



BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

MONDAY 23RD MAY 2011
AT 2.00 P.M.

THE COUNCIL HOUSE, BURCOT LANE, BROMSGROVE

SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION

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

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

K. DICKS
Chief Executive

The Council House
Burcot Lane
BROMSGROVE
Worcestershire
B60 1AA

23rd May 2011

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6

Bromsgrove District Council Planning Committee

Committee Updates 23 May 2011

Application Ref No	Update
10/1099	<p>4 additional comments received, summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The application is supported. The proposal would support local businesses which depend on the hotel for their trade. The proposal would generate employment.
10/1106 - HR	<p>The agent hand delivered 2 copies of the site plan (as amended by plans received 20/05/11) with the Blue line added together with 2 copies of a signed Unilateral Undertaking (as augmented by a Unilateral Undertaking received on 20/05/11) that deems the stables not to be used for the housing of animals. Legal have commented that the unilateral undertaking is not legally acceptable as it does not contain the basic requirements of s106 (9) which requires it to be in the form of a deed and contain statutory information. Therefore refusal is still recommended.</p>
10/1184 -DK	<p>Additional comments have been received from the Tree Officer 20.05 and the application is being deferred following these comments to enable discussions with the applicant to resolve the issues.</p>
11/0127-DK	<p>Members have requested additional information in respect history of the barn adjoining the application site on Needle Mill Lane. The building has permission for conversion to a single dwelling under planning reference B/2003/0681. The application was approved contrary to recommendation and does not appear to have been implemented and would therefore have expired on 14.07.2008.</p> <p>An addendum report and slightly amended plans were presented by the applicant on 09.05 and the report takes these amendments and additional information fully into account.</p> <p>Additional photomontages have been provided by the applicant 20.05.2011 and these have been placed on the presentation.</p> <p>2 additional representations received, summarized as follows:</p> <p>The application is supported. The scheme put forward will remedy a derelict eyesore and the proposal is sympathetic to its surroundings. The proposal will not affect the Green Belt in any significant way.</p>

11/0164 - HR	<p>The applicant hand delivered an amended plan drawing R100/200A (as amended by plans received 18/05/11) and a supporting statement stating that he has amended the notes for the adjacent existing compound area to <i>exclude</i> that statement that the area is to be used as an outdoor market area at weekends. This is replaced by the statement that this area will be used for car parking between Tuesday to Saturday.</p> <p>2 additional objections received: 06/05/11(via letter) 12/05/11 (via e-mail)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why has no mention been made of the change of right of way which is also proposed? How will this affect the residents? The proposal will affect the residents due to the deliveries, unloading, parking and an influx of customers. The current state of the car park is dangerous and has potholes and crates and has never been properly surfaced and is a danger to both pedestrians and motorists. • Concerns that the change of use to retail will cause problems with customers to the market parking and or blocking the access road to the rear of our premises as has already occurred with the hairdressers attached to the warehouse. Perhaps a sign could be erected directing customers to their private gated car park which until recently was not gated and was available to the public. Also a sign informing the public not to park or block access to the rear of our premises would be good. <p>17/05/11 E-mail received from applicant stating the following:</p> <p>The Market should provide a number of opportunities for local businesses and benefit the local community and economy. We anticipate that the majority of new employment opportunities created will be filled by local residents. The Market and Cafe is in an area well serviced by public transport and the site has easy access from the park and high street for pedestrians.</p> <p>The compound area will be used for parking for stall holders and staff cars during opening times Tuesday to Friday, however, we anticipate that a significant percentage of the stallholders will arrive via public transport or on foot. The economic viability of the proposal is dependant on the ability to provide outdoor market stalls in the compound area to the side of the main building at the weekends. Some of the outdoor stallholders will display from their own vehicles within the compound area. The balance of the stall holders will use the main adjacent car park, however, the car park which can accommodate in excess of 150 vehicles is virtually empty on Sundays when the high street shops are closed and at most only half to two thirds utilised during busy periods.</p>

11/0251 - DK	<p>An additional supporting letter was received from the applicant 20.05.2010. It is summarised as follows:</p> <p>The building has remained vacant for a considerable period of time and is beginning to show signs of decay. Compliance with the terms of the enforcement notice will not improve the appearance of the building. It is not economically viable to amend the building to comply with the terms of the Enforcement Notice for structural reasons. The proposal will avoid exposing the gable of a garage and maintain the inherent stability of the existing structure.</p> <p>The loss of two rooms out of the five upstairs rooms (required to comply with the Enforcement Notice) will reduce demand for future occupiers.</p>
11/0329 - SC	<p>09/05/2011 – Additional e-mail received from occupiers 19 Summerfield Road raising the following comments/objections:</p> <p>“On such a large plot and with only one house proposed, we are very surprised and concerned to see the footprint so close to our boundary. It is closer than any other houses are to each other in the road. We would like the new footprint moved away from 19’s boundary to an appropriate distance in keeping with the plot and the general appearance of the road. There is plenty of scope to move it towards the Eastern building line by two metres or so.</p> <p>The present footprint will interfere with light to our greenhouse and sunlight to our terrace at the back of our house. As there is scope to move the footprint to the Northern building line as well, this would also seem sensible and more appropriate to the general appearance of the road. The previously submitted plans were more sympathetic to the rest of the road and to us.</p> <p>In principle, we have no objections to a new dwelling, as the land and the road would benefit from having a house on it, but we do object to the location of the proposed dwelling.</p> <p>We request that you consider the suggested minor moves of the footprint to the North and West.”</p> <p>The comments above in relation to the position of the proposed dwelling and its impact on light are noted. It is, however, considered that these matters do not constitute additional grounds for refusal and that the proposed designs, in relation to these specific concerns, are acceptable in terms of the Councils Residential Design Guidance, SPG1.</p> <p>12/05/2011 – Comments received from Environmental Health:-</p>

	<p>“Further to your consultation I have reviewed the submitted application and GIS records held by this Department. I have no objection to the proposed development.”</p> <p>18/05/2011 – E-mail received from planning agent for the application raising the following points:</p> <p>“1. Belbroughton Parish Council is listed as a consultee but it is Clent PC.</p> <p>2. The description on page 56 seems to have another item attached to it. Only the first sentence applies.</p> <p>3. Part of the comments from no 17 are printed twice.”</p> <p>The above comments are noted and accepted by the Local Planning Department as valid corrections to the published officer report.</p>
--	--