

Public Document Pack



BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

THURSDAY 3RD SEPTEMBER 2026, AT 6.00 P.M.

PARKSIDE SUITE, PARKSIDE, MARKET STREET, BROMSGROVE, 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 5 - 10)

J. Leach
Chief Executive

Parkside
Market Street
BROMSGROVE
Worcestershire
B61 8DA

3rd September 2026

This page is intentionally left blank

Bromsgrove District Council Planning Committee

Committee Updates
3 September 2026

24/01341/FUL Land north Brockhill Lane, Tardebigge

Further consultation response from the Conservation Officer (26.08.26) taking the updated NPPF into account:

- Within close proximity to the sites, and in particular site 2, are a number of designated heritage assets including Hewell Grange (Grade I), Hewell Park and Garden (Registered GII*), Hewell CA and Ivy Cottage and Rose Cottage (Non Designated Heritage Assets (NDHAs))

Hewell Grange

- The present Hewell Grange dates from the late 19th century and was built to the designs of Thomas Garner of the well known firm of Bodley and Garner. It replaced a late 18th century house which was located to the southeast adjacent to the lake. The ruins still exist and are separately listed Grade II. This house had views across the lake to the northeast and southeast, parkland to the northwest and ancillary buildings to the south west. Views beyond the park to the north east, east and south east were obscured by a belt of trees along these boundaries. The parkland was essentially inward looking, there were no borrowed views.
- The new mansion faced northwest with views to the south east over the extensive French Garden. The house was constructed in Runcorn sandstone in a Tudorbethan style, with a high-quality interior, with equally high quality materials and craftsmanship. Despite being in institutional use since 1945 it has survived remarkably. Access to the Mansion is from Hewell Lane and not Brockhill Lane.
- The significance of the Mansion is largely derived from its architectural interest, as well as its historical interest as part of a large country estate in the ownership of the same family since its acquisition following the dissolution of the monasteries. The Registered Park and the listed structures it contains, form the immediate setting of the house, while the surrounding rural landscape forms the wider setting. Historically much of this surrounding land was owned by the family and occupied by tenant farmers including the two sites. The immediate setting comprising the designed landscape clearly contributes to the significance of the house, forming the environment in which it the house is viewed and experienced. The wider setting although not visible from the house, also contributes to the significance as the Mansion forming part of the wider estate and the wider environment in which the estate is experienced. There are however views of cupola of the house from the stretch of Brockhill Lane close to Site 2. There is a strong economic link as the much of the surrounding agricultural land including the two sites, was owned by the family until the mid-20th century and illustrates how country estates functioned up until the early 20th century. The setting therefore makes a minor contribution to the significance of the Mansion.

The Registered Park

- The land now comprising the Registered Park was developed from the mid-18th centuries, initially, it is thought, with advice from William Shenstone but then with the involvement of Capability Brown, who was responsible for amongst other things remodelling the lake. Humphry Repton produced a Red Book for the Park in 1812, which recommended various improvements to the house and parkland. Subsequent works included the addition of the portico to the Old Mansion, the construction of the Repton Island in the lake and various changes to the tree planting. The 19th century saw further changes with the walled garden being moved to its current location to the east of the Park, and the planting of the French

Agenda Item 4

Garden which is immediately to the rear of the new mansion, constructed in the 1880s, as well as the construction of the grass terraces which rise up to the edge of the estate with a water tower at the top. In addition, there is the Quarry Garden to the north east of the mansion, and an area of ornamental woodland. Further parkland lies beyond including the Planted Hill. To the east of the lake is a screen of trees with grass land beyond, rising to Brockhill Lane where there is a permeable tree boundary. The Park as envisaged is primarily inward looking, the work of Brown and Repton encloses the Park, it was not designed with external viewpoints.

- A modern prison sits within the northeast corner of the Park, although this falls outside the Registered Park. Beyond the parkland the wider setting includes agricultural land and some sparse residential development. The Estate Village, including the Home Farm is located to the southeast, with a small development of prison officer housing to the east. Development comprising the edge of Redditch is some distance away to the south/southeast and there is no intervisibility.
- The significance of the Registered Park is derived from it being a designed landscape with contributions by the nationally important garden designers, Brown and Repton. Like many designed landscapes the nature of the Park evolved and changed over the years, especially when the principal residence was relocated, and considered 19th century additions were made, however the work of Brown and Repton remains legible. The wider setting of the Park comprises the agricultural land, including the Sites, which surround it and the estate village to the west/southwest. The Sites, as noted above were part of the original agricultural land to the estate and therefore provide an understanding of the workings of a 19th century estate. This wider setting provides context to the Park and therefore makes a minor contribution to the significance of the Registered Park.

The Hewell Grange CA

- The CA largely follows the boundary of the Registered Park, but extends further to the west, up to the A448, and including the agricultural land between this road and the B4096. It also includes The Park, the modern prison officer housing. The Conservation Area Appraisal describes the special interest of the CA as follows, 'The Hewell Grange Conservation Area is significant because of the high number of listed and unlisted historic buildings, and the connection between the wider landscape and the built environment. As a historic entity the interrelationship between the setting of the listed buildings and the registered historic park is a key element of the special interest of this Conservation Area. Some fragmentation has occurred as the original estate has been sold in parcels to individual owners; however this has been largely mitigated by the passing of the bulk of the park into Crown ownership.'
- Key views within the CA are identified in the Appraisal and does not include views from the sites.
- The significance of the CA is derived from its architectural and historic interest. It comprises a collection of buildings and garden structures, many individually listed which are all of architectural merit, located in a designed landscape. There are examples of work by notable architects and garden designers. The historic interest is derived from it being a country estate held by the same family from the time of the dissolution of the monasteries. As with the Registered Park, the wider setting includes the sites and the surrounding agricultural land, most of which was part of the wider original land holding to the Estate and therefore provide an understanding of the workings of a 19th century estate. This wider setting provides context to the Estate and CA and therefore makes a minor contribution to the significance of the CA.

Ivy Cottage and Rose Cottage (Non Designated Heritage Assets (NDHAs))

- Ivy Cottage and Rose Cottage comprise a pair of late 19th century agricultural workers cottage, clearly visible on the First Edition of the OS (Surveyed 1883), and part of the wider Hewell Estate. Constructed in brick beneath steeply pitched clay tile roofs, with high brick chimneys

Agenda Item 4

and hood mould details to the windows. Rose cottage to the right has been clearly extended, albeit sympathetically and the original windows to both cottages have been replaced.

- The significance of the cottages primarily relates to their historical interest and their relationship with the Hewell Estate. Architecturally they are modest cottages, but they are not without interest, with the high chimneys and window details giving them some interest and presence. The surrounding agricultural land including notably Site 2 immediately to the west/northwest, forms the setting to the cottages, and contributes to our understanding of their history and origins as well as the link to the wider Hewell Estate.
- Sections 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
- This is supported by Policies in BDP20 of the Bromsgrove Local Plan, which amongst other things, state that development affecting heritage assets, including alterations or additions as well as development within the setting of heritage assets, should not have a detrimental impact on the character, appearance or significance of the heritage asset or heritage assets.

In addition, policies in the NPPF (August 2026) must also be considered.

- HE4 1. Heritage assets, as an irreplaceable resource, should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. To achieve this, development proposals which would affect the significance of heritage assets, including any contribution made by their setting should:
 - b. Avoid (or if that is not possible, minimise) harm to the significance of heritage assets, and instead conserve this significance.
- 2. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (including from development within its setting) should have a clear and convincing justification in accordance with the policies in this chapter.
- HE5 1. Development proposals affecting heritage assets should be accompanied by an assessment of the significance of the assets affected (including any contribution made by their setting) and of the potential effect of the proposal on their significance.
- 2. Assessments of the potential effects of development proposals on the significance of heritage assets (including through effects on their setting) should identify whether proposals would be likely to: have a positive effect, neutral effect or harm the significance of the heritage asset, and the degree of harm should be identified. Harm to the significance of a heritage asset, can come about either from work affecting the asset itself or from development within its setting. The degree of harm should be identified: substantial harm would occur where the development proposal would seriously affect a key element of the asset's significance;
- HE6 1. When considering the potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
- 4. Where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal. Important public benefits can include securing the long-term reuse of a vacant or underused listed building, and enabling energy efficiency and low carbon heating measures to be employed.
- HE7 2. Where a development proposal would harm the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, this should be weighed against the benefits of the proposal and a balanced judgement made, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.
- It is agreed that the proposed scheme will not have a direct impact on Hewell Grange, The Registered Park and Garden or the Hewell Grange CA. The application sites and in particular Site 2 fall within the setting of all three designated heritage assets, and it is agreed that the setting makes a minor contribution to the significance of the three assets. The proposed development will bring an industrial feature into the setting of the designated Heritage assets. It is noted that field boundaries will be retained, however the development will be highly visible

Agenda Item 4

from Brockhill Lane and the boundaries of the Registered Park and Garden and CA along Brockhill Lane will be seen within the context of this development.

- It is agreed that the proposals will cause harm (HE6 1) to the DHAs at the lower end of the spectrum, and this harm should be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal (HE6 4)
- As regards the cottages, they are located adjacent to Site 2, and there will clearly be impact on their setting, and in turn their significance. It is noted that it is proposed to reinforce the boundary between the site and the cottages to filter out views and there will be wildflower planting in the corner adjacent to the cottages to reduce the impact. Despite this mitigation the proposals will introduce an industrial feature into the rural setting of the cottages.
- This will harm the significance of the NDHAs, the harm being at the lower end of the spectrum. This should be weighed against the benefits of the proposal in accordance with HE7 2 noted above.
- The impact of the proposal on Hewell Lake SSSI has been considered within the topic areas of Drainage and Ecology. There is a minor correction on page 47 of the published agenda (Drainage - second paragraph) should read: The proposal is considered to comply with Policy CC3 of the Framework.

Further comments from Natural England (01.09.2026):

- Natural England has reviewed this consultation against its casework priorities and will not be providing case-specific advice on this occasion. Our specialist input is being focused on consultations presenting the highest environmental risks or opportunities, and on strategic and plan-led interventions where our involvement can deliver the greatest benefit for nature and for decision-making.
- The absence of case-specific advice from Natural England should not be interpreted as confirmation that the proposal will have no environmental effects. The relevant standing advice, standard guidance and other references provided in our response should be used to inform the assessment and determination of the proposal.
- Natural England responds to consultations on development proposals in line with our statutory remit, published standards and casework priorities. Our advice supports decision-makers in addressing effects on the natural environment, delivering high environmental quality development and securing opportunities for nature recovery and wider environmental gain. Natural England's advice is informed by the National Planning Policy Framework, National Policy Statements, Planning Practice Guidance, and relevant local development plan policies.
- Natural England is making a substantive shift towards a more proactive, strategic and plan-led planning service. We are prioritising our specialist resources towards high risk and high opportunity development management casework, plan lead strategic approaches and complex and strategic interventions where our advice can have the greatest effect. This means that we will not provide advice on every consultation. Where a case is assessed as lower priority, we may provide reference to standing advice or standard guidance instead of a detailed case specific response, or may determine that no further advice is needed from Natural England.

25/01337/REM Land adjacent Perryfields Road, Bromsgrove

- Following on from recommendations from the Community Safety Officer, amendments have been made to the house-types to show additional secondary windows that will overlook the driveways to improve natural surveillance.
- Comments from Worcestershire Regulatory Services queried the location of the air source heat pumps proposed for each plot as some would be located close together. The applicant has reconsidered this matter. Air source heat pumps are no longer proposed, and gas central heating will be provided instead. However, please note that solar panels are still proposed to be provided for each plot on the roof.

Agenda Item 4

- The applicant has submitted a supporting statement this week that they propose to circulate to Members directly. Please note that the supporting document is on the Council's website under the planning application reference number.

26/00417/ADV Victoria Ground, Birmingham Road, Bromsgrove

- A statement in support of the advertisement proposal along with two photos was submitted on the 2 September 2026 from the applicant, Darren Alderson for and on behalf of Bromsgrove Sporting Football Club.

This supporting statement sets out:

- That this application is solely for the improvement and upgrading of existing signage. It does not seek to introduce a new commercial use, alter the established use of the site, or change the character or operation of the football club. The signage has been established at the club for many years and its purpose is simply to provide clear, appropriate and modern signposting for the football club, its matches, fixtures and events.
- It references the public benefits of the scheme being that it would create greater awareness of the venue, which they are actively seeking to develop as a community hub.
- The statement references the harm to the heritage assets but draws attention to totem signs which serve the retail park and Aldi supermarket near to the site. Setting out how against that established context, it is difficult to see how the modest upgrade of an existing sign facing towards a retail park and serving an existing community facility could reasonably be considered to result in an unacceptable visual or heritage impact.
- Officers' views do however remain that the proposed advertisement given its size, design, illuminated nature and siting would appear as an unduly prominent feature in the streetscene which would fail to enhance the character and appearance of the area or preserve the significance of the heritage assets that surround the site, including their setting. Whilst the benefits of the scheme are noted. Officers do not consider that these would outweigh the harm of the proposal in this case.

This page is intentionally left blank