacksoils Brook
- Protect priority habitats within the site

- 8.13 Whilst the proposed application is considered to be in broad conformity with the adopted policies and designations of all three plans; one of the areas where there is considered to be some inconsistency is in relation to the amount of office space required by the policy within the Stratford Plan. It is worth noting that the allocations within the Redditch and Bromsgrove Plans are for developments within the use classes B1, B2 and B8 and there are not any further restrictions placed on the site in terms of thresholds.
- 8.14 The submitted proposals will provide for circa 10% of office floorspace to be for B1 use, and it is likely that this use will come forward as office space as a component of larger industrial manufacturing or warehouse buildings where typically at least 10% of the space is for office use.
- 8.15 Given the departure from the adopted policy position, the applicants have submitted further market evidence (undertaken by Savills) to identify why the 15% office requirement is not deliverable and this has been independently assessed by Stratford, via the report prepared by Cushman and Wakefield in March 2017. The conclusions of both reports are as follows:

**Savills:**

*“The adopted policy requirement of 15% office floorspace is unlikely to deliver office floorspace due to the market conditions described. Areas of this important site may therefore not be developed and will not make a meaningful contribution to the employment land supply, precluding the development of B1c/B2/B8 floorspace for which there is a very strong demand and potential to generate high quality and varied employment opportunities.”*

**Cushman and Wakefield :**

*“It is therefore our opinion that the information provided by Savills in their report is consistent with the market, and that stand-alone offices are very unlikely to be developed on Redditch Eastern Gateway. In our view, reserving land specifically for this use would sterilize the land so reserved, resulting in the creation of fewer jobs.*

- 8.16 *However, a significant amount of office space will be developed as part of a more B1c, B2 and B8 focussed scheme, with the proportional element of the building built as office increasing compared to historic levels. On this basis, the take up of the site will be quicker, with the consequent earlier creation of jobs.”*
- 8.17 I agree with the market assessments and subsequent conclusions provided within these documents. With this evidence in mind, it is considered appropriate to take a view that does not strictly accord with policies REDD.1 and REDD.2 of the adopted Core Strategy for Stratford. This would enable the site to come forward at an appropriate pace to meet market demand and will ensure that is not sterilized and left undeveloped.
- 8.18 As explained above, the site is allocated for development under Policies REDD.1 and REDD.2 of the Core Strategy. Prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy and associated allocation of this site, the northern development parcel (covered by REDD.2) was located within the Green Belt.

- 8.19 Policy CS.10 of the Core Strategy removed this section of land (which extended to approximately 9.8 hectares in area) from the Green Belt.
- 8.20 The Exceptional Circumstances for this (as outlined within the explanatory text to CS.10) being that, through joint working with RBC and BDC, land in Stratford on Avon District should be identified for employment uses to meet the needs of Redditch. The employment Land Review Update for Redditch identifies a shortfall of 27.5 hectares of land that cannot be accommodated within its boundaries.
- 8.21 A study commissioned by North Worcestershire Economic Development and Regeneration identified land at Winyates Green (southern development parcel), and Gorcott Hill (northern development parcel), as the best option available to meet this shortfall. The southern development parcel is outside the Green Belt but is only 12 hectares in size. Furthermore, a new access of the A4023 Coventry Highway is required to gain access to both sites. The cost of this would not be viable unless both areas are made available for development.
- 8.22 In light of the above exceptional circumstances, the northern development parcel was removed from the Green Belt under Policy CS.10 of the Core Strategy.

## **9.0 Economic Impact**

- 9.1 It is important to note the wider economic context in which this site is viewed. The site is identified within the Worcestershire Local Enterprise Partnerships' (LEP) Strategic Economic Plan, highlighted as one of four 'Game Changer' sites within Worcestershire. The focus for this site is to:

*“Create a high quality business park to attract and safeguard investment and employment, with a target being advanced engineering businesses.”*

- 9.2 The site is also referenced as a key economic growth and regeneration project in the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Strategic Economic Plan, as follows:

*“Redditch Eastern Gateway is an identified employment site situated on the outskirts of Redditch. The Gateway’s strategic location takes full advantage of the M40/M42 motorways and just a 20 minute drive time to Birmingham International Airport and railway station, with the potential for 100,000 square metres of high-profile employment development, 2,000 jobs and an additional £90 million of GVA. GBSLEP is working closely with Worcestershire LEP on this opportunity.”*

- 9.3 The site is, therefore, a key development opportunity for both Worcestershire and Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP's that will help to attract and safeguard investment within the Redditch area. There is strong support for these proposals from both Local Enterprise Partnerships recognising that the site will provide important space for new commercial development, which is in short supply within the area.

### ***Economic Development Priorities for Redditch***

9.4 Whilst the proposal lies substantially within Stratford upon Avon and Bromsgrove administrative areas, the site was primarily identified to meet the employment needs of Redditch. In this regard the proposal will contribute to the key aims and objectives identified in the adopted '*Economic Priorities for Redditch*'. Some of the key priorities identified within the Strategy that are pertinent to this proposal, include:

- Ensuring that sufficient land for employment is allocated;
- Provide support for growing businesses
- Keep employment land provision under review to ensure that we have an adequate supply to meet business growth requirements.

9.5 The current application would enable Redditch to meet some of its key economic aspirations for the Borough and this should be taken into account in the determination of this application.

### **10.0 Design Principles and Parameter Plans**

10.1 The parameters plan provides land uses, building heights, indicative internal circulation routes, pedestrian/cycle access points and green infrastructure (to include perimeter planting, landscaping buffer zone adjacent to Gorcott Hall and retained grassland to the southern tip). Assessing each of these in turn:

***Land use*** – the location and maximum extent of land proposed for development is shown. Being proposed for employment use only, the vast majority of the site is shown as employment zones to comprise buildings with associated car parking and servicing areas. An employment zone for parking only lies adjacent to its north boundary, with a landscaping buffer zone to its northeast boundary and retained grassland to its southern tip.

***Building heights*** – the plan prescribes the maximum heights of buildings within the site, also providing a height as measured from AOD to ensure that the heights are complied with if any regarding occurs. The southern development parcel proposes a maximum height of 21m, not to exceed AOD 124.75. The western part of the northern development parcel also proposes a maximum height of 21m, not to exceed AOD 128.0. The middle section of the northern development parcel proposes a maximum height of 15m, not to exceed AOD 124.0, whilst the eastern section of the northern development parcel proposes a maximum height of 9m, not to exceed AOD 122.0 or 123.0 (depending on the specific location). In general the heights do not vary significantly across the site, with the exception of the north-easterly corner where lower heights are proposed to respond to the Grade II\* listed Gorcott Hall and its associated Grade II listed structures/buildings.

***Access and movement*** – the plan shows the primary access point off the A4023 Coventry Highway, as well as the initial length of carriageway within the site. Indicative internal circulation routes are shown, as are pedestrian and cycle access points. The access arrangements would allow for sufficient vehicular,

pedestrian and cycle routes that link the development to surrounding routes and rights of way.

**Green infrastructure** – the plan shows the provision of perimeter planting to all boundaries of the site, with a landscaping buffer zone to its northeast and retained grassland to its southern tip. Potential areas for SUDS are also shown on the plan.

## 11.0 Visual Impact

- 11.1 Policy BDP1 (1.4f) states that *“In considering all proposals for development in Bromsgrove District regard will be had to the following : The impact on visual amenity”*
- 11.2 Policy BDP19 (High Quality Design) provides a set of principles to safeguard the local distinctiveness of the District and ensure a high quality, safe and distinctive design throughout the development.  
The proposed development would inevitably and permanently change the existing character and appearance of the site, which is presently a series of fields interspersed with trees and hedgerows. The form and scale of development proposed means that buildings will be visible from some public vantage points. This harm has to be balanced against the benefits of the development.
- 11.3 Ground engineering works would be focussed on the northern site. Existing ground levels do not enable the optimal development of the site and remodelling of contours is therefore necessary. This would be achieved through the creation of level development platforms that would create a series of development zones set into the wider landscape and require the creation of retaining structures around the north-eastern edges of the development zones. Those retaining structures would not be evident in views from Gorcott Hall as they would sit lower than the land to the north where the hall is situated. The new buildings would screen the retaining structures when viewed from the south. The Parameter Plan 5372-205C identifies the maximum building heights above AOD for each zone and have been defined to ensure that the visual impact of the development would be mitigated in short and longer views.
- 11.4 The full planning permission element of the application seeks consent to undertake the first phase of the ground engineering works. The submitted drawings identify the areas of cut and fill in order to create a level development platform. The edges to the platform will be formed by contoured banks. The proposals (including the creation of the banks for the proposed access) will not require any soils to be removed from the site.
- 11.5 The main development proposals are in outline only. Consequently, matters of detailed design, layout and appearance (including proposed external facing materials for the buildings) would be subject to the approval of reserved matters and subject to conditions on any approved outline permission. The submitted Illustrative Masterplan identifies a potential layout and the subsequent detailed proposals may take a different form dependent upon the requirements of future occupiers.

- 11.6 Nevertheless, the Parameters Plan, clearly identifies areas for development and areas that will form new landscaped buffers and ecological opportunities. The zones have been identified to provide for the efficient use of the land whilst seeking to minimise impacts on surrounding land uses and establish the potential height and proximity of building to adjoining development.
- 11.7 If permission is granted for the development, I would wish to ensure that the key parameter plans and some of the details and principles of the DAS be “fixed” by way of conditions to guide future developments at the reserved matters stage. Given that this development is likely to be built over a 15 year period, greater flexibility is required to enable future developers to respond to changing standards, requirements and aspirations as the development progresses. On this basis, I consider that a condition could be imposed, requiring reserved matters applications to encompass the principles and parameters set out in the application and supporting documents, thereby providing greater clarity and certainty of the design and layout standards required, whilst acknowledging that national and local standards and requirements may vary over time and thus allow for the potential review of the approved documents.

## **12.0 Residential Amenity**

- 12.1 Policy BDP1 (1.4e) states that *“In considering all proposals for development in Bromsgrove District regard will be had to the following : Compatibility with adjoining uses and the impact on residential amenity”*
- 12.2 A number of existing residential properties are located within close proximity to the site, the closest being those on Longhope Close adjacent to the southwestern tip. The Wynyates Green estate lies to the western side of Far Moor Lane with properties backing onto that road. There are a small number of residential properties dispersed along the opposite edge of the A435 which forms the eastern boundary.
- 12.3 I have had regard to the height details on the submitted parameters plan in conjunction with the separation distances which would remain between residential properties and employment zones.
- 12.4 At its closest, the employment zone located within the southern development parcel would be located approximately 23m from the nearest residential property on Longhope Close, beyond an existing soft landscaped boundary to the application site. This soft landscaped boundary is proposed for retention and strengthening and, adjacent to Longhope Close, would extend to a minimum depth of 20m.
- 12.5 Buildings in this zone could be up to a maximum height of 21m, not to exceed AOD 124.75, however, matters of layout and scale which would determine the siting and massing of buildings are reserved. This means that a subsequent application for approval of those details would be required. Accordingly, subsequent consideration of detailed designs, would provide an opportunity for the

Local Planning Authority to consider the proximity of proposed development to nearby residential properties. Consequently it would be possible to ensure that separation distances between dwellings and proposed buildings/associated service yards are sufficient to ensure there would be no unduly adverse impact in terms of overbearance, loss of light and loss of privacy.

- 12.6 The closest dwelling to the west side of Far Moor Lane is located approximately 40m from the development site. Again, development in the nearest employment zone would be 21m in height, not to exceed AOD 124.75. As above, subsequent applications for reserved matters would enable the Local Planning Authority to control matters of layout (including siting of buildings and servicing areas) in addition to scale and appearance which will enable careful consideration to be given to the impact of the detailed design of the development with regard to neighbouring residential development when those proposals come forward.
- 12.7 Subject to consideration of the detailed design of any forthcoming reserved matters submissions, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not have an unduly adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenity.
- 12.8 The application seeks 24 hour operation in order to meet potential occupier requirements. This is to ensure that the development remains competitive and suitable for the widest range of potential occupiers.
- 12.9 In terms of traffic noise impacts from within the development, the Environmental Statement concludes that noise generated will be below the ambient noise background of general traffic noise from surrounding roads. Mitigation measures are suggested in order to reduce noise disturbance arising from the service yards including orientation of buildings and appropriate yard boundary treatment. A condition to ensure these details are submitted as a component of any subsequent reserved matters applications is recommended.
- 12.10 It is envisaged that noise arising during the construction phase would be mitigated through a Construction Environment Management Plan, alongside an hours of working condition.

### **13.0 Light pollution**

- 13.1 As the majority of this application is in outline form, specific lighting detail has not been provided at this stage. The Design and Access Statement confirms that lighting would be the subject of subsequent reserved matters submissions, the specific detail of which would be assessed and subject to LPA control at that stage.
- 13.2 Conditions could be imposed in order to reduce the impacts of lighting both during the construction phase and operational stage. Subject to this, and in conjunction with appropriate lighting design to be submitted at the reserved matters stage, I consider that an acceptable lighting solution would be secured.
- 13.3 I consider that appropriate conditions could control lighting design to mitigate the risk of harm to neighbouring residential amenity.

## 14.0 Noise and Vibration

- 14.1 Policy BDP19 (19 .1t) *“The Council will deliver high quality people focused space through: t. Development proposals should maximise the distance between noise sources (for example motorways) and noise sensitive uses (such as residential), whilst also taking into account the implications of the existing night time use of the locality”*
- 14.2 A Noise and Vibration assessment forms part of the ES (chapter 12) and refers to the results of noise and vibration assessments carried out on the basis of both the construction and occupation phases of development.
- 14.3 Baseline noise measurements have been taken at four receptor locations that represent the nearest noise sensitive properties to the development site.
- 14.4 The construction noise and vibration activities at the nearest noise sensitive properties vary from a negligible effect to a minor adverse effect during normal daytime operations. Construction works should be undertaken in accordance with ‘best practicable means’ to minimise the construction noise effects.
- 14.5 The vibration arising from the construction works would not be perceptible and no further noise mitigation measures are required to reduce the construction vibration effects.
- 14.6 The change in the daytime road traffic noise levels due to the development is negligible at all receptors with the exception of Gorcott Hall where there is predicted to be a minor adverse effect. The change in night-time level due to the development is less than 1 dB and provides a negligible effect.
- 14.7 The traffic on internal circulation routes within the site is predicted to provide a negligible increase in the ambient noise levels at the nearest receptors. The existing night-time noise level at the nearest receptor indicates that with partially open windows the sleep disturbance criteria is already exceeded and windows would need to be closed to meet the internal target noise level. With open windows the development traffic noise would be below the sleep disturbance criteria within the nearest receptors.
- 14.8 To reduce the noise impact of site activity in the yard areas in the night-time period, a scheme of 3m high noise barriers is proposed around the perimeter of the yards. The barriers provide a small noise reduction such that there are only two receptor sites where the BS4142 assessment exceeds the WRS criteria in the night-time period. However, the highest absolute noise levels at night from site activities, with the scheme of barriers, is well below the threshold for sleep disturbance even with partially open windows. Taking both the BS4142 and sleep disturbance assessments into account the site activity noise level is considered to be a minor adverse effect with the scheme of noise barriers. I consider that this noise attenuation could be secured through conditions and consideration of detailed specifications at the reserved matters stage.



14.9 No objection has been raised by either SDC's Environmental Health Officer or Worcestershire Regulatory Services with respect to noise or vibration and on this basis, I am satisfied that the proposal would not have an unacceptable adverse impact upon neighbouring residential amenity in respect of these issues.

## **15.0 Ground conditions and land contamination**

15.1 Chapter 6 of the ES addresses the effects of ground conditions on the proposal which is supported by a Geo-environmental Assessment Report and Agricultural Land Assessment.

15.2 The Geo-environmental Assessment Report considers the potential for effects relating to ground conditions and contamination surface as a result of the proposed development during both the construction and occupational phases of the development.

15.3 Both the northern and southern development parcels have been used for agriculture, and the contaminative risk is considered to be low.

15.4 WRS have considered the proposal and find the submitted Phase I desk study thorough, includes an appropriate site conceptual model and that the assessment has been carried out in accordance with current guidance and best practice. A preliminary intrusive investigation has also been undertaken comprising general site coverage through the excavation of 29 trial pits. To date the contaminated land risk assessment has not identified any significant risk to end-users of the site.

15.5 Both SDC's Environmental Health Officer and Worcestershire Regulatory Services have raised no objection on the basis of the contamination information submitted with the application. WRS suggest that the above requirements, and any necessary associated remediation, can be successfully dealt with through appropriate planning conditions. I concur with this view.

## **16.0 Air Quality**

16.1 Air quality in Bromsgrove District is predominantly good and the air is mainly clean and unpolluted. There are however a few locations where the combination of traffic, road layout, geography, emissions from plant and machinery such as boilers has resulted in exceedences of the annual average for nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) and fine particulates (PM<sub>10</sub>). Several areas in the District are closely monitored for their air quality level, and a few are designated as Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA).

16.2 Whilst the application site itself does not lie within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), there is one in place in Studley along the Alcester Road A435 (within Stratford-upon-Avon). This AQMA was declared on the 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2006 for exceedences of the nitrogen dioxide annual mean objective.

- 16.3 The Warwickshire Local Transport Plan (2011-2026) seeks to, amongst other things, improve air quality by improving congestion/reduce traffic and encourage people to use more sustainable modes of transport. This Plan identifies the impact of traffic on the A435 corridor as the most significant environmental problem in Western Warwickshire. It states that the A435 between Alcester was de-trunked in January 2008 between Gorcott Hill near the junction with the A4023 and the A46 near Alcester and that in those settlements lying along the section of the A435 to the north of Alcester, (i.e. Coughton, King's Coughton, Studley and Mappleborough Green), there are serious adverse effects on quality of life due to high traffic volumes containing a large number of HGVs. One of the key objectives of the strategy is to deliver improvements that reduce the environmental impact of traffic within the District and improve local air quality in existing AQMAs.
- 16.4 Chapter 13 of the ES relates to air quality and considers, amongst other things, the impact of the development on the Studley AQMA. It states that the AQMA is located approximately 4km south of the site and it is anticipated that traffic generated by the development would have largely dispersed across the network over this distance. It concludes that the development would not have a significant impact on the Studley AQMA as it is unlikely that the development would significantly affect pollutant concentrations within the AQMA.
- 16.5 The ES goes on to state that operational mitigation measures would be developed, with the aim of reducing traffic to and from the development through encouraging more sustainable transport options. These measures are:
- new signal controlled junction onto the Coventry Highway which would include pedestrian and cycle crossing facilities, located at the existing intersection of the existing public rights of way;
  - new footways and shared footways/cycleways throughout the development that would tie into the existing and new facilities surrounding the site;
  - improved bus service infrastructure comprising of bus stops and laybys on the Coventry Highway to allow the existing 150 bus service to serve the site;
  - the introduction of a HGV routing plan to manage the number of HGVs routing through sensitive areas, including the Studley AQMA
- 16.6 The above would be implemented in addition to a Travel Plan. The report concludes that the significance of air quality impacts would be negligible, and therefore there is no need for any specific and detailed air quality mitigation measures.
- 16.7 The applicants have submitted a potential HGV Routing Strategy at Appendix H of the TA. The aim of the plan is to prevent HGVs routing south down the A435 impacting on Mappleborough Green and the AQMA of Studley. The TA states that the advisory HGV routes would promote the use of the A435 (north) and the A4023 Coventry Highway to access the wider highway network. These links provide direct access to the M42, M40 and M5. The principle of this HGV Routing Strategy is accepted by both Warwickshire and Worcestershire Highway Authorities and I concur that this would be effective in preventing a significant increase in HGV traffic through the Studley AQMA.

- 16.8 A condition requiring the submission and approval of a full HGV Routing Strategy as well as the submission of the first HGV routing surveys within 12 months of occupation has been recommended by both Warwickshire and Worcestershire Highways Authorities. In conjunction with a financial contribution of £200,000.00 which would be paid and held for a period of 15 years to allow for HGV mitigation to be carried out where it is deemed necessary, I am satisfied that the impact on the Studley AQMA would be limited.
- 16.9 Worcestershire County Council Regulatory Services has confirmed that due to the location of the site and the current air quality in the local area (specifically within Worcestershire), the air quality impacts of the development would be acceptable.
- 16.10 SDC's Environmental Health Officer has raised concern on the basis of the air quality impact of the development on the Studley AQMA. Although a HGV Routing Strategy is proposed to minimise additional HGV traffic through Studley, the EHO recommends that additional information is submitted prior to determination to ensure a robust understanding of the impacts of this HGV Routing Strategy on the Studley AQMA.
- 16.11 I am satisfied that the principle of a HGV Routing Strategy, in conjunction with a financial contribution of £200,000.00, would ensure that the impact of the development from HGVs on the highway network, specifically on the A435 through the Studley AQMA would be acceptable. On the basis of this, I do not consider that further investigation on this matter is required. The applicant concludes that, in conjunction with a Travel Plan these measures would lead to a negligible impact on air quality and this is anticipated to result from the few vehicles that would inevitably pass through the Studley AQMA. Subject to conditions, I am satisfied that the impact of the development on this AQMA would be acceptable.
- 16.12 Impacts from the development would arise as dust during the construction phase and traffic during operation. For dust, this would primarily result from the earthworks and construction activity. Impacts would generally decline with increased distance from the site with highest risk of impact being within 20m of the site declining to negligible risk at a distance of 350m. The Environmental Statement (Table 13.8) identifies sensitive receptors within these distances. The location of the site, to the north of the majority of existing development means that prevailing wind directions will help minimise risks to existing development and the SSSI from impact from dust.

## **17.0 Traffic Impact**

- 17.1 Policy BDP1 (1.4a) states that *"In considering all proposals for development in Bromsgrove District regard will be had to the following: Accessibility to public transport options and the ability of the local and strategic road networks to accommodate additional traffic"*
- 17.2 The application is accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA). In addition to review by the respective County Highway Authorities, this has been reviewed by Mott MacDonald (MM) (Transport consultants acting on behalf of and

commissioned by Bromsgrove District Council) The proposal would result in a change in existing traffic movements.

- 17.3 The Transport Assessment does not utilise the Bromsgrove and Redditch Highways Assignment Model (BARHAM). The TA instead utilises TRICS trip rate data to determine the projected trip generation. These trip rates have been accepted by both Highway Authorities. Despite some concerns about methodology, MM advise that they consider the trip rates satisfactory.
- 17.4 Census Journey to Work data from 2011 has been utilised to determine the assignment of development trips to the network. The assignment of these trips appears satisfactory. Currently, no trips are assigned into and out of the site from the west. It could be argued that some trips heading south may travel west when leaving the site and use the A435 via Studley, but the Census data indicates only a small proportion head in that direction and the difference would be negligible.
- 17.5 An HGV routing plan has also been devised following discussions with the HAs to reduce HGV routing through sensitive areas including the A435 through Studley.
- 17.6 MM have reviewed the proposed site access Linsig model and consider that the junction has been modelled correctly and would operate well within capacity. Whilst the VISSIM Model has not been reviewed, the results indicate that the proposed development has minimal impact in queues and journey times on the surrounding network.
- 17.7 Highways England raised concerns regarding the sensitivity of the M42 junction 3 to fluctuations in development traffic and requested a level of sensitivity testing. The sensitivity testing utilised a VISSIM model developed by JMP covering the M42/M5 corridor for the years 2023 and 2030. The test agreed upon routed an additional 20% of development traffic via the A435 and through Studley.
- 17.8 The modelling of the M42 junction 3 identified that proposed development traffic does not have a significant impact on the strategic highway approaches, but does slightly increase the queueing on the A435 approaches. Highways England have agreed with the conclusions of the modelling and Worcestershire County Council have requested a financial contribution towards a wider improvement scheme.
- 17.9 BDC's highway consultant's – MM, consider the results included within the TA appear to show low level impact.
- 17.10 Warwickshire County Council commissioned Vectos Microsim to undertake a sensitivity test assessment of the development traffic using the Studley area Paramics model. It appears that a significantly greater amount of traffic has been routed through Studley for this sensitivity test. Despite this, it appears that the development does not have a detrimental impact on the Barley Mow junction or through Studley. Warwickshire County Council agree with the conclusions and state that there are no requirements for capacity improvements on the network as a result. However, Warwickshire County Council has requested a financial contribution towards an HGV routing strategy and a wider HGV signage strategy to minimise impact on sensitive areas including Studley.

17.11 BDC's highway consultant - MM consider that the results included within the TA appear to show that impact on Studley will be minimal. Concerns were raised during the public consultation exercise and during discussion with the Highway Authorities about the potential impacts of HGV traffic for the site using the A435 through Studley, the centre of which is a declared AQMA. The applicant has responded to these concerns by proposing a routing plan that aims to divert HGVs from the A435 to avoid Studley. This has been accepted in principle by both Highway Authorities, although the final routing plan is subject to the formal approval of the Local Planning Authority.

*Opportunities for Sustainable Travel*

17.12 The TA has examined opportunities for pedestrian, cycle and public transport journeys. The existing issue of a lack of pedestrian access is to be resolved with the installation of a shared cycle/footway connecting into the existing cycle routes to the west of the site.

*Parking*

17.13 Parking provision is a detailed design matter. However, the illustrative layout provides an indication to potential parking locations and has been designed with reference to the amount of potential car parking that could be achieved to accord with the Councils' parking guidance

17.14 Parking provision is governed by adopted standards. The illustrative master plan demonstrates that adequate off road parking could be accommodated to serve the quantum of development proposed.

17.15 Providing appropriate levels of parking will mean that all parking should take place within the site. During the consultation exercise, questions were raised about on-street parking and how off-site would be prevented. This is a matter of civil enforcement however, at present there are only limited restrictions on parking on adjoining roads. The applicant can do no more than provide the amount of parking that is permitted by the Council's adopted guidance. I consider that there is sufficient space within the site to accommodate the level of parking which would reasonably be required to service the development proposed.

17.16 A Framework Travel Plan has also been prepared to encourage sustainable travel choices. This will include promoting alternatives to the car (pedestrian and cycling) and use of public transport by improving access via the 150 bus route by providing new bus stops on the Coventry Highway. Two pedestrian / cycleway linkages onto Far Moor Lane would encourage and facilitate ease of access by those modes.

## **18.0 Surface Water Drainage and Flood Risk**

- 18.1 Policy BDP23 (23.1c) states that *“The Council will deliver safe developments with low environmental impact through: Ensuring development addresses flood risk from all sources, follow the flood risk management hierarchy when planning and designing development, and do not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. Where inappropriate developments in areas at risk of flooding are necessary after the sequential test is applied, appropriate designs, materials and escape routes that minimise the risk(s) and loss should be incorporated”*
- 18.2 The application site is located within Flood Zone 1 (lowest risk of flooding). Table 2 of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) classifies buildings used for financial, professional and other services, general industry and storage and distribution as ‘less vulnerable’. Table 3 of the PPG identifies that a ‘less vulnerable’ development within Flood Zone 1 is ‘appropriate’.
- 18.3 The applicant has also provided site specific modelling of the minor watercourses within the site. From this model, a series of site specific inundation maps have been produced showing the extent of the various flood zones across the site at the typical return periods. The model indicates that the channels on site typically become overwhelmed readily, some at even low return periods, resulting in large amounts of shallow sheet flows across the site, particularly across the northern development parcel. The Environment Agency confirm that on the basis of this modelling, part of the development site falls within Flood Zone 3.
- 18.4 The hydraulic model has defined the baseline flood risk from the Blacksoils Brook and minor watercourses and has been used to test the outline development layout and flood mitigation measures to offset the impacts of development in the floodplain.
- 18.5 A map of the proposed water course diversions are provided at Annex 5 of the model, and the same return periods have been simulated following these alterations. The model outputs indicate that overland flows across the site would be virtually eliminated. The exception to this is at the 1000 year storm which would still see some inundation from the Blacksoils Brook channel just upstream of the Coventry Highway embankment and where the diverted tributary 3 meets the Blacksoils Brook. At lower return periods there is almost no overland flow at all and almost all water is held within the proposed watercourse network. In addition, there is a predicted betterment downstream of the proposed development within Ravensbank Industrial Estate and nearby residential areas.
- 18.6 The impact of these alterations to the site’s watercourses has also been considered downstream. The virtual elimination of surface water flow across the site naturally reduces the opportunity for losses through infiltration and pooling across the surface. The hydrograph provided within the model indicates that overall discharge post development is reduced compared to pre-development rates.

- 18.7 It is important that the development incorporates appropriate surface water drainage, not only to manage potential flood risk on site and to ensure that the risk of flooding is not increased off site, but also to ensure that the quality of the water entering the water course is of sufficient quality to avoid any adverse impact on the Ipsley Alders Marsh SSSI.
- 18.8 The development would be designed to ensure attenuated surface water storage to accommodate the 1 in 100 year storm event plus a 40% allowance for climate change. At present, existing water channels are undersized and therefore incapable of accommodating flows in storm events leading to temporary and short-lived localised areas of flooding within the site. A series of measures are identified in the FRA and the Water Management Strategy that would relieve the flooding within the site primarily through the:
- diversion and replacement of existing water channels which will the flow into the Blacksoils Brook
  - introduction of swales and permanently wet ponds that would filter and store water prior to release in to the brook at a controlled rate equivalent to green field run off; plus
  - attenuation tanks including filter traps under areas of permeable paving (storage volume up to 357m<sup>3</sup>)
- 18.9 The LLFAs have confirmed that the proposed features, as described within the hydrology chapter of the ES, are acceptable but have requested the attachment of conditions to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted FRA, the provision of infiltration testing to ensure appropriate means of managing surface water run-off and the submission of a scheme detailing the management and maintenance of the ditch network during construction.
- 18.10 I note that a number of representations have been received on the grounds that the proposal would potentially exacerbate flooding in the area as well as impact on the Ipsley Alders Marsh SSSI which is located outside the application site. These concerns have been given careful consideration in the assessment of the planning application, but the responses from the statutory undertakers do not support these concerns.
- 18.11 The drainage and water efficiency proposals would be subject of further approval at reserved matters stage. However, based on the consultation responses from the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authorities (both Warwickshire and Worcestershire), I am satisfied that the final drainage scheme would be in accordance with the Policies of the Core Strategy, specifically Policies CS.4, REDD.1 and REDD.2.
- 19.0 Built Heritage**
- 19.1 Policy BDP20 (20.3) states that *“Development affecting Heritage Assets, including alterations or additions as well as development within the setting of Heritage Assets, should not have a detrimental impact on the character, appearance or significance of the Heritage Asset or Heritage Assets.”*

(20.6) *“Any proposal which will result in substantial harm or loss of a designated Heritage Asset will be resisted unless a clear and convincing justification or a substantial public benefit can be identified in accordance with current legislation and national policy.”*

- 19.2 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that, *“In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”*
- 19.3 The NPPF outlines various principles and measures to be considered when assessing proposals that have an effect on the historic environment. Para 128 states that local authorities should require applicants to provide a description of the significance of the assets affected at a level of detail sufficient to enable the potential impacts to be considered. The applicant has provided this assessment through Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement submitted in support of this application and Appendix 8.2 of the ES provides a Built Heritage Statement. The Built Heritage Statement confirms that there are no listed buildings within the site itself, but that the development has the potential to affect eight listed buildings.
- 19.4 Where any development has an impact on the significance of a designated heritage asset great weight should be given to the assets conservation (para 132 of the NPPF). Substantial harm should generally be avoided. Where development will lead to less than substantial harm of a designated asset, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including securing its optimum viable use.(Para 134).
- 19.5 In this instance, the key asset being considered is Gorcott Hall, a Grade II\* listed Building and its setting. Gorcott Hall comprises a small country house dating back to the 15th century, but with substantial additions and alterations taking place in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries. The earlier ranges were originally constructed in timber framing, with a mix of brick noggin and lime render infill panels, although some of these elements have been replaced with brick, later additions and extensions have been constructed in brick. It represents a building of great interest, with its various phases of development.
- 19.6 The building is located within its own private and relatively extensive grounds, which themselves form a non-designated heritage asset, whilst a further five listed (Grade II) buildings are located within its grounds:
- Stable, Granary, Barn and attached Animal House
  - Right Gatepier and attached Garden Wall approximately 10m se of Gorcott Hall
  - Left Gatepier and attached Garden Wall approximately 10m sw of Gorcott Hall
  - Right Gatepier and attached Garden Wall approximately 30m sw of Gorcott Hall
  - Left Gatepier and attached Garden Wall approximately 30m sw of Gorcott Hall



- 19.7 The Heritage Statement document draws the conclusion that the harm to the significance of Gorcott Hall is less than substantial, falling within the middle of that assessment and would therefore be described as moderate.
- 19.8 Other assets that have been considered are Lower House on Longhope Close (to the south) and a listed church (Church of the Holy Ascension) and listed cottages (School House , Yew Tree and Church Cottages) in Mappleborough Green (to the east). In each case, the development proposals do not have a direct impact on the architectural quality or the historic importance or fabric of the building. The key issue for consideration is therefore whether the proposed development has an acceptable impact on the setting of the buildings.
- 19.9 The setting of the heritage assets has been subject to considerable discussion with the Planning and Conservation Officers for each local planning authority and Historic England during the evolution of the Masterplan proposals. This has resulted in the retention of the fields to the south-west of Gorcott Hall as part of the site wide landscape proposals and the proposed ground engineering and landscape works in the northern site to create development plateaus. This will enable buildings to be set into the wider landscape whilst retaining the existing setting of the building. Intervisibility between the development and the Hall will also be minimised by the creation of a naturalised, landscaped bund.
- 19.10 With the implementation of the mitigation measures outlined in the Built Heritage Statement, the ES and as shown on the parameter plans, I consider that the impact on the setting of Gorcott Hall is considered to be less than substantial.
- 19.11 A similar assessment is made with regard to Lower House and the listed properties in Mappleborough Green. For the latter, the distance of the proposed buildings, proposed landscaping and restriction on building height is considered to mitigate the limited impact on their setting to render the impact at a very low level of less than substantial harm.
- 19.12 For Lower House, the proposed development is not considered likely to affect the way the building is presently experienced. However, I consider that the proposals to restrict the height of the proposed building closest to Lower House and the proposed enhancement of existing landscape screening would render any impact from the development to being of less than substantial harm.
- 19.13 Where harm is less than substantial, this has to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposals (para 134 of the NPPF).
- 19.14 The proposals are considered to have considerable public benefit through the extent of job creation and employment opportunity for Redditch Borough that will help meet the identified requirements of Redditch and contribute to the wider needs of Worcestershire. For this reason, the public benefits are considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm identified.
- 19.15 In terms of archaeology, the ES noted that the site has minimal archaeological importance with any potential likely to be limited to the Blacksoils Brook. Given the

retention of the brook and its immediate environs, as part of the development, disturbance to these areas is likely to be limited. A condition is proposed.

- 19.16 The County and the District has a responsibility to protect, either by preservation or record, cultural remains within its jurisdiction, and this is emphasised by the National Planning Policy Framework section 12, paragraph 128:

*"...Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation"; and paragraph 141, "...They should also require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted"*

## **20.0 Biodiversity**

- 20.1 Policy BDP21 seeks to achieve better management of Bromsgrove's natural environment by, in addition to other criteria :

*f) Deliver enhancement and compensation, commensurate with their scale, which contributes towards the achievement of a coherent and resilient ecological network;*

*i) Adopt good environmental site practices as appropriate, including in the form of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) where appropriate.*

- 20.2 The baseline information search and ecological studies commissioned by the applicant noted the following:

The majority of the site comprises semi-improved grassland. Two fields in the southernmost part of the site to the site of the A4023 are of greater value but still not considered to be of sufficient value to qualify as a priority habitat hedgerows are dominated by hawthorn and blackthorn with only sparse ground flora. A hedgerow assessment identifies the hedge along the Blacksoils Brook as being the key hedge in the northern site. For the southern site, hedges along the western boundary are considered the most important. The Blacksoils Brook and another stream are identified in the northern site along with two small streams in the southern site. One pond is identified in the northern site; a disused pit, it is mostly dry. In the southern site, there are two small ponds within or adjacent to the southernmost hedge. A small amount of woodland habit is present around the northern pond. Common species of wetland flies and butterflies were identified as present. The identified ponds vary in value and suitability for amphibians. Newts have been identified in several of the ponds (There are no ponds on site within Bromsgrove). No records of reptiles have been found. There are no records of bats on site but the site does offer foraging and commuting value. Subsequent surveys noted foraging and commuting activity particularly along the hedgerow along the Blacksoils Brook and the site boundaries but no particular evidence of roosts except for the potential of one in a tree in the county boundary hedgerow. Roosting activity is considered to be more likely in off-site woodlands. There was no evidence of dormouse in recent surveys. There is badger activity on site.

- 20.3 There would be some loss of trees and hedgerows both within the site and in order to create the new access from the A4023. This will impact on species at a site level but there remains suitable habitat adjacent to the site. Similarly, loss of hedgerows may impact on foraging routes for bats but the retention boundary hedges and proposed additional planting is considered to off-set the negative impacts. The loss of the habitat and ponds will impact on amphibians. Badgers would be affected by the development.
- 20.4 Warwickshire Ecology has advised that the northern parcel of the site has the potential to provide a net biodiversity gain for habitats but a loss for linear features. With regards to the southern parcel, the development would result in a significant loss of habitat but potential gain for linear features. At this stage, the actual losses/gains are unknown. However, subject to the Biodiversity Impacts being monitored through a Biodiversity Offsetting Schedule secured by way of a legal agreement, Warwickshire Ecology have confirmed that sufficient biodiversity offsetting would be achieved.
- 20.5 The Environment Agency has raised concern on the basis of the ecological impacts of the proposed realignment of the small tributaries. Warwickshire Ecology has confirmed that this would be factored into the calculations for biodiversity offsetting and, on this basis, I am satisfied that this matter would be adequately addressed through this means.
- 20.6 In light of the above assessment, and as a result of amended plans being submitted through the course of the application, Warwickshire Ecology have raised no objection to the scheme subject to suitable conditions and the provision of biodiversity offsetting secured through a S106 legal agreement. I am therefore satisfied that the biodiversity impacts of the development are acceptable in accordance with Policy BDP21 and SDC Policy CS.6 and the NERC Act.
- 20.7 SDC Policies REDD.1 and REDD.2 set a number of ecology based requirements which are detailed above. I am satisfied that, so far as is possible, these are secured through the development as proposed and consequently I am therefore satisfied that these policies are complied with in this regard.

## **21.0 Public Rights of Way / Connectivity**

- 21.1 Policy BDP19 (19.1) states that :  
*“The Council will deliver high quality people focused space through: j. Ensuring developments are accessible to all users;  
k. Ensuring permeable, safe and easy to navigate street layouts”*
- 21.2 Two public rights of way, namely 585(C) and 588(D) cross the northern part of the application site, (within Bromsgrove’s jurisdiction) Whilst 588(D) which runs alongside Blacksoils Brook would be preserved alongside that feature within a proposed landscaped buffer, the proposal would require the diversion of public right of way number 585(C). The submitted plans show how 585(C) could be

diverted to facilitate development which still providing a viable route and amenity for users of the right of way network.

- 21.3 Proposed connections to the site from existing public footpath number 800(C) would facilitate cycle and pedestrian access into the site and improve its connectivity with the surrounding area.
- 21.4 In light of the above, I consider that the proposal is considered to accord with the criterion j and k of Policy BDP19.

## **22.0 Crime Prevention**

- 22.1 Policy BDP19 (19 .1t) *“The Council will deliver high quality people focused space through: o. Designing out crime and the fear of crime by incorporating measures and principles consistent with those recommended by ‘Secured by Design’”*
- 22.2 Similarly, SDC Policy CS.9 also seeks to ensure high quality design, an element of which includes measures to help to reduce crime and the fear crime.
- 22.3 Warwickshire Police Crime Prevention Design Officer have raised a number of comments in respect of the detailed design of the development, to include boundary treatments, roller shutter doors, windows and road layout. I am satisfied that at reserved matters stage the crime prevention issues raised can be appropriately incorporated into the detailed design of the scheme and.

## **23.0 Loss of Agricultural Land**

- 23.1 Paragraph 112 of the NPPF states that *“Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality.”*
- 23.2 An Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) study has been submitted with the application and this was updated through the course of the application. This evidences that the 32.42% of the application site falls within 3a, whilst 67.58% falls within 3b.
- 23.4 It states that soil wetness is the most significant limitation to the agricultural use of the site, the key effect of which is a reduction in yield of arable crops caused by damage to roots by prolonged periods of saturation. In practical terms, saturated soils also disrupt access with machinery, particularly in autumn and winter. For pasture, soil wetness can restrict the length of the grazing season. Waterlogged soils are vulnerable to structural damage from vehicle traffic, cultivation and livestock, which can be costly and time consuming to remediate. This also further impedes drainage, increasing the risk of additional damage.
- 23.5 The development would involve the loss of 9.65 hectares of Grade 3a land. This land is interspersed between areas of Grade 3b, which is likely to result in

agricultural management of the land under one system, which would be suited to the lower quality grade.

- 23.6 I acknowledge that some harm would arise through the loss of approximately 9.65 hectares of Grade 3a land and this harm needs to be weighed in the planning balance.
- 23.7 The loss of agricultural land is considered to be outweighed by the benefits to be derived to the local economy through development of the site for employment uses.

## **24.0 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations**

### *Transitional provisions*

- 24.1 The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 came into force on the 16 May 2017. Section 76 of these Regulations outline the revocation and transitional provisions and states:
- 24.2 “Notwithstanding the revocation in paragraph (1), the 2011 Regulations continue to apply where before the commencement of these Regulations-
- (a) an applicant, appellant or qualifying body, as the case may be, has submitted an environmental statement or requested a scoping opinion; or
  - (b) in respect of local development orders, the local planning authority has in connection with that order prepared an environmental statement or a scoping opinion or requested a scoping direction”
- 24.3 The applicant submitted a Scoping Report to SDC in December 2015 and in response the Council issued a Scoping Opinion on the 22 February 2016 upon which Bromsgrove and Redditch Councils were consultees. In light of the above transitional provisions, I therefore consider it appropriate to continue to assess the application against the 2011 (as amended) Regulations.

### *Alternatives*

- 24.4 The EIA Regulations require an ES to outline any alternatives that have been considered to the proposed development, and to provide an explanation for their choice. The applicant in Chapter 4 of the ES has undertaken this exercise in accordance with the regulations and considers alternative location, a ‘do nothing’ approach, a different design and different construction and operational practices.
- 24.5 No details of specific alternative sites considered by the applicant have been provided within the ES. However it does state that the application site is identified as the best employment site and that it has the greatest potential to attract significant inward investment, providing a major employment site opportunity which is both highly accessible and in an attractive environment.
- 24.6 The ‘do nothing’ alternative considers the future situation without the proposed development. The ES states that if the scheme does not come forward an

opportunity to deliver the employment land needed in the region in a sustainable location would be lost. It states that evidence suggests that some businesses within Redditch are becoming constrained by the lack of new employment floorspace available, and current available sites lack the scale, profile and access to satisfy this employment need. In the applicant's view the 'do nothing' alternative is not a realistic alternative option.

24.7 The ES confirms that the layout of the development has responded to development requirements and an increasing understanding of the site and surroundings. Specifically it states that through design evolution, the site capacity was amended as was the location of development and proposed building heights. In addition, amendments were made to the road junction and provision of car parking area in the northern parcel.

24.8 The Parameters Plan submitted seeks to respond to key constraints which have evolved in resolved to baseline assessments undertaken for all disciplines.

## **25.0 Phasing**

25.1 The Core Strategy anticipates that the development (REDD.1 and REDD.2) would be delivered by 2031, the end of the plan period.

25.2 The Planning Statement submitted with the application states that, given the scale of the proposals, development would come forward on a phased basis and would primarily respond to market requirements as proposed to being a speculative development. On this basis, it states that the standard time limits for outline permission (3 year period in which to submit applications for reserved matters to be begun with 2 years of date of approval) is not appropriate.

The applicant instead requests the following timescales:

- a 10-year period within which to submit reserved matters
- a 2-year period within which to begin development following approval of the last such matter to be approved

25.3 I am satisfied with the principle of this phasing which could be secured by way of condition.

## **26.0 Community Engagement**

26.1 Chapter 5 of the ES outlines the consultation which took place at a pre-application stage to ensure that statutory and non-statutory consultees, as well as the local community, had an influence over the evolution of the design of both the EIA proposals and planning application.

26.2 Public events were held at the Blue Inn, Far Moor Lane, Redditch on Friday 21 October 2016 and Saturday 22 October 2016. This involved the following:

- 1,300 invites sent to addresses within Redditch and Mappleborough Green a week before the events

- local MPs, District and County Councillors, Planning Committee Members and key portfolio holders were issued with letters advising them of the events and invited them to attend
- invites were sent to Beoley, Mappleborough Green, Studley and Tanworth in Arden Parish Councils
- information regarding the site and proposals were displayed on exhibition boards
- members of the project team were in attendance to answer any questions
- website created to enable those attending the events to send comments online
- advertisements were placed in local papers (Bromsgrove and Droitwich Standard, Redditch and Alcester Standard and Stratford Observer)
- press articles generated before events (Redditch Standard, Redditch Advertiser, Insider Media (West Midlands), posting of the new story on Twitter)
- one article appeared in the Redditch Standard following the consultation event

26.3 Articles in the local press have also been published since the submission of the application.

26.4 In addition, all technical consultees for the applications were invited to a consultation event held at Redditch Borough Council offices to assist in the coordination of their responses in light of the cross-boundary nature of the submission. The case officers for the application, as well as the agent and applicant were in attendance.

26.5 I am satisfied that the above events, together with other meetings that have taken place, have given appropriate opportunity for third parties, Parish Councils and key stakeholders to engage with the Local Planning Authority and key parties on matters relating to the proposals. It is envisaged that community engagement and stakeholder meetings could continue throughout the reserved matters, construction and post construction stages of development.

## **27.0 Developer Contributions / Infrastructure Provision**

27.1 Policy BDP6 (6.1) states that *“Financial contributions towards development and infrastructure provision will be coordinated to ensure that growth in the District is supported by the provision of infrastructure, (including Green Infrastructure) services and facilities needed to maintain and improve quality of life and respond to the needs of the local economy. This will be documented in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.*

*(6.2) Irrespective of size, development will provide, or contribute towards the provision of: Measures to directly mitigate its impact, either geographically or functionally, which will be secured through the use of planning obligations”*

27.2 Policy CS.27 states that the Council will introduce a Community Infrastructure Level (CIL) to fund infrastructure and community facilities necessary to accommodate growth and to mitigate cumulative impacts.

27.3 There is not an equivalent generic policy for Redditch Borough within the BoRLP.

- 27.4 A multilateral s106 legal agreement is proposed to secure contributions towards off site highway improvements, HGV routing measures and ecological mitigation
- 27.5 The introduction of the CIL Regulations 2010 requires any planning obligations, including financial contributions, sought from developers to be assessed under Regulation 122 of the Regulations. This Regulation states that planning obligations may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission if they are:
1. necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
  2. directly related to the development; and
  3. fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- 27.6 The NPPF and PPF re-affirm the statutory tests set out within Regulation 122.
- 27.7 Requests for the following contributions/obligations have come forward:

#### Highways

£200,000.00 to be paid on first occupation and held for a period of 15 years from its receipt in the form of a bond and management arrangement to support the HGV Routing Strategy and Annual HGV Surveys to be secured by way of condition.

#### Ecology

Biodiversity offset scheme for each phase of development and biodiversity monitoring contribution

### **28.0 Summary of identified Benefits and Harm**

#### **28.1 The proposal would result in the following benefits:**

- Job Creation
- New landscaping and ecology enhancements
- Improved access to footpaths, cycleways, connectivity and access.

#### **28.2 The proposal would cause the following harm:**

- Loss of green field land
- Traffic
- Loss of ecology and biodiversity
- Setting of Heritage Assets
- Loss of Agricultural land

28.3 It is considered that the harm identified could be mitigated through the imposition of planning conditions and any remnant harm would not outweigh the benefits which the development would bring.

### **29.0 Conclusion**

29.1 The NPPF defines sustainable development as having three mutually dependent components. The Framework is clear that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that proposals, where they accord with the development plan, should be approved without delay.



- 29.2 The proposals are considered to contribute to the aims of sustainable development through the following:

**Economic Role** – the proposals have a significant economic role through job creation and helping to meet the identified needs of Redditch. In doing so it would contribute to the wider need of Worcestershire as recognised by Worcestershire County Council and the Worcestershire LEP through their designation of the site as one of the four “*game changer*” sites for the county. As an allocated site within up-to-date local plans it would provide land for sustainable economic development.

**Social role** – the proposals would contribute to the social well being of the area through providing jobs for the local community. This would in turn create additional disposable income that has potential to support other local business and retail expenditure helping to contribute to a thriving local community.

**Environmental Role** – the proposals would create a business development within a landscaped setting that would enhance the local environments through the creation of new improved habitats, increased tree and hedgerow planting, ecological mitigation to protect species and respects the built heritage of the locality. The proposals will be designed to meet the requirements for the efficient use of resources and energy and water conservation.

- 29.3 The site presents a potential ‘Game Changer’ for the Redditch economy. The site will offer new employment opportunities and will help to facilitate growth of existing companies within Redditch that require expansion space, thus freeing up existing units for re-occupation. The site will also be attractive for inward investment bringing new companies and employment opportunities to Redditch.
- 29.4 The site is allocated for employment use within the three adopted Local Plans and there is in principle support for the proposed development.
- 29.5 The site will meet the aspirations set out in the local economic priorities adopted by Redditch, as well as ensuring that both Local Enterprise Partnerships meet their aspirations for new jobs and growth within the area.
- 29.6 The proposals would not result in significant environmental impacts on air quality, noise and vibration, risk of contamination, residential amenity, water resources and flood risk that could not be mitigated by the imposition of conditions and/or legal agreement obligations.
- 29.7 The planning application followed and was informed by extensive pre-application discussion with various stakeholders and consultees, and has been designed to ensure that potential impacts have been addressed or can be satisfactorily mitigated through the appropriate conditions imposed on a planning permission. I consider that the changes proposed through the submission of the amended plans have positively responded to the comments submitted and are considered to comply with the provisions of Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy (2016), Bromsgrove District Plan (2017) and Redditch Local Plan No.4 (2017).

- 29.8 The applicant has therefore shown that they are a responsible and considerate developer willing to make amendments where appropriate to ensure quality of development and management of any impacts.
- 29.9 As outlined in the main application, the development of the site has been identified as one of the key employment development opportunities in the area that will be bring both short and long term economic benefits.
- 29.10 A review of the Transport Assessment by the Council's transport consultants - Mott MacDonald, concurs with the findings of that assessment that the impact of the proposed development would be minimal. This is consistent with the views of both Highway Authorities.
- 29.11 Given the potential economic benefits of the proposals and the general conformity with the local adopted planning policies and economic aspirations, it is considered that the application should be approved.

### **30.0 RECOMMENDATION:**

That **DELEGATED POWERS** be granted to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to GRANT planning permission subject to the applicant entering into a suitable legal mechanism to secure the following:

1. £200,000.00 to be paid on first occupation and held for a period of 15 years from its receipt in the form of a bond and management arrangement to support HGV routing.
2. Biodiversity offset scheme for each phase of development and biodiversity monitoring contribution.

### **Conditions:**

**Please Note:** On this occasion the conditions are presented in a summarised form, to adjust the final wording to ensure compatibility across the three Local Authorities and to take into account phasing requirements of the scheme.

### **Permission definition conditions**

1. Details of layout, scale, appearance, landscaping and any means of access that are not hereby approved (the reserved matters)
2. Application for approval of all reserved matters to be made in accordance with set deadlines
3. Expiration deadlines for implementation of approved reserved matters
4. Approved plans and drawings
5. D AND A

### Pre-reserved matters submission conditions

6. Prior to reserved matters submission a Site Wide Phasing Strategy for:-
  - i. development phases of land the subject of separate reserved matters applications
  - ii. the type and general alignment/route/linking of carriageways, footpaths, cyclepaths for each phase and measures to ensure appropriate network connectivity between each phase
  - iii. the timing of provision of development and infrastructure and utilities (including 'super-fast' broadband) for each phase
  - iv. a site wide strategy for the implementation of SUDs infrastructure
  - v. a site wide strategy for management and maintenance of open spaces and green infrastructure
  - vi. a site wide strategy for mitigating and adapting to climate change including measures for:-
    - i. designing buildings to cope with more extreme temperatures
    - ii. reducing energy demand through efficiency
    - iii. the provision of energy from renewable or low carbon sources
    - iv. minimising water consumption and accommodating 'grey' water recycling
7. Written scheme of investigation (WSI) to be submitted to and approved
8. Final phase not occupied until site investigation and post investigation assessment completed in accordance with WSI

### Pre-commencement/occupation and other conditions

9. Samples/palette of all external materials for each phase
10. Details of parking for persons with mobility impairments/disabilities
11. Details of existing ground levels; proposed finished ground levels; building slab levels and building ridge heights
12. Scheme for provision of adequate water supplies to be submitted and approved

### Highways and transport

13. Construction Environmental Management Plan to be submitted and approved (for reasons of Ecology and Drainage also)
14. Detailed design of the Traffic Signalled Access Junction on the A4023 Coventry Highway to be submitted and approved
15. Detailed design of pedestrian/cycleway connection to Far Moor Lane to be submitted and approved (north)

16. Detailed design of pedestrian/cycleway connection to Far Moor Lane to be submitted and approved (south)
17. Detailed design of A435 slip road mitigation to be submitted and approved
18. HGV Routing Strategy to be submitted and approved
19. Annual HGV Surveys to be submitted and approved (first submission 12 months from first occupation)
20. Employment Travel Plan to be submitted and approved
21. Details of secure cycle parking facilities to be incorporated in design of reserved matters submissions (for reason of residential amenity also)
22. Details of scheme of electric charging points to be incorporated in design of reserved matters submissions (for reason of residential amenity also)

#### Drainage and water

23. In accordance with Flood Risk Assessment submitted
24. Detailed flood mitigation scheme to be submitted and approved
25. Details of surface water drainage works to be submitted and approved (for reason of Ecology also)
26. Scheme to manage and maintain construction materials to prevent them entering or silting up the ditch network to be submitted and approved

#### Protection of residential amenity

27. The carrying out, submission, and approval of the following related to contaminated land to include
  - i. further site investigation
  - ii. detailed site investigation and risk assessment undertaken
  - iii. where site investigation identified remediation required, detailed remediation scheme to be submitted and approved
  - iv. remediation undertaken
  - v. validation report demonstrating effectiveness of remediation carried out
  - vi. any contamination not previously identified to be reporting to LPAs; investigation and risk assessment undertaken and remediation scheme prepared; validation report submitted and approved
28. Details of scheme of low emission boilers to be incorporated in design of reserved matters submissions

Ecology/protected species/landscape

29. Scheme for new watercourse channels diverted around the north of the site to be submitted and approved
30. Scheme for provision and management of buffer zone alongside watercourses on site to be submitted and approved
31. Details of all external light fittings and external light columns to be submitted and approved (for reasons of residential amenity also)
32. Landscape and ecological management plan to be submitted and approved
33. Scheme for the provision of a wildlife tunnel under the A4023 to be submitted and approved

**Case Officer:** Simon Jones Tel: 01527 548211  
Email: [simon.jones@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:simon.jones@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)