



BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

MONDAY 23RD JULY 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 - 2)

The Council House
Burcot Lane
BROMSGROVE
Worcestershire
B60 1AA

K DICKS
Chief Executive

Agenda Item 4

Bromsgrove District Council Planning Committee

Committee Updates 23 July 2012

12/0156/MT	<p>Email received from the applicant 12.07.12:</p> <p><i>“The electrical energy consumption at Thriftwood farm is around £10,000 per annum at present, across all the farms approximately £20,000.</i></p> <p><i>The main reason for the turbine is to reduce my reliance on fossil fuels, mainly diesel, as even in last years dry summer, autumn, the tractors and drier used 10,000 litres / month @67.5 pence / litre was a monthly bill of £6,700. Winter the usage drops slightly to around 5000 / litres a month to feed (mill home grown grain and beans) and bed the 700 cattle and 500 breeding sheep and lambs.</i></p> <p><i>If this summer carries on being inclement, the driers consumption is around 500/litres a day.</i></p> <p><i>My thoughts for the future is to replace the mill to electric and to install an under floor grain drying System heated by an electrical heating bank and heat forced through the grain by large electric fans that would be switched on, on more windy days as to use most of the electric produced myself. Any surplus energy will be exported to the national grid.</i></p> <p><i>This all depends on the decision of turbine because electrical energy from the national grid is far more expensive than my present system.”</i></p> <p>With regard to these comments Members should be mindful of the support within the NPPF towards promoting a strong rural economy by promoting the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses. Members are advised to consider the information put forward by the applicant as part of the very special circumstances offered in support of the application.</p>
12/0401/DMB	<p>For the reference of Members, at the meeting of Redditch Planning Committee held on 18 July 2012 in relation to the application submitted to the lower section of the application site located in Redditch Borough (reference 2012/120/OUT), Members at this Committee resolved that:</p> <p>Having regard to the Development Plan and to all other material considerations, authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services to GRANT Outline Planning Permission subject to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Bromsgrove District Council granting Planning Permission for the associated open space on land to the north of Weights Lane;2) A satisfactory Planning Obligation as detailed in the main report;3) The Conditions and informatives as summarised in the main

	<p>report with amendments to Conditions 17 and 18</p> <p>Views of Worcestershire Highways received 19.07.12: No objection subject to Conditions relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway improvement works/off site works to A441 junction • Highway improvement works/off site works to A441/B4101 junction • Wheel washing • Parking for site operatives <p>Additional FAQ information submitted by applicant's agent received 20.07.12 (independently copied separately to all Members of Planning Committee) (Copy appended to update sheet for reference)</p>
12/0460/LA	<p>Additional objections received via email 12th July 2012.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considers the officer has been selective with respect to including comments made by the objector in communication on 12th June and 6th July. • Also considers the officer has been subjective and bias against the objector rather than retaining an objective approach. • Suggests that comments concerning living accommodation being in close proximity to the boundary have been omitted from the summary. Objector feels that due to this arrangement that privacy will be lost as a result of intrusiveness and noise. Refers to SPG1 section 4 considers proximity and the objector sites para 4.2(b) and 4.2(d) as not being complied with by the submitted scheme. • Refers to fact that most houses are separated by boundary hedges or fences and that these in most instances would breach the 45 degree code meaning any development could be erected behind them. Objector feels the presence of a fence is immaterial as this can be removed or changed over time. • States that 7ft high fence was erected on the boundary by neighbour and this is now limiting the impact of the development. Feels that the fence could change but that the proposal is a permanent brick built structure that will not. • Queries which comments came from which letter, and that comments were not raised as part of correspondence dated 06/07/2012. For clarity, members are reminded to read all of the comments received. • Suggests last paragraph should read 'access to service the conservatory, repairs etc' and 'Problems with drain caused by foundations'. • Members are reminded that this represents a summary of the comments made by the objector and that the full detail of the submission are available for inspection in the planning file.