



BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

MONDAY 10TH OCTOBER 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 (circulated prior to the start of the meeting) (Pages 1 - 6)

K. DICKS
Chief Executive

The Council House
Burcot Lane
BROMSGROVE
Worcestershire
B60 1AA

10th October 2011

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4

Bromsgrove District Council

Planning Committee

Committee Updates 10th October 2011

Application Ref No	Update															
11/0343/DMB	<p>Strategic Housing Manager - views received 30.09.2011: I propose the following mix of affordable housing units:</p> <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Property Type</th><th>Rent</th><th>Intermediate</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>3 bedroom house</td><td>8</td><td>4</td></tr><tr><td>2 bedroom house</td><td>10</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>2 bedroom retirement flat</td><td>4</td><td>4</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>22 (69%)</td><td>10 (31%)</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>Highways Agency - additional views received 04.10.2011: Following discussions and subject to the imposition of an agreed Condition for the applicant to submit full details of the bund to the LPA (in conjunction with the HA) for approval, the HA removes the Direction under TR110 and raises no objection to the scheme.</p>	Property Type	Rent	Intermediate	3 bedroom house	8	4	2 bedroom house	10	2	2 bedroom retirement flat	4	4	Total	22 (69%)	10 (31%)
Property Type	Rent	Intermediate														
3 bedroom house	8	4														
2 bedroom house	10	2														
2 bedroom retirement flat	4	4														
Total	22 (69%)	10 (31%)														
11/0529 DK	<p>A Unilateral Undertaking was received: in respect of the provision of a commuted sum for affordable housing, public open space and education provision. This Agreement takes effect upon: permission being granted, development being commenced and the first two dwellings being occupied.</p> <p>Tree Officer Response received 06.10.2011. No objection subject to conditions.</p> <p>A Supplementary Planning Statement, being a report into Housing Densities and the Provision of Affordable Housing, received 03.10.2011, summarised as appropriate:</p> <p>Strategic Planning have commented that the proposal represents too low a density and the site has the capacity of more like 27 dwellings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The site has only one reasonable access point.• The site represents a 'gateway' into the village and the proposal would be reflective of the character of the wider area. The site should reflect the character and ambience of the area.• The existing footpath, bisecting the site is a considerable constraint on the provision of additional dwellings. Negotiations to divert this footpath could be lengthy.• There are attractive trees fronting Birmingham Road.															

- The surrounding development largely consists of large detached and semi-detached dwellings on substantial plots similar to the proposal.
- A Unilateral Undertaking has been received to provide contributions for affordable housing, education and public open space. The affordable housing contribution is fair and reasonable based on the provision of 10 dwellings.
- There is more need in Bromsgrove than Alvechurch for affordable housing.
- There is a need for large family homes in Alvechurch.

Members should note that these issues have been extensively covered in the report. They should examine the comments from Strategic Planning and the conclusions of the Committee Report in respect of the scheme. There is no additional information in the Supplementary Planning Statement which justifies the low density and the lack of on-site affordable housing.

Urban Designer response received: 04.10.2011, summarised as appropriate:

The proposed density is less than 10 dwellings per hectare. For an easily-developable site within ten minutes' walk of the village centre, and within twenty minutes' walk of the railway station, this is too low a density. The use of land is wasteful. Principles of sustainable use of land and of transport demand a higher density. Twice the proposed number of houses could easily be accommodated within a more appropriate and imaginative layout, and could make a much better development than is currently offered.

This proposal is unsatisfactory in so many ways. The site has very few constraints, and deserves to have a much more appropriate design made for it; better density, better arrangement of houses, external spaces and movement routes, and better designed buildings. The Design and Access Statement uses the right words, as when on p.19 it talks about *place function*, but the words are not translated into form. The right decisions will produce a sense of place, which is absent in this proposal.

2 Additional comments received 05.10.2011. No objection to 10 dwellings, but object to a higher density.

Members have requested information on the density of development opposite the site on Birmingham Road. I have measured this and the density is 20 dwellings per hectare immediately opposite the application site. This includes the properties on the west side of Birmingham Road and those on the east side of Willow Brook Road.

<p>11/0568-SC</p>	<p>Committee report correction: Members will note that the application site is defined residential within the BDLP 2004 not Green Belt (GB) as stated on the first page of the report.</p> <p>Additional e-mail comments received 10.10.2011 from Cllr. Anthony Blagg, Worcestershire County Council.</p> <p>"I object to the above Application on the Alcester Road as this would further cause obstructions on the Highway in the vicinity of what is already a major through route close to a motorway interchange.</p> <p>Vehicles parked on the pavement and on the roadway outside the existing two shops already cause traffic hold-ups and the potential for accidents to pedestrians, especially to school children from nearby Lickey End First School. Worcestershire Highways have already placed painted H bars on the road outside the existing shops in an attempt to keep access clear via the dropped curbs. There is no potential to increase these.</p> <p>The development of an extra shop would cause more traffic trying to park. In my opinion there is not sufficient off road parking space for such a development and this will inevitably lead to fly parking on pavements in the area and lead to disruption and/or accidents."</p> <p>Additional e-mail comments received 27.09.2011 from occupant of 61 Alcester Road raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic impact. • Parking impact.
<p>11/0665/SG</p>	<p>Amended plans for the existing house at 5 Cambria Close and amended plans for the proposed house in the garden received 27.09.2011.</p> <p>The plans remove the second floor room and omit the dormer windows on the rear elevation. As a result the proposal relates to the creation of a 2 bedroom storey, 2 bedroom dwelling. The staircase position has been altered internally and the rooms reconfigured with the omission of the first floor side gable end window. The site plan has been amended to show the proposed fencing to the front of the access driveway along the boundary with no. 4 Cambria Close. The elevations and floorplans of the existing house at no. 5 Cambria Close have been amended to show the re-siting of the garage.</p> <p>I consider the issue of overlooking has been resolved with the amended plans for the proposed house. The first floor bedroom window on the side elevation facing towards the rear gardens of 9 and 11 Rushleigh Road has been removed. The ground floor windows on the side elevation would be 8.3m (approx) from the side boundary that adjoins the gardens of Rushleigh Road, which complies with the advice of SPG1. The dormer windows on the rear roof slope have been removed.</p>

	<p>The first floor rear windows for the bedrooms would be a minimum of 9.6m from the rear boundary of the site which adjoins the gardens of 33 and 35 Rushleigh Road. I consider this distance to be adequate to meet the privacy requirements of SPG1.</p> <p>For the reasons above, refusal reason 2 on page 91 of the agenda has been removed.</p> <p>The amended plans for the existing house indicate demolition of the existing garage and single storey front extension, and re-siting of the garage to be set back from the principle elevation.</p> <p>WH comments received 10.10.2011. No objections subject to conditions.</p> <p>TO comments received 07.10.2011 - no objection.</p> <p>EHM consulted 26.09.2011 - no comments received.</p> <p>An application for a single storey side and rear extension has been received for 5 Cambia Close (ref: 11/0784). I do not consider this application would have an impact on the proposal being considered.</p>
<p>11/0676-SC</p>	<p>Further e-mail comments received from applicant 03.10.2011 in relation to the committee report. Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has never been a physical boundary separating 81 and 83 Brook Road. The 'fence' referred to in the report was a screen which had been erected for cosmetic reasons in order to hide the dilapidated state of 81 Brook Road. The so-called 'fence' is very close to the side wall of 81 Brook Road and that the location is inconsistent with ingress/egress to 81 Brook Road via the side-door. • Concern that the comparative heights of the garage approved as part of planning permission 11/0116 and the current proposed garage as part of 11/0676 have not been explicitly noted in the Committee Report. <p>In relation to the above points, firstly, members will note the recent Google maps image as part of the Committee presentation showing a clear and mature physical separation between the properties. The wooden closed boarded fence and significant boundary foliage appear to indicate that the physical separation of the properties was established over a significant period of time.</p> <p>In relation to the comparative scale of the garages proposed under granted permission 11/0116 and the current application 11/0676, please note the dimensions of the below table.</p>

		11/0116	11/0676	Difference
	Maximum height	5m	4m	1m lower
	Eaves height	2.025m	2.4m	0.375m higher
	Width	3.505m	10.5m	6.995m wider
	Depth	6.45m	6.45m	No change
	Footprint	22.6sq m	67.7sq m	45sq m larger
	Table 1 - Comparison of the dimensions of the garages proposed under granted permission 11/0116 and the current application 11/0676.			
11/0742/HR	Highway comments received 10.10.2011. No objections. The Type of Certificate is B.			
11/0743/HR	<p>Highway comments received 10.10.2011. No objections. The Type of Certificate is B.</p> <p>Belbroughton Parish Council consulted 10.10.2011.</p> <p>On this basis alter recommendation to:</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: that DELEGATED POWERS be granted to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to determine the application following the expiration of the publicity period on 31st October 2011.</p> <p>In the event that further representations are received, DELEGATED POWERS be granted to the Head of Planning and Regeneration in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee to assess whether new material considerations have been raised and to issue a decision after the expiry of the statutory publicity period accordingly.</p>			

This page is intentionally left blank