



meeting **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

date **18 MAY 2004**

from: **Director of Environment**

agenda item number

9

**RUSHCLIFFE BOROUGH COUNCIL 8/03/01695/CMA
NEW SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS & REMOTE PUMPING STATION LAND
TO THE EAST OF STATION ROAD & LAND OFF SUTTON LANE, ELTON,
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE
APPLICANT: SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD**

Purpose of Report

1. To consider a planning application for the development of a new Sewage Treatment Works on land to the east of Station Road and the installation of a remote Pumping Station on land off Sutton Lane, in the village of Elton. The application has given rise to various concerns principally relating to noise and visual impact and inappropriate site selection. The recommendation is to grant planning permission subject to planning conditions.

The Site and Surroundings

2. The site of the proposed new Sewage Treatment Works (STW) lies to the north of the village of Elton on land directly to the east of Station Road. The nearest properties are Rectory Lodge and The Rectory Bungalow, which are located some 170m and 200m respectively to the south of the site off Station Road.
3. The site occupies the south-western corner of a large, flat arable field. The field has a dyke and mature hedgerow and trees on the southern boundary, with the adjoining field unit forming the northern and eastern boundaries of the site. A row of semi-mature trees together with a mature hawthorn hedge to a height of approximately 2 metres forms the western boundary fronting Station Road. Access to the site is gained from Station Road via an existing field gate.
4. The site of the proposed Pumping Station lies just off Sutton Lane some 65m to the south of the junction with the A52. The facility would be located under and on adopted highway land just opposite the property known as Manor Lodge and adjacent to the Grade II Listed wall structure that forms part of the semi-circular walled Manor entrance to the property now known as The Old Brewhouse. A location plan is attached.

...

Proposed Development

5. The application seeks planning permission for the construction of a new STW together with a separate Pumping Station to the south of the A52.
6. The STW would directly serve a number of properties on the northern side of the A52 on the outskirts of the village of Elton. The facility would comprise an above ground pump enclosure measuring 1.90m by 1.30m by 1.55m in height and a 9m by 3m Submerged Aerated Filter (SAF) unit, within which effluent would be treated. The outlet from the SAF plant would discharge to the dyke to the south of the site. At the point where the outfall exits the site, 2m of mature hedgerow would be removed along the southern boundary of the site.
7. Two additional above ground structures are required in the form of kiosks comprising an enclosure for blowers measuring 2.15m by 1.30m by 0.97m in height and a control enclosure for the starters/telemetry equipment measuring 3.50m by 0.50m by 1.75m in height.
8. All three above ground enclosures would be constructed in glass reinforced plastic and would be coloured dark green. The eastern, northern and part of the western boundary of the compound would be formed by a timber post and perimeter fence, supplemented by a new hedgerow comprising native species of Hazel, Hawthorn and Blackthorn. Landscaping proposals have been provided.
9. The existing field entrance would be utilised to provide access to the STW and does not involve the removal of any existing hedgerow, but merely comprises the upgrading of the gate and surfacing with bitumen from the highway to the gate. The scheme also proposes the construction of a stone vehicular access, running for some 31m, off Station Road. Within the STW compound a grasscrete turning area would be provided.
10. Construction would last approximately four months and would generate some 2 or 3 lorry movements per day and 250 cars/vans over a ten week period. Once the site is operational, traffic would comprise one van per week and one tanker four times a year for removing solids.
11. The scheme would also incorporate a separate Pumping Station off Sutton Lane, which would be submerged below ground level under the highway. The surface would be reinstated to match the existing road surface. The only above ground structure would be a control enclosure measuring 2m by 0.50m by 1.35m in height and would be dark green in colour. This would be positioned between the BT pole and village notice board on the grass verge to the front of the Grade II Listed side wall structure, some 13m from the Manor entrance gates.

Planning History

12. This is the third successive planning application that has been submitted in relation to this particular proposal. The planning history of this proposal is considered relevant because it shows that Severn Trent Water has taken on

board the various objections that emerged out of the first two planning applications and has addressed them with this current proposal.

13. In July 2002 Severn Trent Water submitted a planning application for a new rural sewage treatment works in the field immediately to the south of the current application site off Station Road. This attracted a significant level of objections from Rushcliffe Borough Council, Elton Parish Council, CPRE and local residents. Advice from landscape expertise within the County Council supported this view. The main objection was that the removal of an extensive section of hedgerow to facilitate the construction of a new access would be detrimental to the rural character and visual amenity of the area. The application was withdrawn.
14. The overriding opinion, including that of the Parish Meeting, was that the site immediately to the north of the proposal would be the preferred option. It was considered that this would be a more appropriate site based on the following criteria:
 - a) it would allow access to the site through an existing field gate;
 - b) it would make use of an existing hedge as a screening feature for properties to the south;
 - c) it would avoid the removal of part of a primary hedgeline alongside Station Road and therefore would conform to one of the key recommendations for the Vale Farmlands landscape character area which recognise the need to conserve and strengthen the historic patterns and features of hedgerows and rural lanes.
15. In February 2003 a second planning application was submitted for the siting of the new sewage treatment works immediately to the north of the original application site, as recommended. In order to reduce the turning bay area within the site, thereby reducing the amount of land take in this particular field, it was proposed to build a lay-by in the grass verge at the side of Station Road, as part of this proposal. However, the County Council as Highways Authority objected to this on the grounds that there was no justification for the provision of a lay-by at this location. In their opinion, it would encourage fly-tipping and other cars to legally park at this location with the possibility of obstructing access to the sewage treatment works. The recommendation was that the proposal be amended to incorporate a vehicular access and turning facility within the site.
16. In addition, Elton Parish Meeting raised concerns that the scheme was not proposing to serve that part of the village of Elton that lies to the south of the A52. In the face of these concerns, Severn Trent Water withdrew the application for a second time, in order to submit a proposal that improved the vehicular access off Station Road and provided a Pumping Station to the south of the A52, so that this part of the village could also be served by the new sewage treatment works.

Planning Policies

17. There are several Structure Plan policies that are relevant to the proposal. **Policy 3/1** of the Nottinghamshire Structure Plan (November 1996) refers to the control of development in the countryside. It states that permission will not be granted for development outside the limits of existing built-up areas other than that provided for in the development plan. However, permission will be granted for utility installations requiring a rural location provided that the development is located and designed so as not to adversely affect the countryside environment.
18. **Policy 3/4** confirms that proposals affecting areas of archaeological interest will not be permitted where development would cause damage or would have a major impact on the setting of archaeological remains. Where there is an overriding need for development, conditions would be imposed to ensure adequate provision is made for the site to be surveyed and recorded as appropriate.
19. **Policy 3/22** states that permission will be granted for utility installations in appropriate locations subject to careful siting, landscaping and other measures, which will allow them to be well integrated with their surroundings.
20. **Policy 12/1** considers waste management proposals and the need for the development to be examined against any environmental impact.
21. **Policy ENV17** of the Rushcliffe Borough Local Plan (June 1996) states that permission for new development in the Countryside outside the Green Belt will not normally be granted except for uses essential to the operational requirements of a public service authority or statutory undertaker.
22. **Policy EWT1** states that permission for new utility services will normally be granted provided that they are both designed and sited in order to minimise their adverse environmental impacts. Similar policies are rolled forward in the Replacement Local Plan Deposit Draft (February 2000).
23. Finally, **Policy W8.1** of the Nottinghamshire & Nottingham Waste Local Plan (January 2002) supports the provision of new waste water treatment facilities, unless there are unacceptable environmental impacts.

All relevant policies are set out in Appendix 1.

Consultations

24. **Rushcliffe Borough Council** raises no objection and supports the application subject to planning conditions including any noise and odour mitigation measures deemed necessary to protect the amenities of nearby residents.
25. **Elton Parish Meeting** objects to the proposal mainly on the grounds of the detrimental impact of the Pumping Station on the property known as Manor Lodge and the Grade II Listed Manor gates entrance, in terms of noise and visual impact, the potential for increased flooding and the health and safety implications of having a sewage treatment facility at a location on Sutton Lane

that is used by the village for the mobile library, school bus and where there is a telephone box.

26. They object to the overall sewage treatment scheme as being inappropriate in its use of a pumping mechanism rather than making use of the natural topography of Elton and its location on a hill, through the creation of a gravity fed system. Finally, they consider the scheme to be a wholly inappropriate approach to the village's need for an upgraded sewage treatment system, believing it to be too limited in scope, inappropriately sited and too expensive for the majority of properties to connect into.
27. **The Environment Agency** raises no objection to the proposal and there are no adverse comments from the Environment Agency in relation to flooding and the impact of the works on the local area. However, the Agency states that there must be no contamination of any adjacent watercourses, ditches or any surface water sewers with rainwater contaminated with silt/soil from disturbed ground, or building material or rubbish deposited in any adjacent watercourse.
28. **CPRE** objects to the proposal on the grounds that it is not an appropriate scheme and is contrary to the principles of sustainable development.
29. **Powergen** has made no response.
30. **Transco** has drawn attention to the fact that there is apparatus in the area.
31. **EMEB** raises no objection.
32. **Archaeology** raises no objections subject to a planning condition requiring an archaeological watching brief.

Publicity

33. The application has been advertised by means of a press notice and two statutory site notices, and Neighbour notification letters were sent to the occupiers of Rectory Farm, The Old Rectory, The Rectory Bungalow, Rectory Lodge, The Old Brewhouse and Manor Lodge. Three letters of representation have been received from three separate households. The letters object to the proposal on the following grounds:
 - a) noise and visual impacts of the Pumping Station on the Manor Lodge and Grade II Listed Manor Entrance Gates;
 - b) possible overflow would run onto Sutton Lane and the hard surfacing outside Manor Lodge exacerbating an already existing flooding problem;
 - c) odour problems from the Pumping Station;
 - d) scheme should be capable of serving all the properties of the village;

- e) a random and limited number of properties only will benefit from the scheme;
- f) Elton is located on a hill and a gravity fed system would be more appropriate than a scheme requiring remote pumping stations;
- g) possible problems of flooding of properties adjacent to the new sewage treatment works;
- h) prohibitive cost for many properties of connecting to the new scheme.

Highway Observations

- 34. There are no highway objections.

Observations

- 35. The application is submitted by Severn Trent Water both to improve the current provision of sewage treatment in accordance with the requirements of the European Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive (UWWTD) and to resolve an existing pollution problem. The treatment works would receive foul water flows that currently discharge directly into the small watercourse, which runs along the southern boundary of the field in which the new sewage treatment works would be sited. This scheme has been put forward to provide an appropriate level of sewage treatment for the village of Elton to accord with the requirements of the UWWTD ('Appropriate Treatment Obligation'). The outcome of the proposal would be that effluent would be treated to a higher standard and this would, in environmental terms, improve the quality of the watercourse.
- 36. Following on from the first two submissions, the proposed scheme represents a more comprehensive approach to the existing problem of untreated effluent flowing into the local watercourse. It has taken on board the Parish Meeting's original concerns that the southern sector of the village of Elton was being excluded from the scheme. With this present proposal, the process would involve the effluent being pumped from the south side of the village up to the main new Sewage Treatment Works (STW) to the north of the village. Once here untreated effluent would be pumped through a splitter chamber before being passed through a Submerged Aerated Filter (SAF) in the centre of the STW. Once the effluent is passed through the SAF, the now treated effluent would pass through a measurement and sampling chamber before being discharged into the adjacent dyke.
- 37. Severn Trent Water has determined that for economic and practical reasons it is only feasible to have one treatment site to serve Elton and believe that the current proposed site on Station Road is the best position from which to serve the whole village including any potential future development adjacent to Orston Railway Station, further along Station Road. In reaching this decision, consideration was given to the site preferred by Elton Parish Meeting known as The Haven, which is located on the old A52 to the west of the village.

38. Severn Trent Water rejected The Haven option based on a number of reasons. It was considered technically impracticable to construct a deep open cut gravity sewer from the village to The Haven, because of the extent of engineering operations required to achieve the depth and resultant trench width required. As a result, a tunnelling solution would be necessary and the cost of this would be prohibitive, being in the region of £500,000 for a 350 metre length of sewer and manholes. This would result in a scheme construction cost effectively double that of the preferred option. In addition, the level of disruption involved in this particular scheme would be greater than that associated with the preferred option, given that the intermediate manholes necessary to launch the tunnelling equipment would need to be excavated by digging machines. Finally, the main sewer from the village would need to go along the A52 which, being a trunk road and managed by the Highway Agency, would be subject to more restrictions than a minor classified road type. The applicant has pointed out that The Haven option would not eliminate the need for a pumping station altogether, as is being sought by the Parish Meeting. This facility would still be needed in order to transfer sewage from several sections of Elton, due to a slight rise along the brow of the hill going westward along the A52 that would preclude a gravity option based on the depth of excavation required.
39. With regard to the Parish Meeting's other preferred option of upgrading the existing sewage treatment reed bed facilities within Elton, it is noted that Severn Trent Water did not consider utilising existing sewage treatment provision due to the fact that these systems do not perform to modern standards, are fragmented in nature and would be uneconomic to up date.
40. Whilst the preference would be for a gravity based system as this minimises both operating and maintenance costs, the applicant has pointed out that it is not practicable in Elton to create a purely gravity system without at least one section of the village requiring a pumping station. This is because for a gravity based system to function successfully a positive fall in the pipeline level is required to counter gravity and frictional forces encountered as fluid passes through a pipeline, and in the case of Elton the indicative ground levels are not compatible with this, so necessitating a pumping facility.
41. There are no designated sites of nature conservation interest either at or close to the site off Station Road. Whilst this site is located in open countryside, the STW is acceptable in policy terms in that it does not give rise to any adverse environmental impacts, which might outweigh any recognised need.
42. It is considered that the new STW would have only a moderate impact on the landscape with the loss of a corner of a large arable field and the new stone access road adjacent to the southern boundary taking up a strip of land for a length of approximately 31 metres. The visual impact would be minimised by a row of semi-mature trees and hedgerow to the western boundary of the site, which gives a relatively high degree of screening of the proposed STW from Station Road. Further screening of the proposal is also provided by the mature hedgerow along the southern boundary of the site. The greatest visual impact would be to the upper storeys of the Old Rectory and Rectory Lodge during the construction period and during the winter months. However, the visual impact of

this development would be slight to these properties and those on the northern edge of Elton, due to the amount of intervening existing vegetation that would break up any views, their distance away from the STW and the low level of the structures within the works themselves.

43. The proposed landscaping scheme, which would provide new hedgerow planting to the perimeter fencing of the enclosure would help to visually integrate the STW into its rural surroundings and mitigate any visual impact. The proposed vehicular access directly off Station Road would comprise a stone surface, which it is felt would be visually unobtrusive, having the appearance of a farm track in the landscape and helping to minimise any detrimental visual impact on the local amenity.
44. The issue of noise levels and odour emissions from the proposed STW are of no significance in this particular case. The distance of the nearest residential property from the plant would be some 170 metres and the village will in any event experience high background noise levels from traffic on the A52. The STW would not generate any long-term excessive noise levels either from the plant itself, which is relatively modest in scale with the main elements at or below ground level, or through associated traffic. Whilst it is acknowledged that for the four months construction period there would be noise associated with approximately 350 vehicular trips to and from the site, this would only be for a temporary period. Once operational traffic would comprise only one van per week and one tanker every three months, minimising any noise impact. With regard to odour emissions, the STW is being proposed to treat foul water flows that currently discharge directly into the local watercourse. One of the outcomes of this particular STW is to eliminate odours and once operational no odour problems are expected.
45. It is not considered that the proposed Pumping Station would have a detrimental impact on the Grade II Listed wall and gate structures at the Manor entrance. The majority of the development would be located below ground level with only a concrete cover slab visible, which would be flush with the ground surface in the highway. The only above ground structure would be a control enclosure, which would be small-scale and appropriately sited next to the other utility equipment, namely the BT pole, to the front of part of the side wall some 13m from the Manor entrance gates. In addition, the dark green coloration would minimise any negative visual impact together with its location, being sited away from the Manor entrance. The green coloration of the structure would mean that it would be visually well integrated with the wall, which is heavily vegetated. Noise levels from the proposed Pumping Station would not be greater than existing background noise levels. Finally, the fact that the Pumping Station is fully enclosed, both in terms of the below ground structure and the above ground control enclosure, means that any odours would be mitigated.
46. It is not envisaged that there would be any measurable impact on the area due to the discharge from either the STW or the Pumping Station. No overflow pipe will be present at the Pumping Station. Indeed, the Environment Agency has not highlighted any potential for flooding as a result of this development.

47. In light of the concerns of the Parish Meeting, in relation to the Pumping Station off Sutton Lane, it is noted that Severn Trent Water's works procedure ensures that no additional health and safety hazards would be presented to members of the public during construction, maintenance or operation of the site.
48. Given that the site is located within an area of archaeological interest, with the Pumping Station element of the development taking place within the historic mediaeval core of Elton, it is considered essential to protect the archaeological content of the site. Therefore, a planning condition requiring a watching brief would be necessary.
49. Although there may be more sustainable solutions, the applicant considers this particular solution to be appropriate and there are no planning objections to this proposal. The applicant has pointed out that where practical Severn Trent Water would always pursue a gravity fed option for a sewage treatment works as being the most sustainable approach. It is only where this is not practical that a pumping station option would be adopted. In the case of the village of Elton, upstream of Sutton Lane (Pumping Station site) to the proposed STW to the north of the A52, there is insufficient fall in ground levels to reasonably allow a gravity main. Minimum gradients are required in order to both maintain a flow through the pipe and to prevent sewage settling out in the pipe. The recommended gradient is 1 in 40 to maintain the flow levels and in the case of Elton, although the ground falls, the gradient is actually some 1 in 110 from the proposed Pumping Station to the new STW.
50. To address this problem, the pipe would need to be laid in a very deep trench to a depth of over 8m in order to maintain a 1 in 40 fall, if a pure gravity solution were to be achieved. This is not considered a practical solution, as it would incur additional costs, involve significant disruption to local residents and markedly increase the risk both to contractors laying the sewer and Severn Trent Water's employees in terms of ongoing maintenance of the sewer. This would be contrary to Severn Trent Water's duty of care to design out health and safety risks on its schemes. On this basis, the more sustainable purely gravity system was not considered an option for the village of Elton by Severn Trent Water.

Conclusions

51. The proposed development will provide upgraded sewage treatment provision for an extended number of properties in Elton and bring it into line with European urban waste water regulations. However, it is recognised that the siting of the proposed Pumping Station and STW in these two locations would introduce sewage treatment facilities closer to residential properties off Sutton Lane and Station Road respectively. Therefore, it is important to minimise any loss of amenity for residents and land users. Planning conditions ensuring the implementation of an appropriate landscaping scheme should adequately mitigate any negative impact on the amenity of local residents and land users.
52. It is considered that the comparatively small-scale and low level nature of the development would have a minimal impact on the locality. It can be seen that the

proposed measures of mitigation planting and choice of sympathetic surface materials would help to integrate the new feature into the countryside.

53. Currently, the sewage treatment system is inadequate, relying on open sewer dykes which are clearly not acceptable in environmental and amenity terms and there can be no doubt that a new sewage treatment system is required. It is acknowledged that this proposal has taken on board previous concerns and represents a more appropriate and inclusive scheme.

Statutory and Policy Implications

54. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, equal opportunities, personnel, Crime and Disorder and users. Where such implications are material, they have been brought out in the text of the report. Members' attention is, however, drawn to the specifics as follows:-

Human Rights Act Implications

55. The relevant issues arising out of consideration of the Human Rights Act have been assessed in accordance with the Council's adopted protocol. Rights under Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol are affected. The proposal has the potential to introduce impacts of visual and noise intrusion for residents. However, these considerations need to be balanced against the improved sewage treatment provision for the village of Elton.

RECOMMENDATION

56. It is RECOMMENDED that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 2. Members need to consider the issues, including the Human Rights Act issues, set out in the report and resolve accordingly.

REASON FOR DECISION

57. The proposal has the potential to impact negatively on the amenity of local residents and land users, but is considered capable of being successfully mitigated. The proposal is in accordance with policies of the Development Plan and will bring benefits to an increased number of residents.

PETER WEBSTER
Director of Environment

Director of Resources' Financial Comments

This report considers the planning application and there are no direct financial implications arising. [DJK 6.5.04]

Head of Democratic and Legal Services' Comments

Planning Committee have powers to decide the Recommendation. [SHB 6.5.04]

Background Papers Available for Inspection

Letter from Miss E.M. Mackie, Rectory Bungalow, Elton, Nottinghamshire, dated 30.12.03.

Letter from Mr C.G. Mackie, The Old Rectory, Elton, Nottinghamshire, dated 04.01.04.

Letter from Elton Parish Meeting dated 08.01.04.

Letter from the CPRE dated 19.01.04.

Letter from Mr R. Amer, The Old Brewhouse, Elton, Nottinghamshire, dated 09.02.04.

Electoral Division(s) Affected

Bingham

EPD.DW/EP4522
29 April 2004

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

Nottinghamshire Structure Plan Review (November 1996)

Policy 3/1

PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE THE LIMITS OF EXISTING BUILT-UP AREAS OTHER THAN THAT PROVIDED FOR IN THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN. PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR:

- a) USES APPROPRIATE TO RURAL AREAS, INCLUDING AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY, MINERAL EXTRACTION AND WASTE DISPOSAL TO RECLAIM MINERAL WORKINGS;
- b) APPROPRIATE RECREATIONAL AND TOURISM USE;
- c) UTILITY INSTALLATIONS REQUIRING A RURAL LOCATION;
- d) CHANGE OF USE OF AGRICULTURAL AND OTHER BUILDINGS TO EMPLOYMENT USES WHICH HELP TO DIVERSIFY THE RURAL ECONOMY;
- e) ROADSIDE SERVICES WHICH FILL A CLEARLY ESTABLISHED GAP IN EXISTING PROVISION AND WHICH CANNOT REASONABLY BE MET WITHIN BUILT-UP AREAS;
- f) THE CHANGE OF USE OF BUILDINGS OF ARCHITECTURAL OR HISTORIC VALUE WHERE IT IS THE ONLY PRACTICABLE MEANS OF ENSURING THE RESTORATION AND RETENTION OF THE BUILDING;
- g) CEMETERIES;

PROVIDED THAT THE DEVELOPMENT IS LOCATED AND DESIGNED SO AS NOT TO ADVERSELY AFFECT THE COUNTRYSIDE ENVIRONMENT.

Policy 3/4

PROPOSALS AFFECTING AREAS OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL INTEREST WILL NOT BE PERMITTED WHERE:

- a) DEVELOPMENT WOULD RESULT IN ANY DISTURBANCE TO A SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENT AND/OR ITS SETTING; AND
- b) DEVELOPMENT ON OTHER SITES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE WOULD INVOLVE SIGNIFICANT ALTERATION OR CAUSE DAMAGE, OR WOULD HAVE A MAJOR IMPACT ON THE SETTING OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS.

WHERE THERE IS AN OVERRIDING NEED FOR DEVELOPMENT, CONDITIONS WILL BE IMPOSED TO ENSURE THAT ADEQUATE PROVISION IS MADE FOR THE SITE TO BE SURVEYED, EXCAVATED OR RECORDED AS APPROPRIATE.

Policy 3/22

PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR UTILITY INSTALLATIONS IN APPROPRIATE LOCATIONS SUBJECT TO CAREFUL SITING, LANDSCAPING AND OTHER MEASURES WHICH WILL ALLOW THEM TO BE WELL INTEGRATED WITH SURROUNDING LANDSCAPES AND LAND USES.

Policy 12/1

IN CONSIDERING WASTE MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS THE NEED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT WILL BE EXAMINED AGAINST ANY ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT, WITH PARTICULAR REGARD GIVEN TO:

- a) THE CONTRIBUTION TO WASTE MANAGEMENT OF REDUCTION, RE-USE AND/OR RECOVERY AND, WHERE NECESSARY, SAFE DISPOSAL OR OTHER MANAGEMENT, AS CLOSE TO THE WASTE SOURCE AS REASONABLY POSSIBLE;
- b) THE ECONOMIC USE OF LAND AND AVOIDANCE OF CONFLICT WITH OTHER LAND USES;
- c) THE HEALTH, SAFETY AND AMENITY INTERESTS OF COMMUNITIES AND BUSINESSES;
- d) THE PROTECTION OF THE NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT, PARTICULARLY IN AREAS OF ACKNOWLEDGED IMPORTANCE AND SENSITIVITY;
- e) THE MINIMISATION OF AIR, SURFACE AND GROUNDWATER POLLUTION;
- f) THE SUITABILITY OF THE WASTE MATERIAL FOR RECLAIMING MINERAL WORKINGS, OR OTHER BENEFICIAL USES SUCH AS RE-USE OR ENERGY RECOVERY;
- g) THE ABILITY TO RECLAIM A WASTE SITE WITHIN A REASONABLE TIMESCALE;
- h) THE IMPACT OF WASTE MOVEMENT ON THE TRANSPORT NETWORK (INCLUDING ROAD SAFETY) AND THE POTENTIAL FOR ACCESS TO SITES BY RAIL AND/OR WATER CARRIAGE.

Rushcliffe Borough Local Plan (June 1996)

Policy ENV17

PLANNING PERMISSION FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE OUTSIDE THE GREEN BELT WILL NOT NORMALLY BE GRANTED EXCEPT FOR:

- a) ESSENTIAL RURAL ACTIVITIES INCLUDING AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY AND MINERAL EXTRACTION;
- b) APPROPRIATE RECREATIONAL AND TOURIST USES (SUBJECT TO CRT6, 7 AND 12);
- c) CERTAIN INSTITUTIONAL AND SIMILAR USES STANDING IN EXTENSIVE GROUNDS;
- d) USES ESSENTIAL TO THE OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS OF A PUBLIC SERVICE AUTHORITY OR A STATUTORY UNDERTAKER; OR
- e) PROPOSALS WHICH COMPLY WITH HOUSING POLICIES H1, H4, H5, H6, H7, H8 AND EMPLOYMENT POLICIES E1, E3, E4, E6, E8 AND POLICY CRT1.

Policy EWT1

PLANNING PERMISSION FOR NEW UTILITY SERVICES WILL NORMALLY BE GRANTED PROVIDED THAT THEY ARE DESIGNED AND LOCATED IN ORDER TO MINIMISE THEIR POSSIBLE ADVERSE IMPACT UPON THE ENVIRONMENT.

Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Local Plan (Adopted January 2002)

Policy W8.1

PROPOSALS FOR NEW WASTE WATER AND SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS, OR EXTENSIONS AND RENEWAL OF EXISTING FACILITIES WILL BE PERMITTED UNLESS THERE ARE ANY UNACCEPTABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.

SUGGESTED PLANNING CONDITIONS

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within 5 years from the date of this permission.
2. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the County Planning Authority (CPA) the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the approved Plans Drawing No. 010249/C/708G, 010249/C/714 C, 010249/C/705 C and 010249/C/715 and Drawing No. 010249/C/720 A, 010249/C/722 A, 010249/C/723 A and 010249/C/716 as received by the CPA on the 1st December 2003. The CPA shall be notified seven working days in advance of the date of commencement.
3. No development shall take place until the developer has secured the implementation of an archaeological watching brief, the details of which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the CPA. The watching brief shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.
4. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, measures shall be taken for the protection of all trees and hedges from damage during the course of the development before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purpose of the development. The means of protection shall include measures to prevent disturbance or reduction in soil levels within the area of the root spread of the hedgerows; and the adequate fencing off of all trees. The means of protection shall be implemented and retained on site until all equipment and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within these areas shall not be altered nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written approval of the CPA.
5. Any trees or shrubs which become damaged during the course of the development shall be replaced in the first available planting season with the same specimens to those originally planted; the size of these trees shall be at least 14-16cm in girth and the hedge shrubs 60-90cm in height.
6. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the CPA a landscaping scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on Plan Drawing No. 010249/C/713C, as received by the CPA on the 1st December 2003.
7. Within three months of the date of the commencement of the development as notified to the CPA under Condition 2, details of a maintenance schedule for the landscaping scheme approved under Condition 6 shall be submitted to the CPA for its written approval.
8. All planting or seeding shall be carried out in accordance with the details approved under Condition 6 in the first available planting and sowing seasons respectively following the completion of the development, as agreed in writing by the CPA. The planting scheme shall be maintained in accordance with the

maintenance schedule approved under Condition 7 and good arboricultural practice for a period of five years following its implementation and any plants or trees which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the following planting season with similar species to those originally planted unless the CPA gives written consent to any variation.

9. Except with the prior written agreement of the CPA no construction work shall be carried out or plant operated other than between the following hours: 0730hrs to 1730hrs Monday to Friday, 0800hrs to 1330hrs on Saturday and at no times on Sunday, Bank or Public Holidays.
10. The removal of the 2m of mature hedgerow on the southern boundary of the site, as shown on Plan Drawing No. 010249/C/708 G shall only be carried out outside the bird-nesting season of Mid-March to the end of September.
11. During the construction period there shall be no discharge of rainwater contaminated with silt/soil from disturbed ground from the site into any surface water sewer, ditch or watercourse without sufficient settlement and nor shall any building material or rubbish be deposited into any watercourse.

Reasons

1. To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
2. For the avoidance of doubt.
3. To enable sites of archaeological interest to be adequately investigated and recorded and to accord with Policy 3/4 of the Nottinghamshire Structure Plan (November 1996).
- 4-9. In the interests of amenity for local residents and land users and to accord with Policy 3/22 of the Nottinghamshire Structure Plan (November 1996).
10. In the interests of protecting local wildlife.
11. To prevent pollution of the water environment and to accord with Policy 12/1 of the Nottinghamshire Structure Plan (November 1996).

Note to Applicant

The applicant is advised to contact the Highway Manager a minimum of 7 weeks prior to any works being carried out within the public highway.

The applicant's attention is drawn to the advice from Transco and the Environment Agency.

Please note. Copies of the plan referred to in this report may be obtained from: John Sheffield, Environment, Trent Bridge House, Fox Road, West Bridgford, Nottingham NG2 6BJ, tel 0115 977 4499, email john.sheffield@nottsc.gov.uk or from Peter Barker at the same address, tel 0115 977 4416, email peter.barker@nottsc.gov.uk.