



BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

MONDAY 25TH JUNE 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 - 4)

The Council House
Burcot Lane
BROMSGROVE
Worcestershire
B60 1AA

K DICKS
Chief Executive

Agenda Item 4

Bromsgrove District Council Planning Committee

Committee Updates 25 June 2012

11/0139SC	Consultation response received 22 June 2012 from North Worcestershire Water Management (NWWM) with regard to the updated Flood Risk Assessment: The applicant must liaise with the Panel Engineer and other bodies in respect any Reservoir Act implications In addition the following 'Conditions' should be applied: - • Full environmental assessments and surveys shall be carried out prior to any works commencing on site. In addition, the results may indicate that Licences are required from Natural England which might also necessitate post-construction surveys be carried out on completion. Where Licences are required, no works shall be carried out on site prior to their issue, and should be carried out in the manner(s) so prescribed. • Any mills, culverts, weirs or dams will either require the formal consent of the Environment Agency if such applications were submitted on or prior to 05 April 2012, or if after that date, the Lead Local Flood Authority (NWWM), in accordance with s23 of Land Drainage Act 1991 and Flood and Water Management Act 2010. No works shall commence on site until such applications have been submitted and approved in writing by the appropriate authorities. • In addition, Temporary Works Consents will also be required from the appropriate authorities. Reasons – To minimise and manage flood risks associated with the proposed development and to ensure that there are no adverse consequences on environmentally sensitive fauna and flora. The above comments of the Drainage Engineer are noted and it is considered that appropriate informatives in relation to protected species licenses, The Reservoir Act 1975 and requirements of s23 of The Land Drainage Act 1991 and The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 can be applied. Amended red-line location plan received 14/06/2012 – no change to proposed development.
12/0300DK	Members should note that this item has been DEFERRED in order to receive the final comments of WCC in respect of the revised Transport Assessment, which was received on 25.06.2012.

12/0326DK	Members should note that the previous application for the conversion of the former chicken sheds into 14 dwellings was refused by Planning Committee for the following reason: <i>The buildings are not suitable for the residential use proposed without significant structural and material alteration. As such, the proposal amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Very special circumstances do not exist to outweigh the harm that would be caused. Thereby the proposal is contrary to policies DS2 and C27 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan (2004) and the advice of Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 4 (Conversion of Rural Buildings).</i> Members should note the comments of Building Control and it was judged in the previous application that the buildings were not structurally capable of conversion without significant intervention and alteration. Members should consider the point that the buildings are likely to have deteriorated further since the previous application was considered in April 2011. Beoley PC Response received: 21.06.2012. Objection. Apart from a small reduction in the number of houses applied for, there is very little difference from the previous application. Beoley PC objects on the following grounds: 1 No grounds on which this can be classed as an Exception Site in the Green Belt. 2 Unsustainable with no access to buses, some two miles away. The timetables supplied are now out of date and not applicable. 3 No access (without use of private cars) to Village amenities, School, Village Hall, Nursery, Church, Village Pub etc. 4 Entrance off a narrow, mainly single track lane. 5 Unacceptable, cramped and unimaginative design with far too much alteration necessary to 'convert' into habitable dwellings. 6 If this is supposed to be 'Rural Housing' then no gardens or private space appears to have been considered. 7 Development is outside the village envelope and remote from any settlement
-----------	---

12/0341	The applicant has supplied a 'Projecting Garage Survey' for Plymouth Road and has claimed that 22 of the 46 houses have a projecting garage and 34 have forward projections and are not linear. The applicant has also referred to Nos. 10, 18 and 26 which are applications in the past 5 years. The issue of precedent at Nos. 10 and 26 has already been covered on page 54 of the Committee Report. In the case of Ref No. 18, this is on the corner of Plymouth Road and Blakes Field Drive (No. 1) and does not set a precedent. The statement that 22 of the 46 houses have a projecting garage generally relates to the original design of the houses which are often also well set back from Plymouth Road. There are few recent examples of set forward projecting wings as sought by the applicant. Conservation Officer, Response received: 25.06.2012. A new building might be expected to enhance the special interest of the area by presenting a notable, well-crafted exterior. Certainly, the proposed development is a change for the better along Plymouth Road though in my opinion the design of the two new houses doesn't quite match the quality of either the older vernacular properties or their late 20th century counterparts. In a high quality design I would have expected more attention to stylistic details and features. For example: - * projecting bay windows, one or two storeys in height * suggestions for a more decorative treatment of the roof covering * gables either half-timbered or white-painted roughcast * brickwork arches over windows * timber-framed external joinery, e.g. windows, bargeboards * red brick chimneys * use of the roof space to provide an extra level The design does have a number of very positive aspects however, such as the use of traditional facing bricks and clay plain tiles and the fact that both houses are intended to occupy largely the same footprint as the existing bungalow. Additional letter of objection received: 20.06.2012. I think the houses themselves are fine but they are ridiculously close together. Houses this close together I believe cause an invasion of privacy for the occupants of both houses. I think two houses such as those proposed would be extremely difficult to sell and many houses currently in Barnt Green are not selling. This is yet another example of plot subdivision which the Council is not in favour of and I can think of no other precedent in Plymouth Road where two houses are situated so closely together. Response Received from WH 15.06.2012. No objection.
---------	---

12/0391SC	3 further letters of objection received raising the concerns in relation to the following: • Plot too small for residential development resulting in overdevelopment. • Front of dwelling will face rear of existing properties exacerbating disturbance due to noise, light and loss of privacy. • Proximity of dwelling to existing properties. • Concern that there is insufficient drainage capacity for another residential dwelling. • Highways and under provision of parking • Harm to existing garden amenity due to proximity of dwelling to existing rear gardens. • Impact on privacy of childminding business of No. 43 Valencia Road. • Overdevelopment • Overbearing impact on Valencia Road properties • Building will dominate road and path • Residential amenity impact due to noise, light and cooking odours.
12/0411HR	The name of the applicant is Mr and Mrs Javid.