BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MONDAY, 23RD MAY 2005 AT 3.00 P.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBER, THE COUNCIL HOUSE, BURCOT LANE, BROMSGROVE


AGENDA

Council Agendas and Minutes are available on our web-site at www.bromsgrove.gov.uk/meetings

1. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman for the ensuing Municipal Year
2. To receive apologies for absence and notifications of substitutes
3. To receive the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on the 25th April 2005
4. Declarations of Interest
5. To receive the Report of the Director of Planning Services relating to non-confidential and non-exempt items
6. To receive the Report of the Head of Administrative Services relating to non-confidential and non-exempt items
7. To consider any other business, details of which have been notified to the Head of Administrative Services prior to the commencement of the Meeting and which the Chairman by reason of special circumstances considers to be of so urgent a nature that it cannot wait until the next Meeting.

S. NIXON
Chief Executive

The Council House
Burcot Lane
BROMSGROVE
Worcestershire
B60 1AA

12th May 2005

86/04 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Miss S. L. Bushby, R. Hollingworth and Mrs. M. M. T. Taylor.

87/04 MINUTES

RESOLVED: that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on the 4th April 2005 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

88/04 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The under mentioned Members declared their respective interests in the applications for planning permission indicated below:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Nature of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Mrs. J. M.</td>
<td>B/2004/1030</td>
<td>Prejudicial. Involved in the matter. During consideration of the application Councillor Mrs. J. M. Boswell left the room and took no part in the consideration or voting thereon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boswell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Mrs. A. E.</td>
<td>B/2005/0225</td>
<td>Personal. Grandchildren at school and guardian to pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Mrs. A. E.</td>
<td>B/2005/0226</td>
<td>Personal. Grandchildren at school and guardian to pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Mrs. J. Dyer</td>
<td>B/2005/0166</td>
<td>Personal. Main objector is her hairdresser.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.B.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor J. A. Ruck</td>
<td>B/2005/0225</td>
<td>Personal. Former pupil at school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING SERVICES RELATING TO NON-CONFIDENTIAL AND NON-EXEMPT ITEMS

The Report of the Director of Planning Services relating to non-confidential and non-exempt items was submitted.

Arising therefrom:

(1) APPLICATIONS FOR THE GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION OR THE APPROVAL OF MATTERS RESERVED BY AN OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION

RESOLVED: that with the exception of those referred to below, the applications for the grant of planning permission, the approval of matters reserved by an outline permission previously granted and/or the grant of listed building consent, comment on applications to be determined by the County Council, etc., as contained in the Report of the Director of Planning Services be determined, or that consideration thereof be deferred, as recommended therein.

(1) B/2004/1030  Removal/vary Condition No. 9 of planning permission B/1994/0819 to allow HGV’s to visit site between the hours of 08.00 a.m. and 10.00 p.m. only, at the Bell Service Station, Bromsgrove Road, Belbroughton - Core Service Stations Limited

The Director of Planning Services amended his recommendation on this application set out on Pages 1 and 6 of the Report to read:

“RECOMMENDATION that permission be GRANTED to vary Condition No. 9 of planning permission B/1004/0819 to read:

HGV’s shall only visit the site between the hours of 0800 and 2200 for any purpose (with the exception of deliveries) and no other commercial uses including car sales shall take place on the site without the permission of the Local Planning Authority to an application in that behalf.”

Consideration was then given to the application and on it being put to the vote it was decided that planning permission be refused and that the Condition should remain as it is because to alter it would make the site more attractive to HGV drivers which would cause a traffic safety issue.

RESOLVED: that permission be refused for the following Reasons:

(1) The removal of Condition No. 9 would cause an increase in HGV movements into a site able to operate on a 24 hour basis, and being in close proximity to a residential property would be likely to cause unneighbourly residential implications, particularly by way of noise and general disturbance.

(2) The removal of Condition No. 9 would be likely to create a significant increase in vehicle movements creating difficulty for turning and parking within the site and exiting onto a fast moving highway, contrary to the interests of highway safety.
(2) B/2004/1452 Wood cabin to provide shelter/storage facilities for work in woodland, land off Pikes Pool Lane, Finstall, Bromsgrove - Dr. H. Swire

The Director of Planning Services reported that there was no update to the recommendation set out in his Report.

**RESOLVED:** that permission be granted subject to Conditions Nod. (i) to (vi) and the Notes set out or referred to on Page 10 of the Report.

(3) B/2005/0072 Ground floor conservatory to rear of property at Olney, Woodland Road, Dodford - Mr. Prickett

Consideration was given to this application which had been recommended for refusal by the Director of Planning Services.

On the matter being put to the vote it was decided that planning permission be granted because Members considered that although the conservatory represented a disproportionate addition, they attached considerable weight to the circumstances surrounding the erection of the conservatory, namely that it was erected as an honest mistake. In addition they considered that the visual impact of the conservatory enhanced the conservation area and was of a scale that did not fundamentally impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Accordingly Members considered that very special circumstances existed to warrant setting aside the presumption against such an inappropriate form of development.

**RESOLVED:** that permission be granted subject to the following Note:

**NOTE**

This decision has been taken having regard to the policies within the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001 and the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and other material considerations as summarised below:

WMRSS - QE1, QE3, PA1, T1, RR1.
WCSP - D38, D39, T1, CTC1, CTC20.
BDLP - DS13, DS2, DS6, S11, TR11, S35A, S36.
OTHERS - SPG1, SPG7.
PPS1
PPG15, PPG2.

(4) B/2005/0092 Residential development of 1, 2, 3 and 4 bed dwellings, associated roads, driveways and infrastructure - Approval of Reserved Matters under previous application B/2004/1014, Phase 7, Breme Park, Newton Road, Bromsgrove - Persimmon Homes South Midlands Limited

The Director of Planning Services referred to the item in his Report concerning this application and reported that receipt of amended plans which addressed the Worcestershire County Council Highways Partnership queries in respect of parking provision.
RESOLVED: that subject to application No. B/2005/0324 (recommended for approval on Page 51 of the Report) being granted the reserved matters comprising details of siting, design and landscaping be approved subject to Condition No. 1 and the Notes set out or referred to on Pages 19 and 20 of the Report.

(Note: Application No. B/2005/0324 was subsequently approved later in the Meeting.)


RESOLVED: (a) that permission be refused for the Reason set out on Page 24 of the Report; and
(b) that further consideration of the enforcement aspect be deferred on the basis that it is not expedient to take such action at this time, and the Director of Planning Services be asked to negotiate a compromise providing for the setting back of the fence with landscaping in front.

(6) B/2005/0193 Proposed ground floor lounge and first floor bedroom with en-suite extension, 573 Birmingham Road, Lydiate Ash, Bromsgrove - Malvern View (Lydiate) Limited

The Director of Planning Services stated that the description of the development had been amended from “ground floor extension and first floor bedroom extension and provision of a total of 9 en-suite facilities” referred to in the Report and replaced with “proposed ground floor lounge and first floor bedroom with en-suite extension”.

RESOLVED: that on the suggestion of Councillor B. L. Fuller C.B.E., Q.F.S.M., further consideration of this application be deferred to the next Meeting of the Committee and that in the meantime arrangements be made for Members of the Committee to undertake an inspection of the site to which this application relates.

(7) B/2005/0199 Erection of a two storey office extension, Lloyds Building, 10 The Square, Alvechurch - Courprice Limited

Consideration was given to this application which had been recommended for refusal by the Director of Planning Services.

On the matter being put to the vote it was decided that planning permission be granted because Members considered that there was adequate car parking available already in the village to take account of any car parking associated with this use.

RESOLVED: that permission be granted and the power to impose suitable Conditions delegated to the Director of Planning Services.

(8) B/2005/0225 Change of use, alteration and refurbishment of the existing first floor and part ground floor, Perry Hall Hotel, Kidderminster Road, Bromsgrove - Bromsgrove School

The Director of Planning Services reported that the application had been amended and augmented by the receipt of additional plans.
RESOLVED: that permission be granted subject to Conditions Nod. 1 and 2 set out or referred to on Page 38 of the Report and the following additional Conditions Nod. 3 and 4:

(3) Before any work on site commences the following details, including schedules of work and samples where specified shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- Confirmation of all areas of stone repairs and replacement including submission of samples which are to match the original stone.
- The design and position of the air wall vents.
- The specification for any areas of repointing which shall be lime mortar to match the existing, including the colour, mix, finish and areas to be repointed to include a sample panel which shall be a lime mortar to match the existing.
- The area of the first floor suspended, fire protection ceilings to the first floor.

The work undertaken shall accord with the details agreed.

(4) The permission does not authorise the removal or covering over of any original plaster ceiling cornices.

RESOLVED: that Listed Building Consent be granted subject to Conditions Nod. 3 and 4 set out or referred to on Page 41 of the Report and the following additional Conditions Nod. 5 and 6:

(5) Before any work on site commences the following details, including schedules of work and samples where specified shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- Confirmation of all areas of stone repairs and replacement including submission of samples which are to match the original stone.
- The design and position of the air wall vents.
- The specification for any areas of repointing which shall be lime mortar to match the existing including the colour, mix, finish and areas to be repointed to include a sample panel which shall be a lime mortar to match the existing.
- The area of the first floor suspended, fire protection ceilings to the first floor.

The work undertaken shall accord with the details agreed.

(6) The permission does not authorise the removal or covering over of any original plaster ceiling cornices.

RESOLVED: that on the suggestion of Councillor P. J. Whittaker further consideration of this application be deferred to the next Meeting of the Committee and that in the meantime arrangements be made for Members of the Committee to undertake an inspection of the site to which the application relates.
RESOLVED: that permission be granted subject to Condition No. 1 and the Note set out on Page 49 of the Report and the following additional Conditions Nos. 2 and 3:

(2) Should the land the subject of this application outlined in red on the approved plan cease to be used for the purpose of a tennis court, the land shall be reinstated to its former appearance to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

(3) The wire mesh fencing hereby approved shall be black.

(3) REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

Consideration was given to the following Reports

(a) Conditions Discharged.
(b) Approved amendments to Planning Permissions.
(c) Advertisement Consent - Granted.
(d) Agricultural - Notification - Planning Permission Required.
(e) Conservation Area Consent - Granted.
(f) Full Planning Consent.
(g) Planning Permission - Refused.
(h) Listed Building Consent - Granted.
(i) Outline Permission - Refused.
(j) Outline Permission - Withdrawn.
(k) Reserved Matters - Granted.
(l) Telecommunications Notification - Details not Required.
(m) Overdue Decisions - Reasons.

RESOLVED: that the above Reports be noted.

89/04 REPORT OF THE HEAD OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES RELATING TO NON-CONFIDENTIAL AND NON-EXEMPT ITEMS

The Report of the Head of Administrative Services relating to non-confidential and non-exempt items was submitted.

Arising therefrom:

(1) THE DISTRICT COUNCIL OF BROMSGROVE TREE PRESERVATION ORDER (NO. 14) 2004 - TREES ON LAND AT FORHILL, LEA END LANE, WEATHEROAK

Consideration having been given to the objection to, and letter of support for the making of this Order it was

RESOLVED:

(i) that the comments of the Director of Planning Services on the objection and letter of support be endorsed on the basis that they constitute this Council's comments thereon; and

(ii) that the Order be confirmed without modification.

(2) APPEAL DECISIONS

RESOLVED: that the appeal decisions detailed in the Report be noted.
90/04  

JONATHAN EDWARDS - PRINCIPAL PLANNING OFFICER

The Chairman referred to the fact that Jonathan Edwards would shortly be leaving the Council and Members thanked him for the help and assistance he had given and wished him every success in his new post.

91/04  

COUNCILLOR MRS. J. DYER M.B.E.

The Members extended their best wishes to Councillor Mrs. J. Dyer M.B.E., in her new duties, should she be elected as Chairman of the Council.

The Meeting closed at 5.20 p.m.

Chairman
BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

REPORT OF THE
DIRECTOR OF PLANNING SERVICES

RELATING TO NON-CONFIDENTIAL AND NON-EXEMPT MATTERS
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1. All items in these Sections of this Report include the following documents:-
   a. The application - the forms and the written documents submitted by the applicant, the applicant's architect or agent or both whichever the case may be - any submitted plans, drawings or diagrams.
   b. Letters of objection, observations, comments or other representations received about the proposals.
   c. Any written notes by officers relating to the application and on the file relating to the particular application.
   d. Invitations to the Council to comment or make observations on matters which are primarily the concern of another Authority, Statutory Body or Government Department.

2. In relation to any particular matter referred to in the report, the following are regarded as the standard background papers:-

   Policies contained with County Structure Plans and Local Plans below and Planning Policy Guidance Notes, specifically referred to as follows:-

   WCSP - Worcester County Structure Plan 2001
   BDLP - Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004
   PPG'S - Planning Policy Guidance Notes
   SPG - Supplementary Policy Guidance (Bromsgrove District's)

3. Plus items listed in report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABBREVIATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGLV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCC (HP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCC (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCC (SS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCC (EA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICNIRP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INDEX FOR SECTION 2 - PLANNING

### 23RD MAY 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNING REF. / OFFICER</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0193 - DI</td>
<td>573 Birmingham Road, Lydiate Ash, Bromsgrove</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Refuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0197 - DI</td>
<td>Land to rear of 48 - 64 Golden Cross Lane, Catshill, Bromsgrove</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0253 - DB</td>
<td>Plot 20, Harris Business Park, Hanbury Road, Stoke Prior, Bromsgrove</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0263 - DB</td>
<td>Abberley House, 223 - 229 Worcester Road, Stoke Heath, Bromsgrove</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Refuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0275 - DB</td>
<td>Field View House, Brickhouse Lane, Stoke Prior, Bromsgrove</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0276 - DB</td>
<td>Seafield Farm, Seafield Lane, Beoley</td>
<td>Householder</td>
<td>Refuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0283 - DB</td>
<td>23 Lickey Square, Rednal</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0328 - HLP</td>
<td>Yew Tree Nursing Home, Yew Tree Place, Romsley</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Refuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0335 - DB</td>
<td>Bromsgrove Rugby Football Club, Finstall Road, Bromsgrove</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0352 - SJ</td>
<td>Wildmoor Mill Farm, Mill Lane, Wildmoor, Bromsgrove</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Delegated - Minded to Approve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MALVERN VIEW (LYDIATE) LTD.  573, BIRMINGHAM ROAD, LYDIATE ASH, BROMSGROVE

RECOMMENDATION:  that permission be REFUSED.

Committee site visit: 19/05/2005

Consultations
Catshill PC  Consulted on:  18/02/2005.  No comment received on:  08/03/2005.
WCC (HP)  Consulted on unconfirmed date.  No objection received on:  30/03/2005.
Publicity  1 site notice posted on:  21/02/2005 (expires on:  14/03/2005).  No response to date.

The site and its surroundings
The application site refers to a residential institution which is located on a corner plot of land between the Birmingham Road and Halesowen Road, in a designated Green Belt area.

Proposal
The application refers to a proposed ground floor, lounge extension and first floor bedroom above with ensuite facilities. I attach as Appendix 2.1 a letter from the applicant explaining the reasoning behind the proposal.

Relevant policies
WMSS  QE3.
WCSP  SD.2, CTC.1, D.38, D.39, T.1.
BDLPFM  DS2, DS6, DS13, C4.
Others  PPS1, PPG2, SPG1

Relevant planning history
Please note: only six of the most recent applications have been included.

B/2002/0448 Amendments to planning permission B/2001/0259 ("Additional bedrooms and ancillary accommodation to existing nursing home") to move plant room; reduce size of office; and to regularise external walls - Resubmission of B/2001/0259.  Granted: 23/05/2002.

Notes
The main issues with this application are:-
Green Belt Issues
Policies in the BDLP and WCSP closely follow advice in PPG2 in stating that inappropriate development will not be allowed in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances exist. In this instance the proposal is not an extension to an existing dwelling as defined by SPG7 of the council's guidance by virtue of being a care home. In addition, the proposal does not fall within the defined categories highlighted in para. 3.4 of PPG2 by not being for the purposes of agriculture or forestry, essential facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, limited extension, alteration or replacement of existing dwellings. Therefore the construction of new buildings inside a Green Belt is inappropriate development and this is the case in this instance.

A letter was sent to the applicant on 21st February 2005 seeking very special circumstances which is attached in Appendix 2.1.

The case for very special circumstances
The Agent/ Applicant has submitted details which he considers to be very special circumstances in this instance in order to justify this proposal which are summarised as follows: “The purpose of the building is for the care of its residents who sometimes need 24 hour care and the current facilities make this very difficult for the staff running the care facility, particularly when it comes to staying over night for the purposes of caring. In addition the Care Standards Act 2000 sets down the minimum areas that should be made to available to a service user and we consider that because the nature of the care is likely to be permanent for its residents that we should provide them with more than the basic minimum”.

In this instance, I am still mindful to consider that the proposal would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the circumstances put forward are not, in my opinion, sufficient enough reasons to out weight the harm caused to the Green Belt.

Conclusion
PPG2 states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. The erection of the proposal would go against the fundamental principle of Green Belt policy by impinging on the openness/ visual amenities of the Green Belt. The proposal would to my mind be detrimental to the rural appearance of the site and area in general and therefore go against PPG2 advice to ensure that the openness/ visual amenities of Green Belt areas are safeguarded. As such I find the proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt and for the following reasons, I recommend that permission be refused.

RECOMMENDATION: that permission be REFUSED.
The proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt and no very special circumstances have been submitted to the Council to outweigh the harm caused to the character and openness of the Green Belt. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to policies D38, D39 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan, DS2, DS13 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and the general provisions of PPG2.
RECOMMENDATION: that permission be GRANTED.

This application is has been referred to Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Hulett.

Consultations
Catshill PC Consulted on: 21/02/2005. No comment received on: 08/03/2005.
WCC (HP) Consulted on: 21/02/2005. No objection received on: 05/04/2005, subject to the inclusion of condition.
PROW Consulted on: 21/02/2005. No response to date.
Publicity 11 letters posted on: 21/02/2005 (expires on: 14/03/2005)
6 additional letters posted on: 23/03/2005 (expires on: 13/04/2005)
1 site notice posted on: 03/03/2005 (expires on: 24/03/2005)
5 letters received summarised as follows: concerned that proposal will not be constructed correctly in the right position, problems associated with trespassing onto land, dispute on proposed road position, struggling to manoeuvre vehicles on the driveway.

The site and its surroundings
The application refers to amended plans which were received by the council on 21/03/2005 for a plot of land which provides access to no.s 1-6, which are dwellings at the rear of nos. 48-64 Golden Cross Lane. The amended scheme involves a minor alteration to the hammer head section only.

Proposal
The application refers to the proposed construction of communal access roadway on land to the rear of 48-64, Golden Cross Lane,

Relevant policies
WMSS QE3.
WCSP CTC.1.
BDLP TR11, DS13.

Relevant planning history
Please note: There is an extensive number of previous applications on this site and therefore only the most recent three have been included.

B/2003/0030 Revised dwelling type (Bungalow), plot 1, following planning permission B2002/0474. Granted: 19/02/2003.
B/2003/1364 Revised dwelling type - Resubmission of B/2003/0030. Augmented by additional drawing received 03.11.03. Granted: 12/12/2003.

Notes
I note that there are no specific policies which would apply to this proposal but consider that certain policies may be relevant. The main issue to consider is whether the proposal will
impact on ‘amenity’ or ‘highway safety.’ It will also be necessary to ensure that the proposal meets the requirements of Policy TR11 and DS13 of the BDLP.

In this instance, there have been a number of objections from neighbouring occupiers which are highlighted overleaf. However, amended plans were received after these objections were received. To my mind, the amended scheme may eliminate some of these initial concerns.

Highway Safety
Policy TR11 of the BDLP requires that all development incorporates safe means of access and egress appropriate to the nature of the local highway network. The Highway’s Partnership have been consulted and have expressed no objection subject to the implementation of conditions which are included at the bottom of this page.

Harm to amenity
I acknowledge the objections which are summarised overleaf with particular reference to highway concerns and land boundary disputes. With this in mind, the Highways Partnership have expressed no objection subject to the implementation of conditions.

With regard to the issue concerning land ownership, this is not considered material to the determination of the planning application and therefore no weight can be attached to these concerns.

Conclusion
The proposal would not cause any detrimental impact to the character of the area or to surrounding amenity and I am of the view that this proposal would be in compliance with the requirements of Policy TR11 and DS13 of the BDLP. I recommend that permission be granted.

RECOMMENDATION: that permission be GRANTED

scf:

1. C099
2. H Note No.1
3. H. Note No.10
4. H. Note No.5

Notes
This decision has been taken having regard to the policies within the West Midlands Spatial Strategy (Regional Planning Guidance Note 11), Worcestershire County Structure Plan (WCSP) June 2001 and the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 (BDLP) and other material considerations as summarised below:

WMSS: QE3
WCSP: CTC.1.

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

Proposal

Erection of commercial units for Use Classes B1, B2 and B8

Plot 20, Harris Business Park, Hanbury Road, Stoke Prior, Bromsgrove

(as amended by plans received 01.04.05)

RECOMMENDATION that permission be GRANTED

Consultations

WCC (HP) Consulted - views received 09.05.05: No objection

ENG Consulted - views received 24.03.05:

No objection subject to Conditions

CO Consulted - views received 16.03.05:

- There does not seem enough space for a meaningful and beneficial area for landscaping adjacent to the Worcester to Birmingham Conservation Area
- In fact the building is so close that the building is likely to adversely affect the hawthorn hedgerow along the bank of the canal. It should be at least be moved back the same distance as the building on Plot 21
- It would also be useful to have confirmation of the landscaping. This needs to be robust, not just shrub planting

Reconsulted on amended plans - views received 12.04.05:

- No objection subject to the normal landscaping scheme Condition etc

CBCO Consulted 18.03.05: views awaited

EDO Consulted - views received 08.03.05:

- Economic Development supports this application
- I assume this is a straightforward and non controversial development on an existing Business Park with the relevant consents

BW Consulted - views received 30.03.05:

No objection

Severn Trent Wa ter Views received 30.03.05:

No objection subject to Conditions

Stoke PC Consulted - views received 23.03.05:

- Members are concerned about the large number of car-parking spaces shown on the plans which will generate additional traffic using the site
- There are also horrendous traffic problems relating to the Hanbury Road which will be exacerbated by this development

Publicity 8 letters sent 22.03.05: no response received (expire 12.04.05)

2 site notices posted 22.03.05: no response received (expire 12.04.05)

1 press notice published 16.03.05: no response received (expires 06.04.05)

The site and its surroundings

The application site is located on Harris Business Park. The Park relates to a number of commercial buildings constructed from a variety of materials of both single storey and two-storey type. The site is open in character and consists of scrubland and is located off a tarmac access road. Other commercial buildings to the east and west flank the site. The land to the south is slightly elevated and is currently undeveloped. The Worcester to Birmingham Canal Conservation Area forms the northern boundary to the site. The site is
located within a recognised employment zone.

Proposal
The proposals relate to the addition of two no. buildings for Use Classes B1, B2 and B8 with a total floor space of 1275 square metres. The first building containing two no. units is located parallel to the northern boundary, with the second building containing three no. units set parallel to the eastern boundary adjacent existing units 12a-12d inclusive. Both buildings are two-storey and of typical design to the Park.

The site is accessed via the existing tarmac access road and proposes 35 no. car-parking spaces and service access. Additional landscaping is proposed to the northern boundary adjacent the Conservation Area and to the south-west corner of the site.

Relevant policies
WCSP  SD.2, CTC.1, CTC.2, D.25, D.26, T.1, CTC.20
BDLP  DS13, E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, E6, E7, E8, E9, TR1, TR11, TR12, S35a
Others  PPS1, PPG3, PPG15

Relevant planning history
B/2001/0151  New Industrial Unit (Plots 20 and 21): approved 20.04.01

Notes
I consider the main issues to relate to the impact of the development on the streetscene and the locality and the impacts on highway safety and egress.

Policy E4 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan sets out a number of criteria that proposals for the expansion, consolidation or expansion to existing commercial uses in non-Green Belt locations should meet. These relate to issues such as the appropriateness of the scale and nature of the activity to the area, traffic and parking implications, landscaping and environmental disturbance to nearby residences. Paragraph 11.5 of Policy E4 states that such schemes can offer an increased source of employment and thus contribute to a more sustainable pattern of land use. Such schemes, however, must not conflict with other land use objectives. Policy E9 of the Local Plan reflects the guidance contained in Policy E4 for new employment development.

Impact on Highway System, Parking and Service Space
Policy E9 resists development that would overload the capacity of the highway network and seeks to ensure adequate loading, off-loading, maneuvering and parking space for cars is made available. The views of the Parish Council are noted. Members will be aware, however, that this proposal is located on a site allocated for employment use within the Local Plan and consequently the principle of traffic movements and volume has already been accepted.

The WCC(HP) has raised no objection to the scheme.

Environmental Disturbance
Policy E9 resists development that would cause harm to the amenities of the occupiers of any adjacent residential dwelling. Given that the site is located some distance away from the nearest residential property, I find the application acceptable in this aspect.

Landscaping
The site currently contains scrub planting and a small degree of immature tree and hawthorn hedgerow screening to the Canal towpath.
The proposed development intends to reinforce the hawthorn hedgerow with further planting to the northern boundary. Additional landscaping is proposed to the south-west corner of the site.

**Design**

Building One is to be externally finished with facing brickwork and concrete interlocking tiles, with Building Two containing a mix of facing brickwork and plastic coated profiled metal cladding. Given the context of the site and the design and appearance of the surrounding structures, I raise no objection to the design or appearance of the new units.

**Impact on the setting of the Worcester to Birmingham Canal Conservation Area**

Policy CTC.20 of the WCSP and Policy S35a of the BDLP and seeks to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Criteria (b) of Policy S35a requires new development, in or adjacent to such areas, to be sympathetic to the character of buildings in the detailed treatment of matters of design including the form, scale and materials. Policy CTC.19 of the WCSP states that any development which would adversely affect those features and areas of historic and/or architectural significance which contribute to the character of the urban or rural parts of the County will not normally be allowed. Such features and areas include Conservation Areas and their settings.

Following the submission of amended plans, the CO has raised no objection to the scheme on Conservation Area grounds subject to the imposition of a suitable landscaping scheme Condition.

**Conclusions**

Given all material circumstances I find this application to be acceptable.

**RECOMMENDATION** that permission be **GRANTED**:

2. C39
3. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, details of storm water and foul sewage drainage systems to serve the application site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved drainage system shall be implemented and operational before the buildings hereby approved are first used
4. C10

**Reasons**

3. To prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with Policy DS13, ES1 and ES2 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan

**Notes**

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

WCSP: SD.2, CTC.1, CTC.2, D.25, D.26, T.1, CTC.20
BDLP: DS13, E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, E6, E7, E8, E9, TR1, TR11, TR12, S35a
Others: PPS1, PPG3, PPG15

It is the Council's view that the proposed development complies with the provisions of the development plan and that, on balance, there are no justifiable reasons to refuse planning permission.
HOMES (CFC HOMES) LIMITED “B”

45-bed care home (C2) and associated car parking
Abberley House, 223-229 Worcester Road, Stoke Heath, Bromsgrove
(as augmented by plans received 17.03.05)

RECOMMENDATION that permission be REFUSED

Consultations
WCC (HP) Consulted - views received 05.05.05:
Recommends the application is deferred for the following reasons:
I have no objection in principle to this application, however, before I can offer any highway conditions to the application I require the applicant to demonstrate parking facilities to Worcestershire County Council standards as stated below:
• 12 car parking spaces must be provided, a minimum of 1 must be designated for disabled
• 1 car space per full time member of staff
• the applicant must also demonstrate by the use of turning circles that a lorry can manoeuvre and turn within the application site so that a lorry can enter and leave the site in a forward gear

ENG Consulted - views received 05.04.05:
No objection subject to Conditions

CO Views received 10.05.05:
• I reiterate my previous objections of 6th June 2003 to the demolition of the existing Abberley House. In my view it is a building of local interest dating from circa. 1824. Buildings of this age would normally be statutorily listed. This one did not succeed in being included in the statutory list. I believe this was due to the inappropriate replacement of windows and the roof coverings. It is, therefore, a candidate for the Bromsgrove Local list. Work has commenced on the preparation of a draft list for consultation.
• As it stands, I consider the replacement of the Abberley House with the proposed scheme would be contrary to WCSP Policy CTC19(iii).
• Notwithstanding the above, I consider the scale, form, layout massing and design of the building is alien to its context. The lack of contextual drawings reinforces my view that this has not been effectively taken into account in the design. This is on the main approach to Bromsgrove town and a building here needs to be of quality, which benefits this principal entry point. In a scale and form which is appropriate to its context.
• It has none of the spatial elegance, dignified proportions of the existing building. The central three-storey block which cuts into the site would be significantly intrusive and a dominant feature unrelated to the character of its surroundings.
• The scheme is equally as detrimental as the previous scheme refused on appeal.
• I would favour retaining and reinstating the front main building with a subservient courtyard style development at the rear.

EHO Consulted - views received 11.04.05:
No objection subject to Conditions

Local Plans Consulted - views received 05.04.05:
Policy Advice

- The site is situated outside the Green Belt. Neither the Local Plan or Structure Plan contain policies relating to the building of care homes in the District.

- The introduction of a home for the elderly need not have a detrimental effect upon the character of a residential area. However, the applicant must take adequate precautions to lessen any impact and pay careful attention to building details. The proposal should be designed to complement the character of the local area in terms of size, scale and siting of the building and they must also allow for sufficient space around for suitably located car-parking and open space provision.

- Outside work areas such as dustbin storage and clothes drying areas should be positioned away from areas of private open space so as to safeguard neighbouring properties and the habitable rooms of the Home from excessive noise, smell and general disturbance. Applicant should pay careful attention to the positioning of work areas so as to safeguard neighbours and residents as the Home from excessive disturbance.

- Shared work areas and areas of open space will not be acceptable. Wherever possible, dustbins should be contained within purpose built shelters, especially where located in prominent public locations.

- The creation of a home for the elderly is likely to result in increased traffic generation to and from the site. Therefore, on site parking provision is essential to accommodate this, and to prevent excessive on-street parking which may represent a traffic hazard or create disturbance to nearby residents. The parking standards in Appendix 17 of the Local Plan require 1 space per 4 beds plus an allowance for residential staff as per C3.

- As the proposal is for a care home which generally does not involve the creation of separate living units, then SPG10 does not apply.

EDO Consulted - views received 18.03.05:
Bromsgrove District’s population contains higher than average percentages of older age groups.
The local need for care homes was amply demonstrated by the recent application by “The Lawns” in Alvechurch.

West Mercia Constabulary Consulted - views received 01.04.05:
No objection subject to Conditions.

Victorian Society Views received 24.03.05:
- Objection
  - The Victorian Society wishes to reiterate its previous comments that we do not want to see Abberley House demolished. We feel that the house is quite able to be restored and would make a very attractive home, or as flats as it has been in the past.
  - The plot is in a semi-rural area, facing open fields, and with its set-back building makes a good contribution to the entry to the town from the south.
  - We object to the plans as proposed by BUPA Care Homes, as being far too large and inappropriate for the setting. It would tower as a huge mass over all of the neighbouring mixed housing. It is our view that any building on the site should be no more than two-storeys in height.

Severn Trent Views received 30.03.05:
Water Bromsgrove Society

No objection subject to Conditions

Views received 15.04.05:

- Objection
- The Society has already submitted two objections to proposed demolition of this property.
- The main objection still exists that architecturally this property is worth saving, but that we did not have any objections to a complete refurbishment (which it badly needs) and would be happy for sympathetic extension to the rear
- We are of course conscious of the fact that the revised proposal to demolish and build a 45 bedroom care home would create several badly needed jobs in the area and perhaps changes the circumstances
- We still believe however that the main shell should be retained and refurbished and a large extension to the sides and rear could be sympathetically “blended in”

Stoke Prior PC Consulted 16.03.05: views awaited

9 letters sent 17.03.05 (expire 07.04.05)
1 site notice posted 22.03.05 (expires 12.04.05)
1 press notice published 23.03.05 (expires 13.04.05)

22 letters of objection received:

- Building would be larger than Abberley House and inappropriate and out of scale with the neighbouring dwellings
- The overall mass is not dissimilar to that refused on appeal last year - the Inspector’s concerns over bulk and height have not been overcome
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- Overshadowing and loss of light
- Site is on the edge of town so a soft edge is needed and not a dominating building more suited to the town centre
- Additional traffic and concerns over highway safety - a care home is a busy organisation that will generate far more usage and traffic than the apartments refused previously
- Parking provisions is wholly inadequate
- Concerns over floor levels
- Abberley House is a building of local character and should be renovated and considered for the local list of buildings of importance
- Not a sustainable location
- If the Council said no to a block of apartments how can it justify this new building?
- Within Worcestershire, Bromsgrove has a much higher number of nursing home places per population over 65 than other parts of the County (Worcestershire Commissioning Strategy). This home is simply not needed. Bromsgrove does not need additional nursing places but does need extra care sheltered housing schemes for which the existing Abberley House would be suitable
- A nursing home with 45-bedrooms will require about 50 full time equivalent staff - this will probably translate into 70-80 staff including part-timers
- All existing care homes in Bromsgrove are facing drastic staff shortages. This care home will do the same and this will create
additional pressure on housing, education and health services

- Existing GP practices in Bromsgrove are closing their lists to new patients because they are oversubscribed. GPs will struggle to cope with the demands of an additional 45 sick and frail elderly patients plus additional demands for health cover for the staff that will need to be brought into the area.

2 letters of support:

- No objection to the demolition of Abberley House
- Car-parking has been reduced from previous scheme and retains green space between Worcester Road and the proposed building
- Reduction in scale enabled the building to retain harmony with the streetscene
- Enhancement of provision of care for the elderly
- Provision of employment opportunities and revenue generation
- Care home provides a better neighbouring use for the adjacent residential dwellings due to lack of noise

The site and its surroundings

The site relates to a site approximately 0.38 hectares in area that currently contains Abberley House - a pre-Victorian dwelling that has been sub-divided into flatted residential development. A block of flat roof single garages are located to the south of the main building. Abberley House is set back significantly from Worcester Road with a large lawned area fronting the highway. A large garden area is located to the rear of the site that abuts the rear boundaries of dwellings fronting Hanbury Road. Mature and semi-mature trees are located predominantly to the boundaries of the site including the frontage boundary facing Worcester Road. All trees on the site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The area is characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings set in large to medium plots. The site is within a recognised residential area.

Proposal

This application relates to the demolition of the existing structures on the site and the erection of a 45-bed care home in a singular block. The unit is predominately three-storey in scale, with the two flank sides being two-storey and reducing to single storey in height.

Bedroom provision is located on all three floors, with each room containing an en-suite and shower bathroom facility. The building is supported by central services including lounge areas, laundry, kitchen and administrative facilities. The home will be open 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

The primary facing material is proposed to be a mixture of brick with contrasting string courses and detailing combined with rendered panels. The roof is a shallow pitch comprising concrete interlocking tiles with dormer windows to the second floor.

The development proposes to permanently close the existing north and south vehicular accesses and insert a new central vehicular access leading off Worcester Road. The scheme proposes a loading bay and 12 no. car-parking spaces (including 2 disabled parking bays) adjacent the southern boundary (1 space per 4 residents’ beds). The Agent states that the care home will be employing approximately 49 full time equivalent persons.

Five no. protected trees are proposed to be felled. Additional tree planting is proposed within the site.

A design statement, further letter of support and arboricultural report has accompanied the
application. Full copies of these documents are available to inspect within the relevant planning should Members wish to view them.

Relevant policies

WCSP  CTC.1, CTC.5, CTC.13, SD.1, SD.2, SD.3, SD.4, SD.5, SD.6, SD.7, T.1
BDLP  DS3, DS13, C17, C19, S7, S14, S28, S29, C4, C17, C36, C38, C39, TR11
Others  PPS1, PPG3, PPG13, PPG17, SPG1, SPG10, WMSS

Relevant planning history

B/2003/0683  Demolition of existing two and three-storey flats and erection of 21 No. 2 and 3 bed apartments and associated car parking - Resubmission of B/2002/1386: refused 21.08.03
Appeal: dismissed 26.07.04

B/2002/1386  Demolition of existing two and three storey flats and erection of 24 no. 2 and 3 bed apartments and associated car parking - resubmission of B/2002/1196: refused 12.03.03

B/2002/1196  Demolition of existing structure and erection of one no. apartment block of 24 no. units with associated car parking and access: withdrawn 12.11.02

Notes

For the information of Members neither the Bromsgrove District Local Plan or the Worcestershire County Structure Plan contain policies relating to the building of care homes in the District. As such I consider the appraisal of the application must be directed to the provisions of Policy S7 of the BDLP and whether the proposed development accords with the criteria set out in this Policy. However, given the proposed use of the site I do not consider density issues advocated by Policy S7 and D.9 of the WCSP to be applicable in this case. I also note the comments from the consultees arising from the consultation exercise.

Form and Layout

In assessing the context of the site, I am of the view that the development needs to relate to the surrounding buildings rather than the building which it is to replace.

The area is characterised by a mix of modern medium-sized detached and semi-detached dwellings, of both two-storey and single storey type, with large to medium sized plots. The bulk of the submitted scheme is three-storey in height, reducing height to two-storeys and again to single storey to each flank of the central aspect of the building.

The proposed block is set approximately 16 metres closer to Worcester Road than Abberley House at present and be approximately 1 metre higher than the current structure. It is my view that the design of the new structure would have a much greater mass than the present buildings (Abberley House and single storey garage block) on site.

In the appraisal of the recent appeal proposal, the Inspector commented that "...I do not discount the value of variety in development, but the considerable frontage of the single block of apartments, in which the three storey section would obviously predominate, would unpleasantly dominate the scale of the housing round about.....In this case I consider the detrimental dominant appearance of the block, combined with the degree of frontage parking would be unacceptably harmful to the scale and nature of the surrounding housing in Worcester Road" (Appeal APP/P1805/A/04/1141693: paragraph 14). A full copy of this appeal decision is included in Appendix 2.2.

I note the applicant has attempted to address the concerns raised by the Council and the Inspector in relation to the previous proposal (B/2003/0683) by reducing the width of the new structure to allow greater distance from the northern and southern boundaries. However, I
remain of the view that the massing and scale of the building, combined with the siting of this building 18.5 metres closer to the Worcester Road frontage would denote an overbearing structure that would dominate this section of Worcester Road and be out of keeping with the predominant setting of two-storey and single storey dwellings.

As such I am therefore of the view that by virtue of its siting and scale, the proposed development would detrimentally impact on the established character and form of the locality and would not respect the form and layout of the locality contrary to policies S7 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and Policy SD.2 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan.

**Loss of Trees and Hedgerows**
All trees within the application site are afforded protection by a Tree Preservation Order. The trees were protected in the interests of public amenity due to their value in the streetscene and the effect of the proposed development on the trees is a material planning consideration in the determination of this application. The proposal will lead to the loss of one no. tree specimen to the rear of the site, together with four trees to the southern boundary (including the diseased mature Horse Chestnut). The applicant is willing to replant to compensate for the loss of these specimens and has indicated replanting on the submitted location plan.

The Council’s Tree Officer has raised no objection to the scheme subject to the imposition of suitable Conditions.

**Impact on the Amenity of Adjacent Occupiers**
Although not relating strictly to a residential development scheme, I consider the contents of SPG1 to be relevant. This document sets out design guidance for residential development including separation distances to existing dwellings so as to avoid detriment to residential amenity due to overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing affects. The Guidelines suggests that new development with main windows overlooking existing private spaces should be set back by a distance of 5 metres per storey from the site boundary where it adjoins a private garden area. I consider these distances can be applied to the habitable rooms within the development, with particular reference to the bedrooms.

Although I note the scheme has been designed to meet the separation distances for overlooking detailed in SPG1, I am concerned over the number of bedroom windows at first and second floor level that face the northern boundary. As such, I am of the view that the orientation and presence of these windows serving the proposed bedrooms would denote a perception of overlooking to the private amenity spaces of the dwellings known as 223a Worcester Road and 14 Hanbury Road. I consider these would be harmful to the amenities of the present and future occupants of these dwellings. Given these circumstances, I am of the view that the proposal would be contrary to criteria (e) of Policy S7 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and the provisions of SPG1 in that new development should not affect the existing amenities of adjoining occupiers and to be able to secure and accommodate an acceptable level of privacy.

**The Development can be Properly Serviced**
The comments of the Council’s Drainage Engineer are noted and I am satisfied that the proposed development can be properly served by a drainage system.

**Traffic and Highway Implications**
Highway safety is detailed in Policy TR11 of the BDLP and T.1 of the WCSP. These Policies require that all development incorporates safe means of access and egress appropriate to the nature of the local highway network. The development proposes to permanently close
the existing north and south vehicular accesses and insert a new central vehicular access leading off Worcester Road. The scheme proposes a loading bay and 12 no. car-parking spaces adjacent the southern boundary. Additional tree planting is proposed within the site.

I note the concerns of third parties in relation to highway safety and insufficient off-road parking within the site. Although not raising an objection in principle to the development, the WCC(HP) has requested the application is deferred in order for the applicant to demonstrate on-site parking facilities and lorry turning facilities to Worcestershire County Council standards.

These views have been expressed to the applicant’s Agent and I will update Members at your Committee on this issue.

SPG10 Issues
As the proposal is for a care home which does not involve the creation of separate living units, the provisions of SPG10 do not apply in this case.

Conclusions
I note that the application would in principle be acceptable in that it proposes a type of residential development in an area designated for residential use. The site falls within the definition of a previously developed site and as such its development would be in general accordance with government objectives set out in PPG3. However, it is noted that Government guidance does not automatically allow the development of urban sites and issues such as layout and effect upon character and residential amenity are all material factors that may result in a residential scheme in an urban area being unacceptable.

In this case I am of the opinion that the proposal would be unduly prominent in the streetscene and would detrimentally impact on the established character and form of the locality contrary to policies DS13 and S7 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and Policies SD.2 and D.9 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan.

Given these circumstances I consider the application to be unacceptable.

RECOMMENDATION that permission be REFUSED:
(a) The proposal would appear as unduly prominent in the streetscene and the combination of the scale and design of the development would detrimentally impact on the established character, form and scale of the locality contrary to Policies DS13 and S7 of the Bromsgrove District Local and Policy SD.2 and D.9 of the adopted Worcestershire County Structure Plan.
(b) The proposal would denote a perception of overlooking, to the detriment of the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of the existing adjacent residential properties, contrary to criteria (e) of Policy S7 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and the provisions of SPG1.
(c) The proposal contains insufficient on-site parking and lorry turning provision that would lead to the reversing of vehicles and the displacement of vehicles on to the highway, to the detriment of highway safety ad egress contrary to Policy TR11 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan.
FOSTER CARE ASSOCIATES “A”

Change of use from mixed office (B1) and teaching facility (D1) to office use (B1) only

Field View House, Brickhouse Lane, Stoke Prior

B/2005/0275

11.03.05

RECOMMENDATION that permission be GRANTED

Consultations

WCC (HP) Consulted - views received 09.05.05: No objection

Local Plans Consulted - views received 13.04.05:

- The site is within the Green Belt and as no construction works are proposed, the proposal does not appear to conflict with Green Belt policy
- Consideration should be given to the levels of parking required, as office space could require more/less parking, dependant on the amount of new office space generated by the change of use

Policy

EDO Consulted - views received 11.03.05:
Economic Development supports the application

Stoke PC Consulted - views received 23.03.05:
- Residents in Brickhouse Lane have expressed their concerns about Field View House becoming more commercial as a result of this application
- There is also the possibility of more traffic using the Lane as a result of the change of use

Publicity
1 letter sent 14.03.05 (expires 04.04.05)
1 site notice posted 22.03.05 (expires 12.04.05)
6 letters received:
- This is again a major change of use to commercial offices exactly as next door in Heath House in a country lane within the Green Belt
- Impact regarding traffic and parking
- Loss of natural vegetation
- Noise issues
- The District contains adequate office accommodation

The site and its surroundings

This application relates to a substantial brick and tile three-storey former ex-offenders hostel located on the southern side of Brickhouse Lane. The building contains a delineated tarmac car park to the front aspect, with natural field boundaries fronting Brickhouse Lane. Vehicular access is gained to the site via Brickhouse Lane. The building was until mid-February 2005 utilised for teaching and administrative office accommodation. At the time of the Officer’s site visit the building appeared to be occupied by a number of small businesses. The site is located within recognised Green Belt.

Proposal

This application relates to the change of use of Field View House from mixed office (B1) and teaching facility (D1) to office use (B1) only.

For the reference of Members, planning permission was granted in 1997 (B/1997/0409) for the change of use of Field View House from an ex-offenders hostel to teaching and administrative office accommodation. According to the applicant’s Agent, the permission was implemented shortly after it was granted. The building was occupied by Foster Care Associates (FCA), a voluntary independent fostering organisation. The ground floor of Field View House was used to teach children whose needs could not be met in mainstream
schools. FCA used the first floor as general offices (not directly related to the school) and
the second floor largely unused. According to the Agent, up to 20 pupils were educated at
the school, with 15 administration and teaching staff. A further 30 staff have been employed
on the first floor at any one time.

On 11 February 2005, the school closed, with the remaining pupils being transferred back to
mainstream schools. The applicant is seeking to use the building entirely for office use. The
Agent anticipates that a total of 20 to 25 people would be based in the office.

Further information pertaining to this application has been submitted by the applicant’s
Agent. This is provided in Appendix 2.3.

Relevant policies
WCSP   D.16, D.26, D.38, D.39, SD.1, SD.2, SD.4, T.1
BDLP   C27, C27b, DS2, DS13, TR11
Others PPS1, PPG2, PPG13, WMSS: PA1, PA14

Relevant planning history
B/2002/0143 (Heath House)
   Removal of condition 3 of application ref B/2001/0948 requiring that use of
   premises as offices shall be ancillary to activities taking place within Field
   View House: refused 13.03.02
   Appeal: allowed 03.12.02
B/1997/0604 Car park extension and playground: approved 08.09.97
B/1997/0409 Change of use of ex-offenders hostel to teaching and administrative
   accommodation: approved 14.07.97
B/12760 Additional workshop: approved 15.04.85
B/9804 Fire escape stairs: approved 21.06.82
B/6357 Continued use of workshop: approved 18.07.79
B/284 Additional workshop: approved 30.09.74

Notes:
The main issues with this particular application are considered to be:

(a) Whether the proposal represents appropriate development in the Green Belt, taking
   into account the relevant policies including SD.4 and D.26 of the WCSP, DS2 and
   C27 of the BDLP and Government advice contained within PPG2 and PPG13

(b) Impact on traffic and highway safety

Green Belt Issues
Policy DS2 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan notes that permission for development in
the Green Belt will not be given, except in very special circumstances, for the construction of
new buildings or for the change of use of existing buildings unless as criteria (a) states,
proposals are for the re-use of rural buildings, in accordance with Policy C27 of the
Bromsgrove District Local Plan. Policies DS2 and C27 of the BDLP and Policy D.39 of the
Structure Plan are in general accordance with national guidance provided in PPG2 in
allowing the re-use of buildings in the Green Belt subject to criteria including:

(i) Any re-use should not have a greater impact upon the present use on the
   openness of the Green Belt
(ii) Buildings are permanent and substantial, capable of conversion without major
    reconstruction
(iii) The form, bulk and design of the conversion is in keeping with its surroundings
In terms of the structural condition of the building, Policy C27 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan is clear in requiring that buildings are of permanent and substantial construction AND are capable of conversion without major works or complete reconstruction (my emphasis).

In relation to point (i) I note that the recent former use of the premises to be a combined teaching/office use. I would suggest that the proposed use of the building to a wholly office use would not have a materially greater impact on the Green Belt than the previous use being of a similar nature. The proposals intend to reuse the existing access leading Brick House Lane and the existing delineated car-parking area. In respect of point (ii) and (iii), I note that the building is substantial and brick built and no alterations to the external appearance of the building are proposed. Given these circumstances and having considered the list of criteria set out in Policy C27, I am of the view that the proposal represents appropriate development in the Green Belt.

Amenity and Traffic Implications
Given the isolated location of the premises, I do not consider the proposals will have any adverse impacts relating to overlooking or loss of privacy.

I note the views of third parties relating to traffic issues. The applicant’s Agent has pointed out that there is no limit on the number of people who can currently occupy the building, or on the number of rooms within the building which can be used, implying that the current uses could be intensified without a further grant of planning permission. The Agent notes that the last use of the building generated arriving and departing movements of 17 pupils and 15 staff in addition to up to 30 office workers employed on the first floor in association with the other roles of FCA. It is anticipated that no more than 25 people will work from the building, compared to 60 occupiers previously. No additional parking provision is required, with the existing parking area containing 29 marked parking spaces. The views of the WCC(HP) are awaited.

Policies SD.4 and T.1 of the WCSP both state that proposals for development will normally only be allowed where they are located so as to minimise the need for travel, particularly travel by private car. In respect of office development, WCSP Policy D.26 states that the preferred option for new office development will be within town centres and the justification to Policy D.29 states that, in relation to proposals for the re-use of rural buildings for employment purposes, proposals that are likely to result in a significant increase in numbers and lengths of journeys to work by car are unlikely to be acceptable.

The application site is clearly away from any town centre but is located on the outskirts of Stoke Heath. Although Brickhouse Lane is not located on a public transport link, Hanbury Road that connects to Brickhouse Lane is a main arterial link that does contains public transport opportunities. I consider these opportunities to be in reasonable walking distance to the application site. Furthermore, as demonstrated by the applicant’s Agent, compared to the current use of the building, the proposed scheme for wholly office use would not appear to generate significant additional traffic. As such on this issue I do not find the scheme to be so contrary to WCSP Policies on minimising the need to travel by car to warrant a refusal on this basis.

The WCC (HP) has raised no objection.

Conclusions
Given all material considerations, I find the application to be acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION that permission be GRANTED sfc:
Notes
This decision has been taken having regard to the policies within the Worcestershire County Structure Plan (WCSP) June 2001 and the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 (BDLP) and other material considerations as summarised below:

WCSP  D.16, D.26, D.38, D.39, SD.1, SD.2, SD.4, T.1
BDLP  C27, C27b, DS2, DS13, TR11
Others  PPS1, PPG2, PPG13, WMSS: PA1, PA14

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

MISS J WHITEHOUSE
"A"
First floor extension
Seafield Farm, Seafield Lane, Beoley
GB  B/2005/0276
11.03.05

RECOMMENDATION that permission be REFUSED

COMMITTEE SITE VISIT: 19 MAY 2005

Consultations
WCC (HP)  Consulted - views received 13.04.05:
No objection
Beoley PC  Consulted - views received 20.04.05:
Objection - this is a farm worker's cottage with a tied usage
Query whether applicant is an employee of the owner of the farm
In view of all extensions query whether the application exceeds the 40% legislation relating to the Green Belt

Publicity  1 site notice posted 21.03.05: no response received (expires 11.04.05)

Councillor Mrs Luck has requested this application is not dealt with under delegated powers but is considered by the Planning Committee (verbal request 06.05.05)

The site and its surroundings
This application relates to a detached traditional-style brick and tile single storey dwelling located on the northern side of Seafield Lane. The dwelling is accessed via a concrete track that also leads to a number of disused poultry sheds to the north of the site. The dwelling is set back significantly from the highway. A mature conifer hedge screens the majority of the dwelling from Seafield Lane. The dwelling is located in an isolated location, enjoying open views to the east, south and west and is within recognised Green Belt.

Proposal
The proposals relate to the raising of a section of the roof of the dwelling to enable the insertion of first floor accommodation consisting of a stairwell, two bedrooms and a bathroom.

Members should note that Condition 3 attached to B1032 states:

The occupation of the dwelling shall be limited to a person solely or mainly employed or last employed in the locality in agriculture as defined in Section 290(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990.
Planning Act 1971, or in forestry (including any dependants of such person residing with him), or a widow or widower of such a person.

According to the applicant’s Agent the dwelling is presently occupied by an elderly widow whose husband had been involved in agriculture throughout his life. The proposal is to make the dwelling suitable for modern family life, in order that a young couple, the grandchildren of the present occupier, might be able to use the property as a family home but still care for their elderly grandmother. The Agent goes on to state that the new occupant will be from an agricultural background and therefore there is no proposal to lift the agricultural tie.

**Relevant policies**
- WCSP: CTC.1, D.38, D.39, SD.2, T.1
- BDLP: DS2, DS13, S11
- Others: PPS1, PPG2, SPG1, SPG7

**Relevant planning history**
- B/2004/0749 Side and rear single storey extension with proposed first floor and new vehicle access: withdrawn 22.07.04
- B3038 Erection of double garage at rear of existing bungalow: approved 1976
- B1032 Erection of poultry manager’s bungalow: approved 12.05.75

**Notes**
I consider the main issues with this application to be whether the extension is appropriate development in the Green Belt and if not whether there are any special circumstances which would override the harm caused. The proposal must also be considered in terms of design and its affect on the amenity of the adjacent occupiers and the surrounding locality and whether it complies with SPG1.

**Green Belt Issues**
Contrary to the views of the applicant’s Agent, the erection of the dwelling known as Woodside was granted planning consent in May 1975. The original floor area of the dwelling as approved is calculated to be 137 square metres. The dwelling has been extended in the past with a detached double garage and hallway link section to the northern aspect of the dwelling. On this basis, the floor area of the proposals, together with the floor area of the previous additions, represents a 82.3% increase in floor area over the original floor area of the dwelling. This amounts to a total resultant floor area of 249.8 square metres.

SPG7 restricts extensions to either 40% of the original floor area of up to a habitable floor area of 140 square metres. On this basis, I consider the 82.3% increase in floor area over the original dwelling constitutes a disproportionate addition in the Green Belt and therefore represents inappropriate development, contrary to Policy S11 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan, SPG7 and the guidance contained in PPG2.

It is now for me to consider whether any very special circumstances to outweigh the harm that would be caused.

The applicant’s Agent has submitted additional information as summarised below:

- (a) The proposal will make the dwelling suitable for modern family life in order that a young couple, the grandchildren of the present occupier, might be able to use the property as a family home but still care for their elderly grandmother

I have noted this view. With regard to point (a), I do not consider the expressed personal circumstances of the applicant to constitute *very* special circumstances to outweigh Green
Belt Policy. Members will also note that the proposal would clearly result in a floor area increase over and beyond the 40% ruling as set out in SPG7. SPG7 refers to examples of special circumstances, including the presence of dwellinghouses within defined village settlement boundaries or within a ribbon of residential development that constitutes a substantial (my emphasis) line of dwellings with residential properties adjacent on either side. I do not consider the dwelling to fall within this remit.

As such I am of the opinion that no very special circumstances exist or have been put forward to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt.

**Design and Amenity**

The existing dwelling relates to a traditional-style single storey dwelling. Criteria (b) of Policy S11 of the BDLP states that work to dwellings in the Green Belt must respect the scale and character of the existing dwelling. The first floor extension (increasing the ridge height from 4.6 metres to 5.9 metres for a length of 14.7 metres) will erode this character and in my view would not respect the scale of the dwellinghouse. The extension would not be screened by the existing hedging and would clearly be seen from Seafield Lane. Due to its height and length it is my view that the proposal would detrimentally impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this location.

**Agricultural Tie Issues**

Members will note that this dwelling contains an agricultural tie. I am aware that if an extension to a dwelling encumbered by an agricultural occupancy condition is proposed, then the case for such an extension is reduced on the grounds of need. This may be due to the extension creating favourable conditions for the later removal of such an occupancy condition because the market for a “large” dwelling from those qualified to occupy it, is very limited.

Case Law on this aspect (Epping Forest DC: 27 August 1997) relating to the erection of a first floor extension and single storey rear extension to an agricultural tied dwelling in the Green Belt, was considered by the Inspector as being compatible with the scale and size of the existing spacious dwelling. The Inspector concluded that the fact that the dwelling was agriculturally tied did not mean that those who might legitimately occupy such a dwelling should be denied an extension which would not be considered suitable for those not employed in agriculture.

Given these circumstances I do not consider the presence of the agricultural tie to be a reason to refuse the application. The onus is placed upon the applicant to ensure that occupation of the dwellinghouse complies with the provisions of Condition 3 on B1032.

**Amenity Issues**

Criteria (c) of Policy S11 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan states that proposed extensions should not adversely affect the existing amenities of adjoining neighbours. Given the isolated location of the proposals, I do not consider this to be an issue in this case.

**Conclusions**

Given all material considerations, I am of the view that the proposal is unacceptable in planning terms.

**RECOMMENDATION** that permission be **REFUSED**:

It is considered that the extension to the dwelling is inappropriate development in the Green Belt because the cumulative impact of the proposals would constitute a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. The proposal would unacceptably harm the openness of the Green Belt, contrary to Policy S11 of the Bromsgrove District
Local Plan, Policy D.39 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan and the guidance contained in SPG7 and PPG2. No arguments exist or have been put forward to support the development that amount to very special circumstances that would outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt.

**RECOMMENDATION** that permission be **GRANTED**

**COMMITTEE SITE VISIT: 19 MAY 2005**

**Consultations**
- WCC (HP): Consulted - views received 09.05.05: No objection
- ENG: Consulted - views received 15.04.05: No objection subject to Conditions
- Local Plans: Consulted - views received 29.04.05:
- Trees: No objection subject to standard Conditions C13 - C19
- Lickey & Blackwell PC: Consulted - views received 13.04.05:
  - Lickey and Blackwell objected to this bungalow in the first place
  - The Parish Council now certainly object, along with the residents of Lickey Square, to this enlargement into what would virtually become a house

**Publicity**
- 4 letters sent 31.03.05: (expire 21.04.05)
- 1 letter sent 01.04.05: (expires 22.04.05)
- 1 site notice displayed 21.04.05 (expires 12.05.05)

3 letters received:
- This application is retrospective and clearly has been built in the hope that planning permission would be given afterwards
- The building now stands very close to the highway, well in front of any previous building line that appears to have been allowed
- Size of the dwelling is mismatched to its plot.
- Intrusion in streetscene
- Loss of tree cover
- Traffic implications

**Councillor Mrs Doyle has requested this application should not be dealt under delegated powers but be considered by Planning Committee (06.04.05)**

**The site and its surroundings**
The application site is located on the northern side of Lickey Square. The site is currently being redeveloped, with the construction of the dwelling to the subject of this application substantially completed. The site formerly related to garden amenity land associated with 23 Lickey Square, with this dwelling set to the north of the site. The access road serving 23 Lickey Square is located to the west of the site. The site contains a number of tree specimens. The site is located in a recognised residential area.

**Proposal**
This full application relates to the erection of a dormer bungalow with an integral double garage.
The applicant has implemented works to construct the bungalow approved under B/2004/0340 and amended this scheme by constructing three no. pitched roof dormer windows and one no. rooflight window to the front elevation and inserting two no. rooflights to the rear roof slope. The dwelling is 0.20 metres higher than the approved dwelling (current scheme 6.4 metres, approved scheme 6.2 metres) The previous scheme contained a detached double garage. The current scheme has altered this to form an integral garage, with height of this structure 1.3 metres higher than the approved scheme (current scheme 5.7 metres, approved scheme 4.4 metres).

The siting and footprint of the dwelling erected on site reflects that of the footprint of the dwelling approved under B/2004/0340, apart from the joining of the garage and the dwelling of some 6.27 square metres.

Works have commenced to implement these works and the application is therefore retrospective.

**Relevant policies**
- WCSP CTC.1, CTC.2, CTC.4, CTC.5, SD.2, SD.4, SD.6, T.1
- BDLP DS3, DS13, S1, S3, S4, S7, S8, C4, C17, TR1, TR11
- Others PPS1, PPG3, PPG13, SPG1, SPG10, WMSS, Lickey and Blackwell VDS

**Relevant planning history**
- B/2004/0340 Bungalow: approved 12.05.04
- B/2003/0922 Residential development: outline (23 and 25 Lickey Square): approved 17.10.03

**Notes**
Given the Local Planning Authority has permitted the principle of development on this site through the granting of outline consent B/2003/0922 in October 2003 and a subsequent Reserved Matters application for the erection of a bungalow in May 2004, the main issue to consider with this particular application relate to the material differences between the submitted scheme and that approved under B/2004/0340 and the implications for visual and residential amenity and highway safety. I note the Policy background applicable to the previous application B/2004/0340 remains relevant to the determination of this application.

**Policy Guidance**
The plot is within an established residential area and therefore residential development is acceptable in principle. Policy S7 of the Local Plan is pertinent to this case as it regards new dwellings outside the Green Belt. The Policy criteria are that any new dwelling should not cause detriment to the character, traditional pattern or amenity of the location, amenity of adjacent neighbours, highways implications and conformity with other Policies within the Local Plan. Policy S8 of the Local Plan states that the District Council will not permit proposals for plot subdivision or housing on backland sites where such development would be detrimental to the traditional pattern or amenity of the location.

Given this Policy context and the extant permission B/2004/0340, is it felt that residential development of this site for one dwelling would, on the face of it, be acceptable in principle. I consider the main issues to consider in connection with this particular application relate to whether the proposed development accords with the criteria set out in Policy S7 and if not whether any disadvantages to the scheme are so substantial to justify refusing permission, despite the Policy support for residential development on such sites. I also note the comments from third parties and consultees arising from the consultation exercise.
Siting and Design
The area is characterised by a mix of modern and traditional medium to large sized detached and semi-detached dwellings of two-storey type, set in large to medium sized plots. Members will note that a detached dormer bungalow has been granted consent on the adjacent plot to the application site in November 2004 (B/2004/1200).

Given the dwelling has been located roughly within the footprint of the dwelling approved under B/2004/0340, the mixed character of the streetscene in this location and the presence of the dormer bungalow at the adjacent site known as 25 Lickey Square, as such I raise no objection to the revised design. I am of the view that the amended proposals would fit comfortably with the form and character of the streetscene in this location and would not appear so out of keeping to warrant a refusal on this basis.

Loss of Trees and Hedgerows
The proposals does not involve the removal of any further tree cover. The Tree Officer has raised no objection to the scheme subject to the imposition of suitable Conditions.

Impact on the Amenity of Adjacent Occupiers
SPG1 sets out design guidance for residential development including separation distances to existing dwellings so as to avoid detriment to residential amenity due to overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing affects. The Guidelines suggests that new development with main windows overlooking existing private spaces should be set back by a distance of 5 metres per storey from the site boundary where it adjoins a private garden area.

I am of the view that the dormer windows and rooflight window to the front elevation do not create any adverse overlooking issues. I consider it pertinent, however, to impose an obscured glazing Condition on the windows to the rear roof slope to ensure that the amenities of the occupiers of the dwelling to the rear are protected. Subject to the imposition of this Condition I am satisfied the development would not affect the existing amenities of the adjoining occupiers and to be able to secure and accommodate an acceptable level of privacy and separation as detailed in criteria (e) of Policy S7 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and the guidance within SPG1.

Access
The WCC(HP) has raised no objection to the scheme.

Managing Housing Supply: SPG10
Given the site benefits from a live consent, I do not consider the provisions of SPG10 to be applicable in this case.

Conclusions
Given all material considerations, I consider the proposals to be acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION that permission be GRANTED
1. The development must be begun not later than the expiration of five years beginning with the date of this permission
2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended), no window(s) or opening(s) other than those shown on the approved plans shall be inserted on the dwellinghouse without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority
3. Prior to the occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted, the two no. first floor windows to the rear elevation shall be fitted with obscure glazing and remain so in perpetuity.
4. There is no Public Surface Water Sewer available and no surface water will be allowed to discharge to the foul water sewage drainage system. The disposal of storm water shall be by means approved by the Local Planning Authority. The approved system shall be operational before building works commence.

5. Details of the means of the disposal of foul sewage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved system shall be operational before the building is completed or occupied, whichever is the sooner.

6. Details of the form, colour and finish of the materials to be used externally on the walls and roofs shall be subject to the approval, in writing, of the local planning authority before any work on the site commences.

7. Before the commencement on site of any works, which are the subject of this permission, a scheme of landscaping and planting shall be submitted to, and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The scheme shall include the following:

(a) Full details of all existing physical and landscape features on the site including the position, species and spread of all trees and major shrubs clearly distinguishing between those features to be retained and those to be removed;

(b) Full details of all proposed fencing, screen walls, hedges, floorscape, earth moulding, tree and shrub planting where appropriate. The approved scheme shall be implemented within 12 months from the date when the building hereby permitted is first occupied. Any trees/shrubs/hedges removed, dying, being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased within 5 years of the date of the original planting shall be replaced by plants of similar size and species to those originally planted.

8. The existing trees/hedges/shrubs shall be retained and shall not be felled, lopped or topped, or otherwise removed without the previous written consent of the local planning authority. Any trees/hedges/shrubs removed without such consent or dying or being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased shall be replaced with trees/hedges/shrubs of such size and species as may be agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

9. Before any materials are brought on to the site or any development commenced the developer shall erect protective fencing as illustrated by BS 5837:1991 Fig 4 on a line concurrent with Section 7 of BS 5837:1991 subject to the approval of the local planning authority. The developer shall maintain such fences to the satisfaction of the local planning authority until all development, the subject of this permission, has been completed. The level of the land within the fenced areas shall not be altered without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.

10. The destruction by burning of any materials shall not take place within 10 metres of the furthest extent of the canopy of the trees to be retained on the site or on land adjoining.

11. No materials whatsoever shall be stored, or temporary buildings for use in connection with the construction of the development erected, beneath the canopy of any tree, which is to be retained.

12. No oil storage tank or concrete mixing plant shall be emptied or otherwise allowed to drain on to land beneath the canopy of any trees to be retained.

13. Where trees to be retained are subject to tree surgery, damage by machinery or damage which results in a part of the bark of the tree being cut away. Remedial work shall be undertaken as set out in BS 3998 - 1989.

14. If it is necessary to carry out excavations beneath the canopy of any tree to be retained on the site or on adjoining land. The excavation shall be hand dug and...
Reasons
1. Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
2. To protect the amenity of adjacent occupiers in accordance with policy DS13 and S7 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004.
3. To protect the amenity of adjacent occupiers in accordance with policy DS13 and S7 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004.
4. In order to secure satisfactory drainage conditions in accordance with policy ES3 and ES4 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004.
5. In order to secure satisfactory drainage conditions in accordance with policy ES3 and ES4 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004.
6. In order to secure the satisfactory appearance of the development in accordance with policy DS13 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 and policy CTC.1 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001.
7. In order to protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the site in accordance with policy DS13 and C17 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 and policies CTC.1 and CTC.5 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001.
8. In order to protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the site in accordance with policy DS13/C17 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 and policies CTC.1 and CTC.5 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001.
9. In order to protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the site in accordance with policy DS13/C17 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 and policies CTC.1 and CTC.5 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001.
10. In order to protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the site in accordance with policy DS13/C17 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 and policies CTC.1 and CTC.5 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001.
11. In order to protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the site in accordance with policy DS13/C17 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 and policies CTC.1 and CTC.5 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001.
12. In order to protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the site in accordance with policy DS13/C17 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 and policies CTC.1 and CTC.5 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001.
13. In order to protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the site in accordance with policy DS13/C17 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 and policies CTC.1 and CTC.5 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001.
14. In order to protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the site in accordance with policy DS13/C17 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 and policies CTC.1 and CTC.5 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001.

Notes
In accordance with s.1 (1) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (amended), it is an offence to damage or destroy the nest of a wild nesting bird.
This decision has been taken having regard to the policies within the Worcestershire County Structure Plan (WCSP) June 2001 and the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004 (BDLP) and other material considerations as summarised below:

WCSP  CTC.1, CTC.2, CTC.4, CTC.5, SD.2, SD.4, SD.6, T.1  
BDLP  DS3, DS13, S1, S3, S4, S7, S8, C4, C17, TR1, TR11  
Others  PPS1, PPG3, PPG13, SPG1, SPG10, WMSS, Lickey and Blackwell VDS

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

**RECOMMENDATION that permission be REFUSED**

Consultations  
Romsley PC  Response awaited, consulted 04.04.05.  
WCHP  No response received, consulted 04.04.05.  
ENG  No objection, subject to comments. 20.04.05.  
CEHO  No adverse comments. 13.04.05.  
NCSC  The Commission welcomes the application and would hold no objections as long as the environmental standards comply with the National Minimum Standards - Care Homes for Older People. 20.04.05.  
FC  No response received, consulted 04.04.05.  
ECO DEV  Economic development supports the application. There is increasing demand for nursing home facilities nationwide and particularly in Bromsgrove, which has an above average age profile. 07.04.05.  

Publicity  
Site notice displayed expires 12.05.05.  
Fourteen neighbours consulted, expires 25.04.05. and 13.05.05.

The site and its surroundings  
The application relates to the existing Yew Tree Nursing home, sited off Yew Tree Place on the northern side of St Kenelm's Road, Romsley. The existing nursing home is sited at the southern end of the site and is provided within an existing ‘L’ shaped building with a number of dormer windows. The site is accessed by a vehicular route along the south east corner leading to a carpark area to the east of the building. Open lawned grounds are sited to the north of the building. The site is located within the green belt.

Proposal  
The application relates to the erection of an extension to the north west corner of the site to provide for a new lounge and a number of new ensuite bedrooms and disabled facilities. The development will run along the boundary of the site with 24 - 29 Yew Tree Place and will result in the removal of a small brick built store along this edge.

Relevant policies  
WMRSS  UR3, PA1, QE1, T1, T7.  
WCSP  SD1, SD2, SD3, SD4, SD5, SD6, SD7, CTC1, CTC2, D38, D39, T1.  
BDLP  DS2, DS13, C4.TR11.
Relevant planning history
The site has an extensive planning history. Application B18636 proposed the demolition of the original single storey building (ex British Legion Club) and replacing it with a 24 bedroom nursing home being refused and dismissed on appeal. Since 1990 the following applications have been considered;

B/1991/0009 Residential development. Outline permission granted. 17.06.91. (land adj 36 St Kenelms Road)
B/1991/0489 Construction of new pitched roof and conversion of the existing building into a 24 bedspace nursing home with ancillary accommodation. Granted 07.10.91.
B/1992/0642 Boiler house. Granted 09.10.92
B/1994/0397 One storey extension to the existing office and laundry and the creation of lounge, office, WC and storage facilities. Granted. 15.08.94.
B/1995/0084 Proposed amendments to original application No. 94/0397. Providing additional first floor accommodation. Granted 03.04.95.
B/2002/1024 Proposed internal alteration and extension to create seven extra bedroom spaces, new disabled bathroom, new disabled WC and a new lounge area. Refused 29.10.02.

Notes
Given the location of the site within the green belt and within a landscape protection area, the application raises two main issues;
1. The appropriateness of the development in this location and if relevant, the presence of any very special circumstances and
2. The impact of the development on the landscape, amenities and other interests of acknowledged importance.

Green Belt
The site is located within the green belt and outside the defined village envelope boundary of Romsley. PPG2 sets out the forms of development, which are considered appropriate in green belt locations if the aims and objectives of green belt designation are to be facilitated. Para 3.4 lists instances in which new buildings are considered as appropriate and the extension to existing nursing home facilities is not included. I consider therefore that by definition, that the development proposed is inappropriate and therefore harmful.

No very special circumstances have been submitted with the application and I am unaware of any that may exist. The applicant’s agents have been asked to submit such information and this is expected in time for the meeting. I note the support for the development from the Economic Development Officer and the National Care Standards Commission. However the views expressed by those consultees seek to provide additional opportunities for care at the facility, they do not set out any unique circumstance as to why this premises, in this location, should be allowed to expand. It is my view that those considerations could be repeated at any similar premises throughout the green belt and as such are not ‘very special’.

Turning to the harm caused by the development, I note that the extension will increase the depth of the development along the southwest boundary. The mass and bulk of the building...
as viewed from Yew Tree Place will therefore increase creating a more urban and built up appearance to the site. In addition the development will encroach further into the space around the building and collectively will undermine one of the objectives of green belt designation (to safeguard the countryside from encroachment). I consider that the development is harmful to the main feature of the green belt - its openness and combined with the harm caused by reason if it’s inappropriate nature is harmful.

Members will note from the planning history that application B/2002/1024 related to a very similar form of development to that currently proposed. Indeed the form, extent and design of that proposal is very like the current scheme. Following the refusal of that application, advice was given to the agents as to what supporting information may be appropriate to include with any subsequent submission, however none has been included.

Other Matters
The site is part of a parcel of land abutting Romsley Village boundary which is identified as a Landscape Protection Area within which the character of the countryside and the quality of the landscape have been identified as being worthy of protection. Criteria are listed in Policy C4 of the BDLP 2004, which lists features to which special attention will be paid. Given the position of the development within the site as a whole I do not consider that the development would be harmful to the Landscape Protection Area.

With respect to residential amenity, I note Yew Tree Place supports flatted development and the block 24 - 29 includes a projecting rear wing with windows looking onto the site. Whilst the wall of the development facing this boundary is devoid of windows the relationship to the blank wall needs to be considered. SPG1 gives indicated distances and I note that some 13m exists between a first floor window and the development and that the development does not project so far along this boundary as to impinge on the latter window. I consider that given the relationship and the advice in SPG1, that this arrangement would not be harmful to residential amenity.

I am also aware of the raft of policies that exist that seek to provide new development in sustainable locations, where a choice of transport options exists and where it is not necessary to rely so heavily on the car. Clearly the application site does not provide for any of those opportunities, however given the scale of the addition and its relationship to the existing function, I don’t consider that the scale of the development is such as to warrant refusing the development on this ground.

However, these conclusions do not override the issues associated with the principal of the development in the green belt and on this ground the application should fail.

RECOMMENDATION that permission be REFUSED
The development is by definition inappropriate in this green belt location and as such is harmful to the objectives and principles of the green belt. In particular the development will bring about the encroachment of development into the countryside. The development is therefore contrary to Policy DS2 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004, Policy D38 and D39 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001 and the advice in PPG2 ‘green belts’ 1995. No very special circumstances have been demonstrated to outweigh this harm caused.

BROMSGROVE Erection of clubhouse equipment storage facility GB B/2005/0335
RUGBY FOOTBALL CLUB “A”

Proposal: Erection of floodlighting system to first team pitch

Bromsgrove Rugby Football Club, Finstall Road, Bromsgrove

RECOMMENDATION that subject to the receipt of satisfactory additional information permission be GRANTED

Consultations

WCC (HP) Consulted - views received 14.04.05:
No objection

ENG Consulted - views received 05.04.05:
No objection subject to Conditions

EHO Consulted - views received 08.04.05:
No objection

Local Plans Trees
Consulted - views received 15.04.05:
- No objection subject to conditions C13 - C19 plus a condition requiring prior approval of the siting and installation methods of the cables for the flood lights (e.g. outside tree protection zones would be good).
- Remind applicant that trees are TPO’d and breach of conditions may result in prosecution

Sport England Consulted - views received 08.04.05:
- Sport England has considered the application in the light of its Playing Fields Policy, which is now largely incorporated into paragraph 15 of Planning Policy Guidance Note 17. The Policy identifies exceptions to our normal position of opposing development on playing fields
- From the information supplied it appears that the proposal is an exception under E2 of our Policy incorporated as criteria (i) of paragraph 15, in that it is ancillary to the use of the site as a playing field and does not adversely affect the quality or quantity of pitches and their use
- In such circumstances Sport England do not object to this application

Worcestershire County Council Rights of Way Consulted 30.03.05: views awaited

Ramblers Association Consulted - views received 11.04.05:
No objection

Finstall PC Consulted - views received 07.04.05:
There were no objections to this application

Publicity
1 letter sent 31.03.05 (expires 21.04.05)
2 site notices posted 29.04.05 (expire20.05.05)
1 press notice published 06.04.05 (expires 27.04.05)
1 press notice published 13.04.05 (expires 04.05.05)

2 letters received:
- Light pollution
- Generation of additional noise pollution
- No objection to the equipment storage facility and walkway

The site and its surroundings
The application site is located on the eastern side of Finstall Road. The site relates to an
established outdoor sports venue with a tarmac access road leading off Finstall Road. The site is large in area and consists of a brick built club-house and several sport pitches, with a number of these pitched being floodlit. A 2-metre high sandstone wall delineates the boundary of the site fronting Finstall Road. The site is within recognised Green Belt.

Proposal
This full application relates to two elements:
(a) Erection of single storey equipment storage facility and covered walkway section to the rear of the existing Clubhouse
(b) The erection of four no. floodlights consisting of two no. columns adjacent to the main access road and two no. columns to the southern boundary of the site. The floodlights comprise of 18 metre high silver metallic galvanised columns with a pre-cast concrete base. The lighting consists of silver galvanised cowled quad luminaries.

The access and parking arrangements are to remain as existing.

Additional information pertaining to this application is given in Appendix 2.4. A lighting specification has also accompanied the application.

Relevant policies
WCSP SD.2, SD.4, RST.1, RST.2, RST.10, CTC.1, CTC.2, CTC.5, CTC.6, D.38, D.39, T.1, T.3, T.4, T.9, T.10
BDLP DS2, DS13, S19, S28, S29, C16, C17, TR1, TR8, TR10, TR11, TR13, RAT1, RAT2
Others PPS1, PPG2, PPG17, WMSS

Relevant planning history
B/2004/0056 Hoarding - Advertisement Consent: approved 11.03.04
B/1998/0728 Alterations, extension and refurbishment to clubhouse, new access off Finstall Road and internal access road, car parking and all weather playing area: approved 14.12.98
B/1993/0030 Extension to provide gymnasium, additional changing facilities and aerobics room, together with floodlit all-weather training facility: approved 08.03.93

Notes
The main issue in this application is therefore whether the proposals constitute development appropriate to the Green Belt and if not whether there are any very special circumstances that would outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. The proposal must also be considered in terms of impact on the amenity of the locality and residential amenity and the implications for highway safety and egress.

Policy Issues
Policy S28 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan states that the provision of new or enhanced community facilities and the retention of existing ones will be supported providing there is no conflict with other policies in the Local Plan. Policy S29 places emphasis on good design that helps to achieve improved access by the disabled.

Policy RAT4 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan states that the District Council will seek to retain and enhance all public and private owned open space of recreational and amenity value. Policy RST.12 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan notes that the creation and conservation of informal and formal open spaces in settlement will be encouraged to meet regional and local recreation needs
Paragraph 12 and 13 of PPG17 (revised) makes it clear that development of open space, sports or recreational facilities may provide the opportunity to substitute for any loss of open space or sports or recreational facility by that “the new land and facility should be at least accessible to current and potential new users and at least equivalent in terms of size, usefulness, attractiveness and quality”.

**Green Belt Issues**

Policy D.39 of the adopted Worcestershire County Structure Plan states that there will be a presumption against allowing inappropriate development in the Green Belt as stemming from national planning guidance PPG2 “Green Belt”. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. Policy DS 2 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan sets out the instances where development is considered appropriate in the Green Belt as stemming from the advice given in PPG2.

One of the objectives of land use within the Green Belt referred to in PPG2 is “to provide opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population [and] to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas”. Criteria (b) of Policy DS2 of the BDLP regards proposals that are for essential (my emphasis) facilities for outdoor sport and recreation. Paragraph 3.5 of PPG2 goes into state that ‘these essential facilities should be genuinely required for uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in it’. Paragraph 3.15 of PPG2 goes on to state that the visual amenities of the Green Belt should not be injured by proposals for development within or conspicuous from the Green Belt which, although they would not prejudice the purposes of including land in Green Belts, might be visually detrimental by reason of their siting, materials or design.

Policy RAT2 relating to the development of outdoor sport and recreation facilities states that such proposals will be supported in the Green Belt subject to a number of criteria including (a) the proposal must not include new building other than that genuinely required for essential facilities which must be solely related to the main outdoor sports use, (d) the scale, design and visual appearance of the proposal should not have an adverse effect upon the character or amenities of the surrounding area and (f), the proposal must not lead to the generation of excessive noise or other nuisance, such as lighting.

The Clubhouse extension is required to provide space to store additional sports equipment to be used for the function of the site. The covered walkway will enable a more accessible and manageable approach into the Clubhouse for disabled visitors. Given these circumstances and having considered the list of criteria set out in Policy DS2 and PPG2, I am of the view that the extension aspect of the proposal represents appropriate development in the Green Belt.

**Floodlighting**

The scheme includes the erection of four no. floodlights consisting of two no. columns adjacent to the main access road and two no. columns to the southern boundary of the site. The lighting has been specifically designed to use the Musco Sports Cluster system which reduces spill to areas within the vicinity of the site. Members will also note the site contains existing floodlighting of a similar nature to the training pitches to the west and south of the first team pitch.

From the observations of your Officer on site, the existing floodlighting columns are estimated to be approximately 11 metres in height. I am not aware of any restrictions on the hours of illumination of the floodlights.
Although higher than the existing lighting columns, given the established outdoor sport use of the site, the presence of other lighting columns and the specific design of the lighting direction, I am of the view that the floodlighting would not cause undue harm to the visual amenities of the Green Belt or the amenities of the in this location. I have, however, written to the applicants to ascertain the precise purpose for the lights, how often they are to be used and to what intensity, compared to the existing training lights and at what times they are to be used.

I note the views from third parties. Although I note these comments, the EHO has raised no objection to this aspect of the scheme. Accordingly, subject to the acceptance of satisfactory additional information outline above, I do not consider the scheme would demonstrably harm the amenities of the adjacent occupiers over and above that of the current activities and lighting of the existing site. Given no conditions are present restricting the hours of illumination of the existing floodlighting, I am mindful that illumination of the site can take place at any time. The current proposal, however, does bring the lights closer to Finstall Road residents and, therefore, I am mindful to restrict their use by conditions. I have raised this issue with the applicants and will update Members at your meeting.

Conclusions
Having considered all material factors, including third party comments, I consider the scheme to be acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION that subject to the receipt of satisfactory additional information, permission be GRANTED:
1. C99
2. The external wall finish (materials, colour and texture) and the roof covering shown on the approved drawings in relation to the Clubhouse extension shall be used and no others substituted without the written approval of the local planning authority.
3. The external finish of the lighting columns and specification of the lighting shall be as detailed on the approved drawings and technical specification unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority
4. There is no Public Surface Water Sewer available and no surface water will be allowed to discharge to the foul water sewer. The disposal of storm water shall be by means approved by the Local Planning Authority
5. C13
6. C14
7. C15
8. C16
9. C17
10. C18
11. C19

Reasons
2. To protect the amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DS13 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan
3. To protect the amenities of the adjacent occupiers in accordance with Policy DS13 and RAT2 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan
4. To ensure the provision of adequate surface water drainage in accordance with Policy ES1 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004

Notes
The applicant is cautioned that the commencement of any works on site prior to the discharge of tree protection conditions may result in legal action to prevent such works
continuing or causing damage to protected trees and may also result in prosecution for any damage caused to protected trees and their root systems.

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

| WCSP         | SD.2, SD.4, RST.1, RST.2, RST.10, CTC.1, CTC.2, CTC.5, CTC.6, D.38, D.39, T.1, T.3, T.4, T.9, T.10 |
| BDLP         | DS2, DS13, S19, S28, S29, C16, C17, TR1, TR8, TR10, TR11, TR13, RAT1, RAT2 |
| Others       | PPS1, PPG2, PPG17, WMSS |

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

| MR RICHARDS   | Change of Use to approximately 4510 Green sqm use class B1A and B1C, new access and associated works. |
| 'A'           | WILDMOOR MILL FARM, MILL LANE, WILDMOOR, BROMSGROVE. |
| B/2005/0352/SJ| 11/04/2005 |

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the determination of the application be **DELEGATED** to the Director of Planning Services upon the expiration of the publicity period. Minded to **GRANT**.

Consultations:

| Belbroughton PC | Objection - "Not change of use but re-development in a fashion unacceptable in a Green belt area. Buildings proposed were felt to be unremittingly ugly." (21.04.2005.) |
| ENG           | Consulted (12.04.2005.) |
| RA            | Raise concerns over location of access to the site and pedestrian/highway safety - application is opposed (18.04.2005.). |
| BC            | Consulted (12.04.2005.) |
| EHS           | Site located in relatively quiet rural area. However complaints have been received in the past concerning noise from activities at the waste food processing mill located adjacent to the site. For B1(a) and B1(c) uses suggest conditions. However consider that the proposed change of use should not give rise to any significant nuisance. (19.04.2005.) |
| WMC           | Requests that proposed development complies with SBD (Commercial Standards) and that the proposed CCTV conform to both PSDB and data protection standards (28.04.2005.). |
| EA            | Consulted (12.04.2005.) further information sent (18.04.2005.) |
| EDO           | Consulted (09.05.2005.) |
| WCC(HP)       | Consulted (12.04.2005.) |
Publicity
Site notice posted 03.05.2005. Expires 25.05.2005.

The site and its surroundings
This application relates to a site measuring some 1.66 hectares located to the east/north of Mill Lane. The site accommodates a number of former pig sheds (currently redundant) and associated equipment. Buildings immediately to the south are used in connection with a pig feed processing business and this benefits from a Certificate of Lawfulness granted in 1999. Fields lie to the north, west and east with conifer tree screening on parts of the site boundary. A stream runs from north to south on land to the east and in between the main complex of buildings and a sharp bend in the road. A rough, partly overgrown track runs from the gated entrance on the bend to the former agricultural buildings.

Proposal
Planning permission was sought in 2001 for the conversion of 6,220 sqm of buildings for B1c, B2 and B8 uses (B/2001/0379 refers). During the course of the application the B2 heavy industrial element of the application was deleted and planning permission was subsequently granted for 6,220 sqm of B1c and B8 uses. Amongst other conditions the scheme included the requirement to make improvements to Mill Lane to be carried out prior to occupation.

This current full planning application proposes a total of 4,510 sqm of buildings to be used as B1(a) and B1 (c ) uses and includes as previously alterations to the road at the junction of Mill Lane and Third Road as well as the provision of a new passing bay on Mill Lane.

As previously the scheme includes alterations to the existing track leading from Mill Lane and the provision of a new bridge over the nearby stream. This application is accompanied by a Traffic Generation note prepared by David Tucker Associates (DTA) and a planning statement.

Relevant policies
WMSS QE1, QE2, QE3, QE6, PA14, PA15
BDLP DS2, DS6, DS11, DS13, C4, C27, C31, C32, E9, TR1, TR11, ES1, ES4,
Others PPS1, PPG2, PPG4, PPS7, PPG13, PPG23, SPG4

Relevant planning history
There has been a number of planning applications submitted relating to this site the most recent being the following:-

B/2001/0379 Change of use of redundant pig units into approx. 6220 sq. metres of use class B1(c) & B8 units together with ancillary work including a new access. Granted 29.10.2001.

B/1994/0626 Construction of extension for processing pig feed, installation of weighbridge & replacement building to create canteen & improved staff facilities (as augmented by letter received 04/10/94. Approved 10.10.94.

B/1991/0463 Steel framed side extension to existing mill/mix storage building. Refused 07.10.91.

B/1991/0093 Erection of slurry weeping wall and storage tank. Approved 11.3.91.
On 8th December 1999 a Certificate of Lawfulness was approved for the pig feed processing business on the adjoining land.

Notes
Given the site's position within designated Green Belt and rural area, the nature of the proposed development and local road system, I consider the main issues of this application to be :-

(i) whether the proposed development is acceptable in terms of Green Belt policy;
(ii) whether the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of the likely impact on the local environment and the amenities of local residences; and
(iii) whether the benefits of the proposal in terms of assisting farm diversification and road junction improvements outweigh the disadvantages of the scheme.

Green Belt Issues
Policies in the BDLP and WCSP echo advice in PPG2 in stating that the re-use of buildings can be appropriate development in the Green Belt subject to various criteria. Policy C27 states that such proposals will only be acceptable if the proposed conversions could be undertaken without major reconstruction or major works. Members are aware that an extant planning permission exists for the conversion of these buildings under plan no. B/2001/0379. It is therefore important to establish whether more works are required than previously accepted for the re-use of these buildings. To that end I note that the Building Control Officers comments are awaited. Members will be updated at Committee regarding this issue although it would appear from the information submitted by the applicant and experience of similar buildings elsewhere in the district that this type of agricultural building can be converted without major works, providing they are structurally sound.

Green Belt policy only defines the re-use of buildings as being appropriate where the proposed use would not materially harm the openness of land. The application site not only includes buildings but the hardstanding area to allow for parking and servicing.

The proposed development would obviously result in the increased presence of vehicles including heavy goods vehicles over and above the current vacant situation. I note however that the proposal includes the demolition of significant areas of existing buildings within the site. This is over and above the extant planning permission, which proposed the conversion of 6220 sq.m of buildings, where the current proposal involves the conversion of 4510 sqm of buildings.

However I note that the proposed development includes the removal of existing buildings covering an area of some 3670 sq metres. As previously I would also suggest that the existing buildings shown to remain, as well as the existing screening to the site, will help reduce the visual impact of additional activity on the site. Subject to conditions preventing outside storage, I am satisfied that the proposed development would on balance not harm the openness of Green Belt land as such I find the proposal to be acceptable in Green Belt terms.

Impact on the local environment and residential amenity
The comments from the EHS on the likely disturbance caused by the proposed uses on the amenities of neighbouring properties are noted. I note that the extant planning permission included use of the buildings for B1 (c) light industry and storage or as a distribution centre (Use Class B8) and that the permission does not specify any limitation on the extent of this use.
This current application would exclude B8 uses and would instead propose B1 (a) Office uses. As such I would suggest that the Office uses proposed are less likely to give rise to a significant adverse effect on the local environment and residential amenities than the B8 use previously approved. Indeed I note that the EHS considers that this use is least likely out of the two uses currently proposed to give rise to complaints in terms of residential amenity. The other use B1(c) was I acknowledge part of the approved scheme (B/2001/0379). This use by definition includes industrial uses that can be carried out without detriment to the amenity of that area by reason of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, soot, ash, dust or grit.

It is noted that when the approved scheme was considered there was particular concern with respect to the proposed disturbance to amenity and the local environment caused by the increase in traffic generation. Policy E9 of the BDLP states that employment development proposals will need to demonstrate that the traffic generated will not adversely affect residential or other non-industrial development. Policy T.1 of the WCSP states that any additional traffic generated by proposals will need to be shown to be capable of accommodation on the road system without undue environmental consequences. As such the applicants have submitted a Traffic Generation Note, which reviews the traffic generation implications of the revised proposals and considers the appropriateness of the previously agreed off-site highway works to accommodate the revised development proposals.

The applicants have stated that of the 4510 sqm of total floor area proposed to be converted, 1,804 would be specifically B1(a) and the remainder would be B1( c ) uses. The traffic assessment concludes that the proposed development would give rise to around 491 vehicle movements per day of which 35 would be HGVs. As stated above the existing permission is unrestricted in terms of the levels of each use class. Therefore the scenarios considered in the assessment are 100% B1(c) or 100% B8. I note that if the extant planning permission were to be implemented and 100% of the buildings were used for B1(c) then this would give rise to some 517 vehicle movements per day of which 64 would be HGVs. Further the second scenario of 100% B8 use would give rise to some 165 vehicle movements per day of which 49 would be HGVs.

Accordingly the assessment concludes that the proposed development would generate less trips than the maximum potential generation of the permitted use of the site for 100% B1 (c) light industry and that the potential for the site to generate large HGV movements would be significantly reduced.

Furthermore the assessment concludes that the level of traffic forecast for the proposed scheme is lower than that previously submitted to the Highway Authority. The Highway Authority raised no objections to approved scheme and concluded that the level of off-site highway works proposed outweighed the impact of the additional traffic. Whilst, at the time of writing this report, comments from the Highway Partnership are awaited, given the above I am of the opinion that the proposed scheme is unlikely to give rise to an objection from the Highway Authority in terms of highway safety or operation of the adjacent highway network.

Given the assumptions made by the applicant in terms of the proportion of each use proposed I would recommend that this proportion is secured by virtue of a planning condition,

Benefits of the proposed development
I note the WCC(HP)’s comments made with respect to the approved scheme on the proposed works to the highway junction and as previously I would accept that the
improvements that these would have on the safety of this junction are an advantage to the application.

I am also aware of the encouragement given to farm diversification schemes as set out in PPS7, policy C31 of BDLP and D.30 of the WCSP. Further I also acknowledge that Government policy and development plan policy supports the re-use of existing buildings. This support is not, however universal but dependent upon the buildings being appropriately located and suitably constructed, meeting sustainable development and environmental objectives.

In addition to the issues already considered in this report I acknowledge that the site although close to the urban area is in a relatively rural location and would create employment in an area poorly related to the urban core of Bromsgrove and not served by public transport. In broad sustainable terms therefore the site is a poor choice of location for an employment site.

In accordance with case law one has to weigh this harm against the "fall back" position which in this case constitutes the extant planning permission granted in 2001 for the conversion of some 6220sqm of existing building. The benefits of this current proposal have been explored above and may be summarized as follows:

- More buildings demolished that previously approved therefore the current scheme would lead to a beneficial impact on the openness of the Green Belt.
- Office use is less likely to give rise to significant adverse effects on the local environment and residential amenity.
- Would enable levels of each use to be controlled.
- Subject to control the scheme is likely to generate significantly less trips than the maximum potential generation of the permitted use.

In conclusion having considered the benefits of this current proposal against the harm caused, I am of the view that the application is acceptable.

**RECOMMENDATION:** that the determination of the application be **DELEGATED** to the Director of Planning Services upon the expiration of the publicity period, minded to **GRANT**.
### CONDITIONS DISCHARGED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| B/2002/1327    | One bedroom bungalow.  
9 Mill Close, Hollywood, Birmingham  
Condition no. 2: Details of materials  
As set out in your letter received by the Council on 22.03.05.  
Condition 22.03.05  
Condition no. 4: Landscape details as shown by drawing no. 04038/105 received by the Council 22.03.05. |
| B/2002/1360    | Single storey detached timber building to be used as a church and village hall - Resubmission of B/2002/0832  
St. Leonard’s Church, Church Hill, Frankley  
Condition No. 2  
Timber panels and colour as sample submitted 24.02.05.  
Please note that we require a sample of the tile to be used on the roof.  
Condition no. 3 Landscaping details as submitted 24.02.05. |
| B/2002/1422    | Proposed demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 2 no. new dwelling houses - Outline application.  
As amended by letter received 03.01.03.  
50 Wellington Road, Bromsgrove, Worcestershire.  
Blockley Brindled Orange Sandface brick to be used on both properties. |
| B/2003/0597    | Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 24 no. dwellings, parking and associated access (As amended by plans received 30.05.03)  
Marlgrove Club Motel, 408 Birmingham Road, Marlbrook, Bromsgrove, Worcestershire.  
Condition no. 9 - ground contamination report and proposals  
As set out in GIP documents dated 05.05.04, 10.06.04, 21.07.04, 07.09.04, 30.11.04 and 18.02.05. |
| B/2004/0313    | Change of use of redundant barns and office/ancillary accommodation into dwelling and dwelling into office and ancillary accommodation.  
As amended by plans received 13.05.04.  
Bell Hall Farm, Hartle Lane, Belbroughton, Worcestershire.  
Discharge of condition 03 (Archaeological programme) as described in report prepared by The University of Birmingham, project number 1300, received 18.03.05.  
Discharge of Condition 04 (Landscaping) as shown on drawing 1 received 02.03.05.  
(Adequate fencing to protect trees during construction and ensure materials are not stored within canopies will be required).  
Discharge of Condition 09 (highways matters) as shown on drawing 1 received 02.03.05. |
B/2004/0700  Two storey rear extension and internal alterations. 
The Coach House, 10 Plymouth Drive, Barnt Green, 
Birmingham. 
Revision to elevations as shown on drawing nos. 04/725/04B 
and 05A received by the Council on 30.03.05.

B/2004/1070  Installation of 23m high telecommunications tower, 3 no. 
antennas, 1 no. 300mm dish, radio equipment, housing and 
development ancillary thereto. 
Utsumi Smith, 6 Sherwood Road, Aston Fields, Bromsgrove, 
Worcestershire. 
Revision to the height of the mast and layout as shown on 
drawing no. 00213799-101 issue C, received by the Council on 
01.04.05.

B/2004/1328  Rear single storey extensions with conservatory. Single storey 
side extension. Detached garage to front. General disabled 
adaptions and extensions. 46 Hollywood Lane, Hollywood, 
Birmingham. 
- Amendments to extension shape and boundary positions, 
alterations to rear ramp arrangement 
- Alterations to pool extension 
- Internal alterations to rear right hand side extension 
- Garage increased in length by 740mm and repositioned 
slightly, allowing for covered area between garage and 
house.

All items as detailed in your letter and plans received 26.04.05. 
Plan numbers PIC: 1634/04 - PIC: 1634/07 Revision A.

B/2004/1331  Increase of nursery use from 15 - 23 places. Deletion of part 
residential use. 131 Perryfields Road, Bromsgrove, 
Worcestershire. 
Condition 3. Details of fencing as described in letter received 
09.02.05. and colour stated in letter received 20.04.05.

B/2004/1332  Amendment to approval B/2003/0182 for the resiting of double 
garage. 
Condition 3: Storm water drainage. 
As detailed in letter and plan received 14th March 2005. 
Drawing No. 0405980 05 Revision A 
Condition 6: Landscaping* 
As detailed in letter and place received 10th March 2005. 
Drawing No: unreferenced. 
*Amended scheme to that approved 3rd March 2005.

B/2004/1369  Change of use to single dwelling, to include new vehicular 
access to rear of Greendale Close. 55 & 57 Golden Cross Lane, 
Catshill, Bromsgrove. 
Discharge of condition 02 in connection with treatment of side 
elevation, as shown on drawings submitted under cover of letter 
of 09.03.05.

B/2004/1482  Demolition of existing dwelling, construction of a new private 
dwelling and modification of an existing vehicular access. 
Plot 1, 411 Stourbridge Road, Catshill, Bromsgrove. 
Condition 13. I note the contents of your letter dated 30.03.05 
and that the work was undertaken in accordance with this 
condition.
B/2004/1483  Demolition of existing dwelling
Construction of a new private dwelling and new vehicular access.
413 Stourbridge Road, Catshill, Bromsgrove.
Condition No.2 External materials
Facing Brick - Caradale Bracken Red
Tiles - Eternit Acme Smooth Brindle clay plain tiles front elevation only. Rear elevation only Forticrete Gemini plain tiles Autumn colour.

B/2004/1483  Demolition of existing dwelling.
Construction of a new private dwelling and new vehicular access. 41.
413 Stourbridge Road, Catshill, Bromsgrove
Condition 13. I note the contents of your letter dated 30.03.05 and that the work was undertaken in accordance with this condition.

B/2004/1544  Proposed 5 no. detached dwellings.
57 & 59 Victoria Road, Bromsgrove, Worcestershire.
Conditions 13 & 14. Obscured glazing
As sample submitted - Pilkington Cotswold Glass.

2. **APPROVED AMENDMENTS TO PLANNING PERMISSIONS**

B/2004/0813  Extension - 84 Hartle Lane, Belbroughton, Worcestershire.
Revised detail and layout of bay window as shown on drawing no. D43.1/003 rev E received 19.04.05

B/2004/0904  2 no. semi-detached dwellings - Approval of Reserved Maters under previous application B/2003/1051.
Land adj. To 16 Wyche Cottages, Shaw Lane, Stoke Prior.
Condition 3: Red Bagridge Tuscan/Tuscan bricks.

B/2004/1080  Modifications to existing drawings approval no. B02/0923 of a proposed 2 storey side extension.
Sunglow, Victoria Road, Dodford, Bromsgrove.
Amendments to include extension of the canopy as shown on drawing submitted 20.04.05.

B/2004/1095  Formation of shopmobility unit within existing car park.
Multi Storey Car Park, Churchfields, Bromsgrove.
Minor amendment to scheme approved under B/2004/1095:
- Alteration to floor plan
- Glazing of reception area
- Partitioning of kitchen area from storage area
As detailed in letter and plans received 17th March 2005 and letter and plans received 24th March 2005-04-28
Drawing Nos:
  05-250-1 T1
  05-250-2 T1
  05-250-4 T1

B/2004/1160  Lounge extension
29 Stonehouse Road, Bromsgrove
Additional window in approved lounge extension as detailed in letter and plans received 13th April 2005.
B/2004/1421  Ground floor extensions to form utility and kitchen
59 Lodge Crescent, Hagley, West Midlands.
Implementation of previously approved scheme as shown on
drawings no. 1562 received 13.04.05.

B/2004/1425  Details of materials and landscaping reserved matters relating to
residential development - Reserved Matters (Outline Planning
Permission ref. No. B.2002/1014)(as amended by plans received
07.01.05). Phase 6, Breme Park, Newton Road, Bromsgrove.
Revisions to the driveway and boundary wall/entrance feature on
plots 615 and 650, shown on plans received by the Council on

12 Pikes Pool Lane, Burcot, Bromsgrove.
Change of colour to white stained timber (as amended by letter
and photograph received by the Council on 20th March 2005)

B/2005/0046  Enabling works to existing site consisting of alteration of existing
contours and provision of new strategic landscaping and alteration
to existing estate road and footpath in connection with proposed
development.
Buntsford Gate Business Park, Buntsford Hill, Stoke Heath,
Bromsgrove.
Removal of spur road as shown on drawing nos. 04-1845-055 rev
T3, 056 rev T3 and 057 rev T3 received by the Council 19.04.05.

B/2005/0060  Alterations and consolidation of ‘Jalna’
‘Jalna, Woodland Road, Dodford, Bromsgrove.
Demolition of existing two chimneys and a single replacement
chimney on the side elevation (as amended by plans received on
30th March 2005).

3. **DELEGATED PLANNING APPLICATIONS**
Pursuant to the powers delegated to me by the District Council of Bromsgrove under
Minute 85/03 (2) (a), I hereby approved the item(s) referred to in column 2 below to
the proposals submitted to and permitted or approved by the Council under the plan
referred to in column 1 below.

**Advertisement Consent - Granted**
B/2005/0013  Illuminated fascia signs and non-illuminated directional sign
140A High Street, Bromsgrove
Received Date: 25.01.05  Decision Date: 27.04.05

**Agricultural - Notification - Details Not Required**
B/2005/0332  General purpose concrete building - Agricultural Notification
Brockhill Farm, Brockhill Lane, Redditch
Received Date: 30.03.05  Decision Date: 19.04.05

**Conservation Area Consent - Granted**
B/2005/0237  Removal of agricultural buildings, conversion of listed barn and
stables to residential use
Barns at Hall Farm, Hill Lane, Alvechurch
Received Date: 02.03.05  Decision Date: 27.04.05

**County Matters - No objection**
B/2005/0348  Renewal of 1 no. double mobile classroom - County Matters ref.
No. 603305
South Bromsgrove High School, Charford Road, Bromsgrove
Received Date: 31.03.05  Decision Date: 25.04.05
**Permitted Development**
B/2005/0322  Rear white PVCu Conservatory  
2 Davenham Road, Bromsgrove  
Received Date: 24.03.05  Decision Date: 19.04.05

**Full Planning Consent**
B/2003/1048  Demolition of house, factory, cottage, tea room building and amusement arcade. Erection of 24 no. apartments with car parking and modified vehicular access (as augmented by design statement received 14.08.03, tree survey received 04.11.03 and amended plans received 09.12.03 and 11.12.03).  
Land at 444 - 448 Lickey Road, Rednal, Birmingham.  
Received Date: 23.07.03  Decision Date: 20.04.05

B/2003/1116  Change of use of barns to storage/light industrial units with associated car-parking - resubmission of B/2003/0346  
Yew Tree Farm, Money Lane, Chadwich, Bromsgrove.  
Received Date: 12.08.03  Decision Date: 20.04.05

B/2004/0087  Single storey conservatory extension to rear. Replacement of flat and low pitched roofs with new pitched roofs. Detached double garage (as amended by plans received by the Council on 25.02.04). Planning Permission revoked 20/04/05 and replaced by B/2005/0177  
Wrens Nest, Wapping Lane, Boleyn, Redditch  
Received Date: 23.01.04  Decision Date: 20.04.05

B/2004/1123  Revert to use as a domestic dwelling  
1 Summerfield Road, Holy Cross  
Received Date: 03.09.04  Decision Date: 18.04.05

B/2004/1452  Wood cabin to provide shelter/storage facilities for work in woodland  
Land off Pikes Pool Lane, Finstall, Bromsgrove  
Received Date: 14.01.05  Decision Date: 27.04.05

B/2004/1580  Retrospective access road within field and proposed ménage.  
Land off Rowney Green Lane, Alvechurch  
Received Date: 08.03.05  Decision Date: 27.04.05

B/2004/1583  Conversion of existing outbuildings to form ‘Granny Annex’ ancillary to main dwelling house  
Carpenters Hill House, Carpenters Hill, Boleyn  
Received Date: 29.12.04  Decision Date: 07.04.05

B/2005/0006  Construction of Duck Pond  
New Barn Farm, Swan Lane, Fairfield  
Received Date: 21.02.05  Decision Date: 18.04.05

B/2005/0028  First floor extension over existing garage - Resubmission of B/2003/1449  
13 Stonehouse Road, Bromsgrove  
Received Date: 15.02.05  Decision Date: 11.04.05

B/2005/0033  Increase height of roof at the front of the property  
70A Barkers Lane, Wythall  
Received Date: 14.01.05  Decision Date: 04.04.05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Received Date</th>
<th>Decision Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0036</td>
<td>2 storey rear extension including demolition of existing outbuildings.</td>
<td>3 Hartle Lane, Belbroughton</td>
<td>17.01.05</td>
<td>11.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0038</td>
<td>Extension to rear of dwelling</td>
<td>142 Kidderminster Road, Dodford</td>
<td>07.02.05</td>
<td>04.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0049</td>
<td>Front boundary wall</td>
<td>125 The Oaks, Bromsgrove Road, Romsley</td>
<td>10.02.05</td>
<td>07.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0064</td>
<td>Demolish garage and replace with two storey extension. Replace conservatory and part of roof structure to main section</td>
<td>57 Bittell Road, Barnt Green</td>
<td>21.01.05</td>
<td>27.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0072</td>
<td>Ground floor conservatory to rear of property</td>
<td>Olney, Woodland Road, Dodford, Bromsgrove</td>
<td>25.01.05</td>
<td>27.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0074</td>
<td>Amendments to extensions previously approved under plan no. B/2004/0979</td>
<td>The Old Bakery, Woodman Lane, Clent, Stourbridge</td>
<td>02.02.05</td>
<td>19.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0081</td>
<td>Erection of bowling pavilion to existing bowling green</td>
<td>Bowling Green, Sanders Park, Kidderminster Road, Bromsgrove</td>
<td>16.02.05</td>
<td>12.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0087</td>
<td>Proposed extension and detached garage</td>
<td>The Oaks, Broome Lane, Hagley, Bromsgrove</td>
<td>14.02.05</td>
<td>07.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0094</td>
<td>Extension to industrial unit to replace outside storage area</td>
<td>44 - 46 Sherwood Road, Bromsgrove</td>
<td>22.02.05</td>
<td>18.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0098</td>
<td>Erection of parapet wall to screen mechanical plant, external ducting, painting of kitchen canopy extract flue and retention of cold store and air condensers to rear of unit of decking and storage sheds. As amended by plans received 11.03.05</td>
<td>127 Worcester Road, Hagley, Stourbridge,</td>
<td>09.02.05</td>
<td>18.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0101</td>
<td>Proposed showroom extension</td>
<td>Branson’s Furniture Showroom, Alcester Road, Beoley, Alvechurch</td>
<td>11.02.05</td>
<td>07.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0115</td>
<td>Two storey side and single storey rear extension with loft conversion installing rooflights.</td>
<td>63 Linthurst Newtown, Blackwell</td>
<td>03.03.05</td>
<td>22.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0118</td>
<td>Change of Use from Residential Private to Residential Private and Nursery (as amended by letter received 03.03.05).</td>
<td>6 Cirencester Close, Parklands, Bromsgrove.</td>
<td>15.02.05</td>
<td>27.04.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B/2005/0129 Covered walkway to link two buildings  
Hurrans Garden Centre, Alcester Road, Bromsgrove  
Received Date: 16.02.05    Decision Date: 08.04.05

B/2005/0131 2 storey extension to include lounge, study and master bedroom/bedroom 4. Internal replanning, revised entrance (as amended by application forms received 21.03.05)  
Windover Cottage, Field Lane, Clent  
Received Date: 07.02.05    Decision Date: 07.04.05

B/2005/0133 Garage, porch and utility room  
31 Hazel Road, Rubery  
Received Date: 24.02.05    Decision Date: 21.04.05

B/2005/0134 Proposed dining kitchen extension  
16 Pinewoods Avenue, Hagley  
Received Date: 07.02.05    Decision Date: 04.04.05

B/2005/0135 Detached double garage and conversion of existing garage to family room  
75 Clent Road, Rubery, Birmingham  
Received Date: 07.02.05    Decision Date: 04.04.05

B/2005/0136 Demolish existing garage and build 2 storey extension at left hand side of house. Upgrade existing rear extension flat roof to a tiled pitched mono roof.  
9 Bowmore Road, Bromsgrove  
Received Date: 07.02.05    Decision Date: 04.04.05

B/2005/0137 Formation of room in roof space with front dormer extensions  
3 Pipers Close, The Forelands, Bromsgrove  
Received Date: 07.02.05    Decision Date: 04.04.05

B/2005/0138 Additional industrial unit and extension of 2 no. industrial units.  
Sugarbrook Mill, Buntsford Hill Bromsgrove  
Received Date: 07.02.05    Decision Date: 07.04.05

B/2005/0143 Domestic extensions to existing bungalow with first floor bedroom  
20 Three Oaks Road, Grimes Hill, Wythall  
Received Date: 22.02.05    Decision Date: 18.04.05

B/2005/0145 Proposed alterations to existing garage  
Hunters Rise, Holy Cross Green, Clent  
Received Date: 08.02.05    Decision Date: 05.04.05

B/2005/0148 Retention of satellite dish, television aerial, exterior lighting and boundary wall  
‘Swallows Nest’, Rowney Lodge Farm, Rowney Green Lane, Alvechurch  
Received Date: 17.02.05    Decision Date: 20.04.05

B/2005/0149 Two storey side extension  
63 Windmill Avenue, Rubery, Birmingham  
Received Date: 09.02.05    Decision Date: 06.04.05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Received Date</th>
<th>Decision Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0150</td>
<td>Demolition of existing conservatory and construction of new conservatory</td>
<td>Sundays Hill, Whinfield Road, Dodford</td>
<td>09.02.05</td>
<td>06.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0152</td>
<td>Two-storey side extension</td>
<td>40 Gleneagles Drive, Barnt Green</td>
<td>09.02.05</td>
<td>06.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0155</td>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>Lye Brook House, 55 Redditch Road, Alvechurch</td>
<td>28.02.05</td>
<td>06.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0158</td>
<td>Loft conversion (as amended by plans received on 18.02.05)</td>
<td>58 Middlefield Lane, Hagley</td>
<td>10.02.05</td>
<td>07.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0159</td>
<td>First floor extension over existing balcony and garage</td>
<td>Woodland View, Quantry Lane, Belbroughton</td>
<td>22.02.05</td>
<td>18.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0162</td>
<td>Ground floor kitchen extension to ancillary accommodation</td>
<td>77 Redditch Road, Stoke Heath, Bromsgrove</td>
<td>18.02.05</td>
<td>18.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0163</td>
<td>Replacement concrete sectional garage (from a flat roof to one with an apex 18 inches approx)</td>
<td>Peartree Cottage, 110 Golden Cross Lane, Catshill, Bromsgrove</td>
<td>23.02.05</td>
<td>20.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0164</td>
<td>Side 2-storey and rear single-storey domestic extensions</td>
<td>15 Newton Road, Bromsgrove</td>
<td>14.02.05</td>
<td>08.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0166</td>
<td>Loft conversion including dormer window to rear and side (as amended by plans received 14.03.05)</td>
<td>182 Station Road, Wythall</td>
<td>22.02.05</td>
<td>27.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0168</td>
<td>Rear ground floor and side extension</td>
<td>The Oaks, School Lane, Alvechurch</td>
<td>15.02.05</td>
<td>08.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0176</td>
<td>Extension at first floor to provide enlarged bedroom/bathroom. Extension at ground floor to extend kitchen/provide dining area.</td>
<td>21 Waseley Road, Rubery</td>
<td>16.02.05</td>
<td>18.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0177</td>
<td>One and two-storey extensions to existing dwelling</td>
<td>Wrens Nest, Wapping Lane, Beoley</td>
<td>16.02.05</td>
<td>20.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0178</td>
<td>Demolition of existing garage, erection of garage and store building. Modification to existing access.</td>
<td>Gorse Cottage, Chapel Lane, Alvechurch</td>
<td>16.02.05</td>
<td>12.04.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B/2005/0179 Demolition of part of building and reconstruction with part additional floor over. Construction of pitched roof over existing flat roof section of building.  
1 Worcester Road, Hagley  
Received Date: 16.02.05 Decision Date: 13.04.05

B/2005/0180 Raising of ex flat side roof and conversion into pitched roof, front garden extension porch and canopy  
138 Worcester Road, Hagley  
Received Date: 02.03.05 Decision Date: 27.04.05

B/2005/0182 Alterations to bar and restaurant entrances  
The Country Girl, Stoke Prior, Bromsgrove  
Received Date: 23.02.05 Decision Date: 18.04.05

B/2005/0183 Single and two storey extensions  
24 Worcester Road, Hagley  
Received Date: 17.02.05 Decision Date: 14.04.05

B/2005/0184 Extension to ground floor flat  
Ground Floor Flat, 45 Birmingham Road, Bromsgrove  
Received Date: 17.02.05 Decision Date: 14.04.05

B/2005/0185 Two storey side extension to form master bedroom, dressing room and ensuite.  
9 Carnforth Road, Bromsgrove  
Received Date: 17.02.05 Decision Date: 13.04.05

B/2005/0187 New garden wall to front of property  
8 Park Road, Hagley  
Received Date: 17.02.05 Decision Date: 14.04.05

B/2005/0187 New garden wall to front of property  
8 Park Road, Hagley  
Received Date: 17.02.05 Decision Date: 14.04.05

B/2005/0189 Garden wall  
5 Stretton Croft, Brookhouse Road, Barnt Green  
Received Date: 18.02.05 Decision Date: 13.04.05

B/2005/0190 Single storey extension to rear comprising study and shower room. Dropped kerb to give new vehicular access  
29 Old Birmingham Road, Bromsgrove

B/2005/0192 Conservatory at rear  
31 Reservoir Road, Birmingham  
Received Date: 18.02.05 Decision Date: 14.04.05

B/2005/0195 New flat/pitched roof and garage conversion  
61 Willow Road, Bromsgrove  
Received Date: 01.03.05 Decision Date: 26.04.05

B/2005/0198 Proposed porch  
146 Broad Street, Bromsgrove  
Received Date: 21.02.05 Decision Date: 18.04.05

B/2005/0199 Erection of two storey office extension (as amended and augmented by information received 16.03.05)  
10 Lloyds Building, The Square, Alvechurch  
Received Date: 21.02.05 Decision Date: 27.04.05
B/2005/0201 Proposed extension over garage and porch
65 Malvern Road, Rock Hill, Bromsgrove
Received Date: 28.02.05 Decision Date: 27.04.05

B/2005/0202 Proposed conservatory to the rear of the property
16 Laurel Bank Mews, Blackwell
Received Date: 08.03.05 Decision Date: 20.04.05

B/2005/0204 Reposition existing pavement crossover and extend two storey building by 3m in length previously granted planning permission no. B/2004/0071
128 Five Mile House, Hanbury Road, Bromsgrove
Received Date: 28.02.05 Decision Date: 20.04.05

B/2005/0207 Change of Use of Car Park from use ancillary to the Dolphin Centre to a public Pay and Display car park
The Dolphin Centre, School Drive, Bromsgrove
Received Date: 23.02.05 Decision Date: 08.04.05

B/2005/0208 Conservatory to rear
28 Graham Crescent, Rubery
Received Date: 23.02.05 Decision Date: 20.04.05

B/2005/0209 Construction of conservatory
26 College Road, Bromsgrove
Received Date: 23.02.05 Decision Date: 20.04.05

B/2005/0211 Loft Conversion
The Woodlands, 7 Rose Avenue, Alvechurch
Received Date: 24.02.05 Decision Date: 21.04.05

B/2005/0215 Extension to side and rear to provide additional living accommodation and garage.
11 Pinchers Close, Belbroughton
Received Date: 24.02.05 Decision Date: 21.04.05

B/2005/0217 Extension to kitchen, garage and front bedroom
2 Broadfields, Hagley
Received Date: 03.03.05 Decision Date: 19.04.05

B/2005/0219 Single storey rear extension to form kitchen and revisions to internal layout to form dining room and cloakroom.
98 Crabtree Lane, Bromsgrove
Received Date: 25.02.05 Decision Date: 22.04.05

B/2005/0221 Replacement Dwelling
Lilac Cottage, The Gutter, Madeley Heath, Belbroughton
Received Date: 25.02.05 Decision Date: 22.04.05

B/2005/0222 Hardstanding area 14m x 10m to allow access to two fields via two new field gates due to change of ownership
36 Bromsgrove Road, Romsley
Received Date: 09.03.05 Decision Date: 27.04.05

B/2005/0225 Change of Use, alteration and refurbishment of the existing first floor and part ground floor
Perry Hall Hotel, Kidderminster Road, Bromsgrove
Received Date: 11.03.05 Decision Date: 27.04.05
B/2005/0228 Detached garage/store
51 West Road, Bromsgrove
Received Date: 01.03.05 Decision Date: 21.04.05

B/2005/0229 Replacement of mono pitched roof with new plain tiled pitched roof to stable block
Dordale Farm, Dordale Road, Belbroughton
Received Date: 01.03.05 Decision Date: 19.04.05

B/2005/0234 Two storey rear extension
72 Stourbridge Road, Bromsgrove
Received Date: 02.03.05 Decision Date: 27.04.05

B/2005/0235 Two storey rear extension
18 Cotton Church Lane, Birmingham
Received Date: 02.03.05 Decision Date: 22.04.05

B/2005/0236 2 no. new windows to front elevation
Metalsoft UK Ltd., Unit 66, Sugarbrook Road, Bromsgrove
Received Date: 02.03.05 Decision Date: 22.04.05

B/2005/0244 Extension to rear
Bourneway, Rowney Green Lane, Alvechurch
Received Date: 03.03.05 Decision Date: 22.04.05

B/2005/0249 Single storey garage extension
14 Linthurst Newtown, Blackwell
Received Date: 10.03.05 Decision Date: 22.04.05

B/2005/0256 Extension to bungalow
63 Finstall Road, Bromsgrove
Received Date: 08.03.05 Decision Date: 20.04.05

B/2005/0262 New Tennis Court
Sling Cottage, Angel Street, Upper Bentley
Received Date: 16.03.05 Decision Date: 27.04.05

B/2005/0264 Lounge and conservatory extension
16 Fords Road, Majors Green
Received Date: 09.03.05 Decision Date: 22.04.05

B/2005/0324 Variation of Condition 4 on Outline Approval B/2002/1014, to remove reference to framework plan and replace reference with land use plan 12228/200
Breme Park/Bromsgrove Technology Park, Newton Road, Bromsgrove
Received Date: 24.03.05 Decision Date: 27.04.05

Planning Permission - Refused
B/2004/1030 Removal/vary condition 9 of planning permission B/1994/0819, to only allow HGV’s to visit the site between the hours of 08.00am to 10.00pm.
Bell Service Station, Bromsgrove Road, Belbroughton
Received Date: 16.08.04 Decision Date: 27.04.05

B/2004/1188 Retention of the existing 3 dwellings together with the erection of 4 dwellings to the rear of land at 49 - 53 Twatling Road (as amended by plans received 11.02.05)
49 - 53 Twatling Road, Barnt Green
Received Date: 12.09.04 Decision Date: 08.04.05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B/2004/1552</td>
<td>Formation of patio at ground floor level including earthworks with provision of garage in the below ground space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Alcester Road, Finstall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Received Date: 05.01.05 Decision Date: 08.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0108</td>
<td>Erection of new Agricultural shed for use as storage/stabling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moors Farm, Whitford Bridge Road, Bromsgrove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Received Date: 09.02.05 Decision Date: 20.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0123</td>
<td>Boundary Fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Varykind, Houndsfield Lane, Hollywood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Received Date: 01.03.05 Decision Date: 27.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0146</td>
<td>First floor extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fernbrook, Heath End Road, Belbroughton, Stourbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Received Date: 08.02.05 Decision Date: 05.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0157</td>
<td>Single storey side extension to improve kitchen layout and provide office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mearse Cottage, Mearse Lane, Belbroughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Received Date: 10.02.05 Decision Date: 07.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0167</td>
<td>First floor rear extension over existing ground floor accommodation and replacement of existing conservatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The White House, Warbage Lane, Dodford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Received Date: 24.02.05 Decision Date: 21.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0169</td>
<td>Lounge extension and double garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Lingfield Walk, Catshill, Bromsgrove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Received Date: 15.02.05 Decision Date: 11.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0196</td>
<td>Demolish existing buildings and erect 2 storey detached building as store, w.c. shower and snooker room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walton Fields House, Walton Hill, Clent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Received Date: 21.02.05 Decision Date: 22.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0212</td>
<td>Replace existing conservatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beoley Cottage, Seafield Lane, Beoley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Received Date: 01.03.05 Decision Date: 26.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0218</td>
<td>Two storey side extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 Callow Hill Road, Alvechurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Received Date: 25.02.05 Decision Date: 19.04.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applications Withdrawn**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0188</td>
<td>Rear conservatory, 1st floor extension and loft conversion with dormer windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Sandhills Lane, Barnt Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Received Date: 17.02.05 Decision Date: 02.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0248</td>
<td>Detached garage and driveway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shire Barn, Upper Gambolds Farm, Upper Gambolds Lane, Finstall, Bromsgrove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Received Date: 17.02.05 Decision Date: 27.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/2005/0288</td>
<td>Formation of room in roof space with front dormer extensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Woodland Drive, Barnt Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Received Date: 15.03.05 Decision Date: 08.04.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B/2005/0288  Formation of room in roof space with front dormer extensions
2 Woodland Drive, Barnt Green
Received Date: 15.03.05  Decision Date: 08.04.05

**Listed Building Consent - Granted**

B/2005/0170  Fixing of sign to front wall to mark site of medieval crosses.
22 St. John Street, Bromsgrove
Received Date: 15.02.05  Decision Date: 11.04.05

B/2005/0171  Fixing of sign to side wall to mark site of medieval black cross
The Black Cross Inn, Worcester Road, Bromsgrove
Received Date: 15.02.05  Decision Date: 11.04.05

B/2005/0172  Fixing of sign to front wall to mark site of medieval welsh cross
Strand House, 70 The Strand, Bromsgrove
Received Date: 15.02.05  Decision Date: 11.04.05

B/2005/0173  Fixing of sign to flank wall to mark site of medieval market cross
1/3 High Street, Bromsgrove
Received Date: 15.02.05  Decision Date: 11.04.05

B/2005/0216  Addition of Oak pentice boards to external wall frames, replacement of Oak sole plate. Re-open existing blocked doorway and open up doorway in wall frame.
Meadows Farm, Whitford Bridge Road, Stoke Prior
Received Date: 02.03.05.  Decision Date: 27.04.05

B/2005/0226  Internal alterations and external landscape proposals.
Perry Hall Hotel, Kidderminster Road, Bromsgrove
Received Date: 11.03.05  Decision Date: 27.04.05

**Reserved Matters - Granted**

B/2005/0092  Residential development of 1, 2, 3 and 4 bed dwellings, associated roads, driveways and infrastructure - Approval of Reserved Matters under previous application B/2002/1014 (as amended by plans and letters received 31.03.05 and 18.04.05)
Phase 7, Breme Park, Newton Road, Bromsgrove
Received Date: 31.01.05  Decision Date: 27.04.05

B/2005/0128  New build 2 storey dwelling
Rear of 117 Birmingham Road, Alvechurch
Received Date: 11.02.05  Decision Date: 20.04.05

Phase 2, The Courtyard, Buntsfordgate Business Park, Heath. Buntsford Hill, Stoke
Received Date: 14.02.05  Decision Date: 08.04.05

**Overdue Decisions - Reasons**

B/2004/1123  Awaiting letter to amend scheme
Due Date: 29.10.04  Decision Date: 18.04.05
1 Summerfield Road, Holy Cross
Revert to use as a domestic dwelling

B/2004/1188  Awaiting appeal decision for Simila
Due Date: 16.11.04  Decision Date: 08.04.05
49 - 53 Twatling Road, Barnt Green
Retention of the existing 3 dwellings, together with the erection
of 4 dwellings to the rear of land at 49 - 53 Twatling Road (as amended by plans received 11.02.05).

B/2004/1552 Had to go to Committee
Due Date: 02.03.05 Decision Date: 08.04.05
3 Alcester Road, Finstall
Formation of patio at ground floor level including some earthworks with provision of garage in the below ground space.

B/2004/1583 Awaiting amended plans
Due Date: 23.02.05 Decision Date: 07.04.05
Carpenters Hill House, Carpenters Hill, Beoley
Conversion of existing outbuildings to form ‘Granny Annex’ ancillary to main dwelling house

B/2005/0013 Work pressures due to staff shortages
Due Date: 22.03.05 Decision Date: 27.04.05
140A High Street, Bromsgrove
Illuminated fascia signs and non-illuminated directional sign Advertisement Consent

B/2005/0033 Work pressures due to staff shortages
Due Date: 11.03.05 Decision Date: 04.04.05
70A Barkers Lane, Wythall
Increase height of roof at the front of the property

B/2005/0036 Work pressures due to staff shortages
Due Date: 14.03.05 Decision Date: 11.04.05
3 Hartle Lane, Belbroughton
2 storey rear extension including demolition of existing outbuildings

B/2005/0064 Work pressures due to staff shortages
Due Date: 18.03.05 Decision Date: 27.04.05
57 Bittell Road, Barnt Green
Demolish garage and replace with two storey extension. Replace conservatory and part of roof structure to main section.

B/2005/0073 Work pressures due to staff shortages
Due Date: 28.03.05 Decision Date: 08.04.05
The Croft, Alcester Road, Portway, Birmingham
Modification of Condition 03 of B/2004/0626 to omit Part 1 Class E

B/2005/0074 Awaiting Discussion with Conservati
Due Date: 30.03.05 Decision Date: 19.04.05
The Old Bakery, Woodman Lane, Clent, Stourbridge
Amendments to extensions previously approved under plan no. B/2004/0979

B/2005/0098 Amended plans received
Due Date: 06.04.05.2005 Decision Date: 18.04.05
127 Worcester Road, Hagley, Stourbridge
Erection of parapet wall to screen mechanical plant, external ducting, painting of kitchen canopy flue and retention of cold store and air condensers to rear of unit, erection of decking and storage sheds. As amended by plans received 11.03.05

B/2005/0108 Work pressures due to staff shortages
Due Date: 06.04.05.2005 Decision Date: 20.04.05
Moors Farm, Whitford Bridge Road, Bromsgrove
Erection of new Agricultural shed for use as storage/stabling

B/2005/0128 Amended plans received
Due Date: 08.04.05 Decision Date: 20.04.05
117 Birmingham Road, Alvechurch
New build 2 storey dwelling

B/2005/0131 Amended plans received
Due Date: 04.04.05 Decision Date: 07.04.05
Windover Cottage, Field Lane, Clent
2 storey extension to include lounge, study and master bedroom/bedroom 4.
Internal replanning, revised entrance (as amended by application forms received 21.03.05)

B/2005/0138 Work pressures due to staff shortages
Due Date: 04.04.05 Decision Date: 07.04.05
Sugarbrook Mill, Buntsford Hill, Bromsgrove
Additional industrial unit and extension of 2 no. industrial units

B/2005/0148 Work pressures due to staff shortages
Due Date: 14.04.05 Decision Date: 20.04.05
Rowney Lodge Farm, Rowney Green Lane, Alvechurch
Retention of satellite dish, television aerial, exterior lighting and boundary wall

B/2005/0176 Case Officer involved in car accident
Due Date: 13.04.05 Decision Date: 18.04.05
21 Waseley Road, Rubery
Extension to first floor to provide enlarged bedroom/bathroom. Extension at ground floor to extend kitchen/provide dining area

B/2005/0177 Work pressures due to staff shortages
Due Date: 13.04.05 Decision Date: 20.04.05
Wrens Nest, Wapping Lane, Beoley
One and two storey extensions to existing dwelling

B/2005/0196 Had to contact Councillors as refusal
Due Date: 18.04.05 Decision Date: 22.04.05
Walton Fields House, Walton Hill, Clent
Demolish existing buildings and erect 2 storey detached building as store, w.c., shower and snooker room

B/2005/0201 Work pressures due to staff shortage
Due Date: 25.04.05 Decision Date: 27.04.05
65 Malvern Road, Rock Hill, Bromsgrove
Proposed extension over garage and porch

M. GRIFFITHS
Director of Planning Services

The Council House
Burcot Lane
BROMSGROVE
Worcestershire
B60 1AA

23rd May 2005
1. **THE DISTRICT COUNCIL OF BROMSGROVE TREE PRESERVATION ORDER (NO. 1) 2005 - TREE ON LAND AT THE MONA, WALTON RISE, WALTON POOL, CLENT**

The above mentioned Tree Preservation Order relates to a Monkey Puzzle Tree the position of which is shown by means of a black circle numbered "T1" on the plan attached as "Appendix 1".

A representation has been received in respect of the making of the Order from Mr. and Mrs. W. Hodgetts of 7 Walton Rise, Walton Pool, Clent and a copy is attached as "Appendix 2".

The comments of the Director of Planning Services on the representation are as follows:

"The tree the subject of the Tree Preservation Order is a large Monkey Puzzle Tree which is in very good condition. It is situate at the rear of the property at the bottom of a steep incline. It is sheltered by the hill and the property would not be subject to high wind forces.

There is no obvious reason why this tree should fail for many years. The tree is rooted in a free draining sand soil and so will have no effect on any adjacent foundation.

It is confirmed that the liability for any damage caused would lie with the owner of the land on the tree was growing, that is to say The Mona, 8 Walton Drive."

It is recommended:

(i) that the comments of the Director of Planning Services on the representation be endorsed on the basis that they constitute this Council's comments thereon; and

(ii) that the Order be confirmed without modification on the grounds that the tree provides special amenity value and the Tree Preservation Order was made in the interests of amenity.
Background Papers:

(1) Order.
(2) Representation dated 28th February 2005 received from Mr. and Mrs. W. Hodgetts.
(3) Memorandum from Director of Planning Services dated 7th April 2005.

2. **TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 - SECTION 191 - CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS OF EXISTING USE OR DEVELOPMENT - LAND REAR OF 130 OLD BIRMINGHAM ROAD, MARLBROOK**

In pursuance of delegated powers a Certificate of Lawfulness of Existing Use has been granted to the effect that the use of land to the rear of 130 Old Birmingham Road, Marlbrook as part of the residential curtilage of those premises was lawful.

Background Papers:

(1) Application dated 21st December 2004 (received in completed form on the 3rd March 2005).
(2) Memorandum from Director of Planning Services dated 28th April 2005.

3. **APPEAL DECISIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeal against the refusal of planning permission for residential</td>
<td>Persimmon Homes (South Midlands) Ltd</td>
<td>Appeal allowed and planning permission granted subject to Conditions. Application for award of costs against the Council refused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development comprising 21 new build houses and 3 conversions at Mill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm, Radford Road, Alvechurch. Plan No. B/2003/0972 refers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal against the refusal of planning permission for the demolition</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Swift</td>
<td>Appeal allowed and planning permission granted subject to Conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of existing garage and erection of detached 2 car garage, at Malvern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background Papers:

Appeal decision letters.

V. HARRISON
Head of Administrative Services

The Council House
Burcot Lane
Bromsgrove
Worcestershire
B60 1AA

12th May 2005