



**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**MONDAY 2ND MARCH 2020, AT 6.00 P.M.**

**PARKSIDE SUITE - PARKSIDE**

**SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION 1**

The attached papers were specified as "to follow" on the Agenda previously distributed relating to the above mentioned meeting.

4. Updates to planning applications reported at the meeting (to be circulated prior to the start of the meeting) (Pages 1 - 6)

**K. DICKS**  
**Chief Executive**

Parkside  
Market Street  
BROMSGROVE  
Worcestershire  
B61 8DA

2nd March 2020

This page is intentionally left blank

**Bromsgrove District Council  
Planning Committee**

**Committee Updates  
2nd March 2020**

**14/0408 Land Rear Of Algoa House, Western Road**

Further comments have been received in respect of this application;

Councillor Colella has submitted further comments:

Objection raised by the residents at Eightlands, Western Road should be fully considered  
Please also see my request that this site should not be under a management company and should be adopted for HPC for lighting and WCC for highways and BDC for play area management. This management company approach is the same as modern leasehold and the residents are unprotected from uncontrollable price rises.

A further 6 resident objections have been received, the issues raised can be summarised as follows:

Increase traffic, congestion and accidents

Strain of existing facilities in Hagley

Insufficient road and rail facilities

Increase in environmental issues

Inaccuracy on the plan showing existing properties surrounding the site, in particular the property at Eightlands, Western Road

The proposed split of the £21,044.66 identified for Hagley Community Centre and Clent Parish Hall, questioning whether the entirety of the money should go to Hagley Community Centre, due to the location of the site.

NHS Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)

The CCG have confirmed that the £9,936 identified for Hagley Surgery is an up-to-date figure

**19/01023/FUL Land SW Of , Saltbay Farm**

A statement was provided by the applicant in response to the local objections;

"The proposed stable building is intended to be a traditional building which will fit in with its surroundings, in terms of its design and materials, whilst providing a safe and healthy environment for horses.

In the latter respect, doors need to be a minimum of 2.1 metres high for horses and, the door height shown on the application drawings of 2.4 m is not excessive. It has the advantage of providing greater headroom within the stable. High ceilings are important as they allow better ventilation, reduce the amount of moisture in the air and, help keep the temperature down: horses tolerate cold but, high temperatures cause them distress. A pitched roof increases further the headroom within the stable and, also drains well.

A ridge height of 3.3 metres would only allow a roof pitch of 15 degrees which is only suitable for a light-weight roof covering of felt and, felt is not fire proof. The proposal is to use a roof pitch of 30 degrees which is suitable to accommodate a tiled roof (if preferred) or, as currently proposed, a

# Agenda Item 4

coated-metal sheet roof which will prevent rain from penetrating underneath the roof covering. The roof shape would be more aesthetically pleasing than a shallow roof pitch and, be more weatherproof.

The use of a taller brick plinth, to a height of 1 metre, provides a more robust construction, better able to withstand impacts from horses. In my experience of keeping horses, wooden stables are easily damaged by a horse weighing half a ton or more and, consequently, are harder to maintain in good order.

The control over new buildings in the countryside should not sacrifice quality of design and materials in order simply to limit their size. Guidance is just that, guidance and, should not be imposed on a one size fits all basis. The more room they are given, the happier and healthier horses will be. The sizes of the stables are not excessive at about 3.6 metres x 3.6 metres and, the extra headroom provides a healthier, more pleasant, living environment."

One addition letter of objection was received from the residents of Saltbay Farm objecting to the proposal on the height of the building and views from their conservatory.

## **19/01610/FUL The Council House, Burcot Lane**

Comments have been received from Leisure Services relating to landscaping, biodiversity and open space.

- o The re-naturalisation of the canalised section of the watercourse would be beneficial for many reasons including visually, reduction in flood risk and improved connectivity for the Water Vole population, the latter of which has been successfully implemented locally. Questions whether the scheme conserves and enhances the local environment sufficiently in context of NPPF and Nerc Act 2006.
- o Landscaping plan includes tree species which are small and relatively short lived with some unsuitable locations proposed. Mitigation value of planting is thus reduced and falls short of what is required.
- o Cellular storage areas are sited close to trees which can reduce effectiveness and create maintenance issues. Rain garden features can raise issues when run off is from trafficked areas as pollutants are not filtered out thus reducing biodiversity potential. To maintain effectively regular maintenance is required and the size and shape of areas appears to make this difficult. Recent experience supports these concerns.
- o Overall multiple objectives are being sought from areas and maintenance costs will as a result be high. Raises concerns in this context about advising the authority to adopt.

Officers comments;

o Officers acknowledge that benefits would arise from naturalisation of the Spadesbourne Brook however there are complexities associated with land ownership. Whilst the site boundary is on the eastern side of the brook, Officers have been advised that in order to undertake naturalisation that it would be necessary to work with the land owner for the other side of the brook. Riparian rights are legally complex and associated maintenance responsibilities of the watercourse may ensue resulting in additional liability for the developer with possible increased costs. Efforts have been undertaken to improve the visual amenity of this area with the removal of the southern bridge and the landscaping of this area. The Councils Ecologist has commented upon the scheme and supports the recommendations and enhancements proposed as part of the relevant report. Flood risk issues have been considered under that relevant heading and whilst naturalisation of this area would be welcomed, Members of Committee are tasked with

# Agenda Item 4

determining the proposal as presented and for which Officers have no technical reason for withholding consent.

o With respect to Landscaping and additional condition is proposed to enable the submitted landscaping scheme to be revisited and checked with respect to the appropriateness and siting of species proposed.

o This comment underlines the importance of a management plan (Bio-retention areas generally need quarterly inspections and replacement of filter medium approx every 20+ years. Attenuation tanks require annual inspection and generally silt removal every 5 years) which is incorporated into the recommendation. The drainage options for the site are limited, for example disposal of storm water to the sewer would not be compatible with building regulations or with water hierarchy principles, and furthermore there is a need to comply with S38 adoption criteria. With respect to run off from trafficked areas; whilst there is no direct runoff from highway drains into the SuDS features, as part of the final drainage design gullies should be fitted with interceptors for pollution management. It is important to note however that many SuDS features can be designed to intercept pollutants - Hopwood Services is a good example of this and whilst plants which are suitable for this type of SuDS do require more frequent maintenance and removal of contamination to keep them working effectively, this can be achieved. In the context of the site the proposed features will need little maintenance - just periodic strimming and removal of cuttings for aesthetics. Additional above grounds SuDS features would be welcomed but there is a balance in terms of maximising the potential for the site to deliver housing and achieving a suitable outcome from a drainage perspective. The Officer recommendation therefore remains as printed and updated with associated conditions and clarification/amendments to elements of the legal agreement.

o As set out maintenance of the drainage features is a requirement and is addressed via the Section 106. The adoption of this area and the associated open areas is something that the Council may consider and an additional clause to the section 106 is proposed to address this or allow alternative sustainable arrangements for long term maintenance with another party.

## Additional Condition

Additional condition to require drawings and written details of soft landscaping areas of the site to be submitted prior to installation. To ensure the appearance of the development is acceptable.

## Section 106 amendments;

o As set out on page 152, Officers continue to work with Leisure Services colleagues to understand the requirements associated with the development in so far as they relate to offsite contributions for Sport, Recreational facilities and any Open Space requirements. Officers request therefore that the final detail of the offsite sum and the nature of these provisions listed above be Delegated to the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services.

o For clarity it is proposed to delete the obligation relating to Suds on page 153 stating;

o To provide and maintain in perpetuity SuDS including ; pipes, gullies, channels, flow controls, cellular storage, porous paving, attenuation basin, Spadesbourne Brook and address remedial action required due to failure and vandalism.

and replace it with

The provision of the on-site SuDs facilities, with associated trigger points for adoption

And the management and maintenance of the on-site SuDs facilities by Bromsgrove District Council or another appropriate party (Cost to be confirmed)

- o It is proposed to add the following obligation to page 153 relating to the open areas on site

The provision of the on-site open space provision, with associated trigger points for adoption

And the management and maintenance of the on-site open space provision by Bromsgrove District Council or another appropriate party (Cost to be confirmed)

## **19/01625/FUL Land Adjacent, New Inns Lane**

19/01625/S73 UPDATE

### Relevant Planning History

17/01429 Application for a non-material amendment to approved development REFUSED  
19.12.19

Clarification: Determination of such applications is based upon whether or not any proposed changes are deemed to be material or non-material. As the changes involved the addition of new features and increase in height of parts of the roof, they were deemed to be material changes. Accordingly, the application seeking to confirm they were non-material changes was rejected. Consequently, the application before members this evening, made under section 73 (an application for a minor-material amendment) is to consider those proposed changes.

### Further Representations

VISUAL AMENITY - the addition of a gas cooling unit is another visual blot on our landscape.  
NEED FOR COOLING UNIT - The application states - this cooling unit is required to meet DEFRA and Environment Agency Process Guidance Notes (Sept 2012) If this is the case then why was it not in the original plans?

NOISE - Not clear whether the cooling unit will make a noise or when it would operate.

HEALTH RISK - the lowering of the chimney will mean that particles released will now be lower to the ground and therefore more of a health risk to people living in the surrounding area.

IMPACT ON TREES - particles released from the crematorium may have an adverse impact upon trees.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY - The crematorium would utilise fossil fuels at a time when we should be considering impacts relative to climate change.

TYPE OF APPLICATION - The application is for full planning permission

NEED FOR CREMATORIUM - It is alleged that the developer placed the land on the market for housing which demonstrates that the crematorium is not required.

### Officer Comments

- o The application suffix should be S73 not FUL. This does not affect how the application has been processed because the type of application is explicit in the proposal description which formed the basis for its publicity, and the correct application form has been completed.

- o The visual impact of the scheme has already been considered.

- o Any noise emissions from cooling unit would not lead to any adverse residential amenity issues given its location

# Agenda Item 4

- o WRS have raised no objection regarding emissions from the amended proposal
- o There is no evidence to substantiate the claim that existing trees could be harmed by emissions from the crematorium and this issue was not raised in respect of the two extant permissions.
- o There has been no significant change in Government policy since the most recent appeal decision in August 2019 with respect to the operational parameters of crematoria
- o How the landowner chooses to market and dispose of privately owned land is a matter for them. The most recent application has been informed by the technical requirements of a crematoria operator. The most recent appeal decision acknowledges the need for the facility (paragraph 41 APP/P1805/W/18/3211026.)

## **19/01636/FUL 2 Dodford Road, Bournheath**

One additional comment received raising issues as per the report.

Worcestershire Wildlife Trust have commented on the application and have raised no objections to the scheme subject to conditions regarding landscape and protection of trees and ecological features. WWT have confirmed there is no need for a more detailed ecological appraisal of the site. They are satisfied that there is rather limited habitat being lost and that it is of low value for wildlife.

Members are reminded that this is a domestic garden with an associated domestic hedge therefore it is not considered necessary or appropriate or enforceable to impose restrictions on the retention of the hedge.

Tree protection measures has been proposed.

An advisory note will be placed on any approval reminding the applicant of their responsibility under the NERC Act and of the Wildlife and Countryside Act.

This page is intentionally left blank