

# Public Document Pack



## **BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

### **MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**MONDAY 8TH APRIL 2024, AT 6.00 P.M.**

**PARKSIDE SUITE, PARKSIDE, MARKET STREET, BROMSGROVE,  
WORCESTERSHIRE, B61 8DA**

### **SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION**

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 3 - 4)

S. Hanley  
**Chief Executive**

Parkside  
Market Street  
BROMSGROVE  
Worcestershire  
B61 8DA

8th April 2024

This page is intentionally left blank

## Bromsgrove District Council Planning Committee

Committee Updates  
8 April 2024

### **24/00079/FUL Land rear 1-6 Smedley Crooke Place, Redditch Road, Hopwood**

Following the publication of the committee further comments have been received by Dr Peter King, Chairman, CPRE Worcestershire Branch, who cannot attend the committee meeting on 8th April. This have been uploaded onto the application file. The comments are summarised as follows:

The site in question has multiple planning applications. It is located next to Hopwood but outside the village envelope and may be suitable for the next District Plan. Dr King questions whether Hopwood is the right location for significant affordable housing development. The Local Government Ombudsman reprimanded previous Committee Members after the Willow Close development application was granted.

Dr King believes there is a significant need for more affordable housing in the district, but the applicant must prove there is robust evidence of a need for affordable housing in Hopwood and its surrounding areas. The wider needs of the ward or district should not be sufficient.

### **23/01232/FUL Arosa, The Holloway, Alvechurch**

A further representation from Rowney Green Residents Association has been received which follows the publication of the Officer's Report. The responses raises the following planning matters:

- The proposed conversion together with the 49 dwellings at Bordesley Hall would be contrary to paragraph 143c) of the NPPF.
- Underplaying the highways impacts of nearby Bordesley Hall and that the proposals fail to comply with paragraph 115 of the NPPF on road safety.
- Arosa is not isolated due to its proximity to existing and approved dwellings at Bordesley Hall
- Unclear as to how the extension meets with paragraph 84d) of the NPPF.
- Two flats fail to meet with Technical Housing Standards but unclear if this is acceptable and makes reference to paragraph 84e) on design quality for isolated homes.
- Questions the judgement used when considering Green Belt harm and acceptability of the proposals.
- BDC's continued failure to give due regard to paragraphs 114-116 of the NPPF due to the hazardous nature of The Holloway.

#### **Officer Response:**

Paragraph 143 of the NPPF sets out the five purposes of the Green Belt, c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The planning proposals do not conflict with this purpose, the application is primarily for conversion with limited external alterations and an overall reduction in floor space. The proposed garden area and parking already exist. There would be an increased number of dwelling on site if permission is granted; however, it is not considered that the proposals encroach into the countryside.

The cumulative impact of the development together with nearby developments has not been raised by County Highways. The District Council has no reason to take a different view and it is not considered that the proposals residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

The entrance to Bordesley Hall, which is at the terminus of a driveway, is c.270m to the east of the

# Agenda Item 4

site, a similar distance is to the properties along Storage Lane and Rowney Green Lane. The Officer's Report sets out the reasons why Arosa has been considered isolated.

The Officer's Report sets out that the extension has been assessed against Policy BDP4 and paragraphs 152-154 of the NPPF and that very special circumstances would exist to allow the extension.

The failure to meet the Technical Housing Standards is acknowledged within the Report and within the conclusion as part of the balancing exercise as required by NPPF paragraph 11dii). Paragraph 84e) does not apply to this application.

The District Council has received confirmation that the Applicant has submitted an appeal against the Council's refusal to grant planning permission (Ref: 23/00625/FUL) to subdivide the dwelling into 9no. self contained apartments. The Planning Inspectorate has confirmed the appeal is valid.

## **24/00025/FUL 135 Shawhurst Lane, Hollywood**

No updates

## **23/01400/FUL Land Rear 17-19 Willow Gardens, Bromsgrove**

No updates

## **23/01401/FUL Land Rear 8-14 Willow Gardens, Bromsgrove**

A further representation from a resident following the publication of the Officer's Report. The response raises the following planning matters:

- Parking problems
- A failure to notify residents about the proposals

### **Officer Response:**

The Officers Report sets out a response to car parking including the County Council response. The Officers Report sets out that 9 neighbour letters were issued and a site notice was displayed, the requirements of Article 15 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) were complied with.