

MEMORANDUM

To : Internal Consultee
From : Mrs G Webster, Planning Services, Blueschool House - H31
Tel : 01432 260139 **My Ref** : 163253
Date : 27 October 2016

SITE: Land at Mirror Brook Smallholding, Stoney Cross, Cradley, Malvern, WR13 5JB
APPLICATION TYPE: Planning Permission
DESCRIPTION: Landscaped acoustic bund to northern site boundary constructed solely of materials arising from earthworks relating to planning consent 153490
APPLICATION NO: 163253
GRID REFERENCE: OS 372387, 247450
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs A Parkhill
PARISH: Cradley

The application form, plans and supporting documents are available in Wisdom.

Please let me have your comments by 17/11/2016. If I have received no response by this date I shall assume that you have no objections. Should you require further information please contact the Case Officer.

Any comments should be added below and actioned in Civica to Mrs G Webster.

COMMENTS: (Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Object

Support

No Objection

Approve with Conditions (Please list below any conditions you wish to impose on this permission.)

Further information required

Consultation response from: **Sarah Lowe, Senior Building Conservation Officer**

The application site, as shown, includes a grade II listed milepost towards the western extent of the proposed acoustic bund. The information supplied does not mention the heritage asset and therefore does not indicate what measures would be taken in order to protect the milepost from direct or indirect harm. The Location Plan shows that the earth bund would cover the position of the listed milepost.

NPPF Section 12 and Core Strategy Policy LD4 both indicate that heritage assets should be protected, conserved and, where possible, enhanced. Where development proposals would impact upon heritage assets in a negative manner, the level of harm must be properly assessed and special regard must be given to the conservation of the heritage asset.

The application documents do not explain how the position and profile of the bund would result in a reduction in noise. They do not show the location of the properties that the bund is intended to benefit either.

Since the grade II listed milestone would be buried by the proposed bund, there is deemed to be effectively a complete loss of the heritage asset. This is not considered to be acceptable. The position of the bund should be reviewed and also the effectiveness of the bund. If the bund would not be effective then it is questioned whether it is necessary at all. Assessment must be made of the impact of the proposal on the designated heritage asset and if any alteration to the asset is proposed, then a Listed Building Consent application would be required.

In its current form, the proposal would be harmful to the heritage asset, in that the bund would bury the milestone. This is considered contrary to NPPF Section 12 and Core Strategy Policy LD4 and therefore cannot be supported.

DATE RETURNED: 7 December 2016