



BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

MONDAY 20TH AUGUST 2012
AT 6.00 P.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBER, 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 - 6)

The Council House
Burcot Lane
BROMSGROVE
Worcestershire
B60 1AA

K DICKS
Chief Executive

Agenda Item 4

Bromsgrove District Council Planning Committee

Committee Updates 20 August 2012

<p>12/0571/LA Bowling Green Farm, Worcester Rd</p>	<p>Stoke Parish Council – views received 20.8.12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No objection• Represents a sympathetic project which will bring the building up to modern standards and ensure its long term future.
<p>12/0586/DMB Land at Church Road, Catshill</p>	<p>For the reference of Members, the applicant has lodged an appeal against the decision of the LPA to refuse Reserved Matters application 12/0066.</p> <p>The appeal has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate and is in the process of being validated and registered.</p> <p>Amended house type to Plot 21 and 22 received 1 August 2012.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This has altered the gable end of both plots from the previous gable end to a hipped roof configuration <p>Amended site plan received 9 August 2012.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This plan has relocated the dwelling located on Plot 21 further away from the eastern boundary (plan reference 189A82 001 Revision AH). As a result of this change the separation distance between the flank gable of the property on Plot 21 and the rear building line of the properties in Bourne Avenue (with specific reference to 52 and 54 Bourne Avenue) now equates to a minimum distance of 12.5 metres.• This revised separation distance now complies with the guidance set out in paragraph 8.7 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1. <p>Additional views received via emails on 16 August 2012 and 20 August 2012:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concern over proximity of dwelling located on Plot 21 to existing dwellings• Accept that the roof configuration has now altered to a hipped roof but still believe this will have a intimidating and detrimental effect• Loss of daylight into gardens• Looking directly onto a high wall is not unacceptable• Traffic• Flood water <p>Additional email received 17.08.12 from the Catshill Marshes Action Group (also containing two photographs) (and copied to all Members) raising the following issues:</p>

Before we start on the Reserved Matters, we have unanswered concerns:

The Recent Floods and the proposed development of Catshill Marshes

- Since early 2000 we have had three separate instances of properties being flooded in Catshill and surrounding areas, the most recent being the 28th June 2012 when a considerable number of domestic properties were flooded in the village, some from the Lickey run-off and some from the Marshes area and M5 run-off as there are no ditches or drains to take this extra water. Please see attached photographs
- This is an unacceptable risk of flooding to the residents of Catshill
- The Bromsgrove Council Drainage Engineer attributes “much of this to runoff problems associated with development of the catchment area and has noted that it is the Catshill area which warrants urgent attention to control localised flooding. Since then there has been continued infilling development and, added to this the effects of climate change, so Catshill has become even more vulnerable to ‘flash’ flooding events of the type recently experienced”.
- Cala are responsible for NOT worsening an already ineffective drainage system and we feel they should contribute under Section 106 to these “urgently needed drainage works quoted from the Strategic FRA.

Traffic problems and speeding on Church Road

- Irrespective of the HA stating there is no problem, the Planning Committee saw for themselves how parking and congestion affect the free flow of traffic in Church Road, with cars parked on both sides of the road and frequently speeding vehicles in both directions and very poor forward visibility for traffic off the Stourbridge Road.
- This road is actually narrower than the New Development Estate Roads?
- We *will* be applying to WCC for traffic calming to make the road safer for cars and more importantly pedestrians but we still feel that Cala should support road improvement infrastructure as part of their proposal.
- This should have been done by BDC to safeguard residents as every day we witness drivers speeding down Stourbridge Road straight onto Church Road without slowing down.
- This situation will only be exacerbated by the development of Catshill Marshes!

ERROR

- An incorrect Development Layout Plan was sent out with the Planning Application notification letters to all residents for comment, the correct one was amended on 1st August 2012 and we have a correct copy. Therefore residents will effectively be unable to comment on the latest site plan!

APPEARANCE

The Apartment Block

- None of us believe this design is appropriate in style, scale or visually to the site, even with the latest modification to design, due to it being 3 storeys at the front and therefore extremely visually intrusive. This style and proportion of building is unrepresented in Catshill currently and marks a very unwelcome change.

The Eastern side of the development

- Although the amended design is more pleasing than the former one and the affordable homes have now been integrated into the overall site, the site is still dominated by what are effectively rows of terraced homes which we feel is a negative aspect of the proposal and not seen to be an actual improvement over the last proposals.

The Western side of the Development

- The layout is still that of a long line of houses connected by carports which gives a stark and unimaginative appearance and a crowded together effect.
- More green space would be preferable, even if Dale Birch doesn't want it altered!

LAYOUT

- It is still flawed in that on the Eastern side of the development the homes are far too close to the existing homes, e.g Plots 21/22 are planned only 11.5 metres from existing properties in Bourne Avenue despite the BDC SPG1 recommendation of 12.5 metres.
- The east is more crowded than the west side of the site, giving an obviously unbalanced look to the development
- We request a Sunlight and Daylight report to be carried out for the benefit of existing residents in Bourne Avenue and Woodrow Close, if this has been done, please can we see it?
- The road on the western edge of the site is still offering a very real security risk to the homes on Stourbridge Road and now the line of new houses has been extended even further towards the motorway.
- Overlooking and lack of security is a real problem here,
- Why the change from the original design of a central road with gardens backing onto the gardens of Stourbridge Road? It appears to have been a backwards step.
- The homes could have been similar to Westfields and could command even higher prices and they would also potentially save on road costs!
- We noticed that one 'affordable home' will have neighbours cars parked next to their home and the bin store for the apartments are right against their garden. Is this an error?

It was stated by Dale Birch in the previous planning submission that 'I am content the scheme will not lead to adverse neighbour amenity issue given the careful design and siting of the new dwellings.' This is blatantly untrue

Light Pollution

- “External dusk until dawn security lighting should be used to the rear of Plots 1-33 (inclusive), 49, 61 and 80. Bulk head lighting providing illumination around the apartment block should be considered”

This will affect all the surrounding residences that have never had light pollution to the rear of their homes. Low level lighting should be used site wide.

LANDSCAPING

- The Developers of The Marshes Site have the opportunity to produce a development that could enhance the surrounding area by creating desirable homes set in a unique and sustainable environment.
- We have seen a copy of the Hard and Soft Landscaping Plan, which answers a lot of questions, but will this maintenance be on-going into the future?
- The sound attenuation BUND is of major importance to the development AND the homes surrounding the site, as a significant number of the tall trees were removed during “clearance” by the Developers, leading to increased noise pollution however there are no details of this feature at all. Why?
- Particular attention should be paid to the details of the BUND by BDC to ensure that it is built to its MAXIMUM to protect the development and surrounding area.
- How will the development affect the badgers next year?
- In the Soft Works agenda it states that the earth within 10 metres of the setts must be hand dug, we were informed this should be 20 metres!!
- We were also concerned to read that pesticides and herbicides would be used!
- Can we be completely assured that the soft ground works will NOT contain any chemicals that could further harm any flora or fauna that have ecological importance and that are still in existence on the site?

The Ponds

- These are some concern, as there will be many children living on the development and we would like to understand more about the proposals for security to safeguard the children around these wet areas. At the moment the plans show fencing, are these adequate and will these be rigorously maintained?

Battlefield Brook

- We have serious concerns over the re-siting of the brook, there are ecological issues with this, as it will take a long time to return to its rich and varied water life and any chance of wildlife re-establishing within it for some time are slim.
- As it is being moved much further east, it puts homes in Marsh Way and Chadcote Way at a greater risk of damage, as they suffered flooding on June 28th.

SCALE

- We have been informed that the pitched roofs are to remain, even though higher than the existing homes due to ‘designing for climate

	<p>change'. They may need it in Catshill on a floodplain!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Apartment Block is neither desirable nor aesthetically pleasing, as it is set high on the site and will dominate the area. <p>SUMMARY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposed site layout - August 2012 - does not satisfy the majority of the points mentioned in the reserved matters, as we would like to achieve at least 3 aims for the benefit of all;• It is the Council's responsibility to ensure flooding is alleviated, not worsened as a duty of care to Catshill residents. It is unacceptable that homes should be flooded at the current frequency.• A Development that blends into the unique Marshes landscape and is acceptable to the people that will live there and the people that live around it.• A Development that shows some "input" from the Community as despite our meeting with Cala and making specific requests, only 2 minor points have been conceded, the others have been 'looked at' and dismissed as 'not feasible' or not affordable which shows a lack of real imagination.• This is a special site and if it <u>must</u> be developed, then it deserves special consideration as to what is built there and how it will affect the people of Catshill.

This page is intentionally left blank