



BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

MONDAY 18TH JULY 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.

4. 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

18th July 2011

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4

Bromsgrove District Council Planning Committee

Committee Updates 18th July 2011

Application Ref No	Update
10/1184-DK	<p>The scheme for 17 affordable housing units has been amended and a re-consultation on the amended plans has been conducted on 17.06.2011 as outlined in the updated report.</p> <p>Additional comments received from Tree Officer 08.07.2011. No objection to the revised proposal, subject to conditions.</p> <p>2 additional comments received summarized as follows: Structural concerns are raised in respect of the boundary wall of No. 15 New Road. There are existing structural defects. The wall is in the ownership of the applicants BDHT. There is also a potential for overlooking from the proposed new block.</p> <p>The applicant has carried out a Structural Survey of the wall in question (dated 13.07.2011) and Members have received copies of this report. The report concludes that: <i>'we can unreservedly assure you that neither of the methods proposed.....will impose disturbance and/or additional pressures on the wall'</i>.</p> <p>The issue of the boundary wall with No 15 has been thoroughly addressed and the proposal would not have any impact on the stability of the wall.</p>
11/0182-SC	<p>31/06/2011: Further consultation response received from WMC in relation to traffic and parking impact.</p> <p>"In relation to this proposed development I would like to make the following observations.</p> <p>There have been issues with the parking in Chadcote way for some time, these have been reported directly to the local policing team on many occasions. The issues relate to inconsiderate parking which includes driveways being blocked on occasion, and problems due to the sheer volume of vehicles that are parked there.</p> <p>I understand that the application proposes one parking space per premises, with an additional two spaces in total for visitors to these premises. I understand this may well conform to guidelines set by the government. However, I am concerned that this will not provide enough spaces for the new residents and the overspill from this will lead to even more cars parking along Chadcote way, causing more disruption and inconvenience to the other residents.</p>

	<p>Please can these observations be taken into account when the matter is heard and if you require any further detail or if I can be of further assistance in any way please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Julian Smith Bromsgrove District Inspector West Mercia Police "</p> <p>5 additional letters of objection received 07/07/11, 08/07/11, 10/07/11 & 12/07/11 raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amended plans are a minor attempt to lessen the huge impact of the proposals and do not change previously stated objections. • Under provision of parking. • Concern cycle parking spaces insufficient. • Overdevelopment. • Overbearance. • Highways impact – insufficient capacity. • Increased security risk due to access road to rear of properties. • Increased disturbance due to access road to rear of properties. • Loss of vegetation and impact on wildlife. • Increased noise from properties. • Detrimental to privacy. • Drainage issues. • Impact of services in local area such as sewerage, electricity and GPs. • Reduction of light to rear gardens.
11/0266-SG	<p>Following claims from a third party in relation to bats utilising the Warehouse building, a third bat survey was carried out to the building by Dr. Stefan Bodnar (Ecologist) on 11.07.11. The third survey involved an additional internal inspection of the upper floor of the building and a further emergence survey. The results demonstrated that there is no evidence that there is an active roost within these buildings and that the broken window aperture on the eastern face of the building functions as a roost entrance. To conclude; after an extremely detailed protected species survey involving 2 internal inspections of the buildings, 1 external inspection of the buildings and 3 emergence survey visits within the survey season (2 in May 2011 and 1 in July 2011), there is no supporting evidence for a bat roost being present within the building.</p> <p>Amend description of proposal to include ‘as augmented by bat survey received 12.07.11’.</p>
11/0328-DK	<p>Lickey and Blackwell Parish Council, Response received: 01.07.2011 No objection.</p>

	<p>Worcestershire Highways, Response received 16.06.2011. No objection.</p> <p>Western Power Distribution, Response received: 03.06.2011. No objection.</p> <p>Comments received from the Environment Agency 15.07.2011. No objection subject to conditions.</p> <p>Additional statement and email received from the applicant 21.06. and 15.07.2011. The statement repeats the very special circumstances within the Design and Access Statement and no additional issues have been raised.</p> <p>Additional letter received from the applicant 15.07.2010 to address the consultation responses of the Victorian Society and the Conservation Officer. The letter considers that the responses are misleading and inaccurate and that the openness of the Green Belt would be enhanced. It is repeated that the current financial climate precludes the conversion of the building. A consulting engineer has stated that the cost of making the building habitable are prohibitive and it should be demolished.</p> <p>Members should note that the very special circumstances have been examined in the report and the recommendation remains one of refusal. Members should note the economic arguments are rarely very special circumstances.</p>
11/0426-RL	<p>20/6/11: Letter of objection received from local businessman concerned that the signs would make the islands look 'messy' and would cause distraction to drivers.</p> <p>4/7/11: Letter of objection received concerned with regard to the signs being hazardous in terms of distracting traffic at the busy island and visually unattractive in these surroundings.</p> <p>18/7/11: Objection received from Hagley PC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate development within the Green Belt with no VSC's put forward. • Drivers would be distracted by signage causing a road safety issue. • There is no council policy which would protect similar sites from the introduction of more signs and therefore no control. • No conditions have been proposed to limit size, materials and type of advertising. <p>(The proposed size and materials are shown on the submitted plans and form part of the application details).</p> <p>18/7/11: Objection received from Ward Councillor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BDC have no policy in place to control advertisements on traffic islands. • The application would set a precedent for other advert applications without a policy to control number, size or type of hoarding.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No conditions have been proposed for control of time limits, size, precise location etc. • Proposed signs would catch the attention of road users and threaten their safety. • The island should be protected from development as it is within the Green Belt.
11/0442-RL	<p>Councillor Scurrall has recommended the following be added as an update:</p> <p>Within the Supporting Statement, the applicant states that a further benefit of the proposal would be to provide a replacement staircase for one which is considered safe to use by the very young or elderly should be considered as a Very Special Circumstance. However, this could be provided by reconfiguring the internal layout of the property and therefore the proposed extension is not required in part to provide space for a new staircase which could be provided without the extension. This cannot therefore be considered as a VSC which would outweigh the potential harm caused to the openness of the Green Belt by the proposed extension.</p>
11/0444-RL	<p>14.06.2011: Objection received from Belbroughton PC concerned that the signs would be unsightly and cause a distraction to drivers negotiating this busy roundabout.</p> <p>1806.2011: Objection received from Wildmoor Residents Association concerned that the signs would down-grade the semi-rural, green belt area, effect tourism by visitors being deterred by the 'shanty-town' appearance of the surrounding roads, cause distraction to drivers and therefore increase accident risk.</p> <p>2006.2011: Letter of objection received from local resident concerned that the signs would be dangerous, not in keeping with the nature of the area and would bring down the tone of the area.</p> <p>2006.2011: Letter of objection received from local businessman concerned that the signs would make the islands look 'messy' and would cause distraction to drivers.</p> <p>04.07.2011: Letter of objection received concerned with regard to the signs being hazardous in terms of distracting traffic at the busy island and visually unattractive in these surroundings.</p> <p>18.07.2011: Objection received from Hagley PC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate development within the Green Belt with no VSC's put forward. • Drivers would be distracted by signage causing a road safety issue.