



**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**MONDAY 5TH NOVEMBER 2012**  
**AT 6.00 P.M.**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, THE COUNCIL HOUSE, BURCOT LANE, BROMSGROVE**

:

**SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION**

The attached Update Reports for the various Planning Applications to be considered were circulated to Committee Members and the public gallery prior to the commencement of the meeting.

4. Updates to planning applications reported at the meeting (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 5 November 2012

<p>12/0490/MT The Mount Hotel</p>	<p>Comments received from Worcestershire Highways 25.10.12; no objection raised subject to the following conditions (HC) and notes (HN):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• HC25 (development not brought into use until access, turning area and parking facilities constructed in accordance with details to be approved by LPA.</li><li>• HC36A (secure parking for 4 cycles shall be provided within the curtilage of each dwelling).</li><li>• HC36B (secure parking for 14 cycles for the apartments shall be provided within the curtilage of the site)</li><li>• HC40 (engineering details of the amendments to the retaining wall including the proposed steps shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority).</li><li>• HC51 (parking for site operatives and visitors has been provided within the application site)</li><li>• HN4 (The applicant should apply to the Worcestershire County Council's Network Control Manager to install private apparatus within the confines of the public highway)</li><li>• HN5 (permission does not authorise the applicant to carry out works within the publicly maintained highway - license required under Section 184 and 278 of the Highways Act, 1980)</li><li>• HN9 (Drainage arrangements shall be provided to ensure that surface water from the driveway and/or Vehicular turning area does not discharge onto the Public Highway).</li><li>• HN21 (Any work involving the removal or disturbance of ground or structures supporting or abutting the publicly maintained highway should be carried out in accordance with details to be submitted to be approved by the Highway Authority).</li><li>• HN24 (This consent does not authorise the erection of temporary direction signs on the Public Highway.)</li></ul> <p>Comments received from the Conservation Officer 31.10.12; no objection subject to conditions to secure details of materials, bricks and tiles; drawings showing joinery details at a scale of 1:5; details of window and door materials; detailed drawings at a scale of 1:5 of vernacular detailing to cottages (such as overhanging eaves and a verge detail).</p> <p>In relation to these comments, Members will note conditions 3 and 4 on the Officer's report in respect of external materials and details of window and door materials. It is recommended that two additional conditions are imposed on any planning permission granted to request detailed drawings of joinery and vernacular detailing to cottages.</p> <p>In light of further advice in relation to a deferred contribution mechanism, the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Regeneration on this</p>
---	--

application has been amended as follows:

(a) **MINDED to APPROVE FULL PLANNING PERMISSION**

(b) That **DELEGATED POWERS** be granted to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to determine the planning application following the receipt of a suitable and satisfactory legal mechanism in relation to:

- (i) An updated viability review to be submitted at a date two years from the date planning permission is granted, with the viability review updating the current Viability Report submitted with the current application.
- (ii) If, upon the review of the viability of the scheme it is established that market conditions have improved insofar as financial contributions towards education provisions and off site open space provisions can be reasonably afforded, then the applicant shall enter into a S106 agreement with Bromsgrove District Council and Worcestershire County Council to secure the identified contributions.
- (iii) The District Council's fees and costs of the initial and subsequent viability reviews (as applicable) (index linked to RPI, plus expenses and VAT) to be borne by the applicant.

For the information of Members, the former hotel use of the site accommodated 15 bedrooms along with a bar and restaurant, and business, wedding and meeting facilities. The proposed development would create 4 no. 1 bedroom apartments, 3 no. 2 bedroom apartments and 3 no. 4 bedroom apartments amounting to 22 bedrooms in total.

Further letter received from the occupier of The White House (01.11.12) in response to the report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration to the Planning Committee. Those points that require your officer's response are summarised below with officer comments emphasised in italics:

- The report states that the site already contains an inappropriate form of development. In his view however a small hotel is not considered to be an inappropriate form of development. *Members should note that a hotel does not feature on the defined categories of 'appropriate' development set out at Policy DS2 of the BDLP. It is confirmed therefore that a hotel does represent an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt.*
- There are contradictions in the Officer's report over what the very special circumstances are. *There is confusion here over the points made in the applicant's Planning Statement summarised on page 15 of the agenda, and the Officer's own comments and consideration of very special circumstances. Members should be clear that the points made on page 15 refer to the applicant's argument and not the considerations of your officer.*

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “The planning department should make up its mind as to whether this is a brownfield or Green Belt site as surely it cannot be both”. <i>Members are reminded that a brownfield site refers to developed, or previously developed land whereas the Green Belt is a national policy designation, normally applying to land around major towns and cities. The Mount Hotel relates to a brownfield site within the Green Belt.</i></li> <li>• The officer does not consider the benefits of the scheme to be significant so how can they be classed as very special circumstances. <i>Members are reminded that very special circumstances can only exist if harm to the Green Belt is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In this instance, it is considered that the benefits of the scheme would be significant enough to outweigh the limited amount of identified harm to the Green Belt. They are therefore considered to represent very special circumstances.</i></li> <li>• The existing boundary trees along Mount Lane do not provide a suitable screen as these are likely to be removed by the future occupiers of the properties. <i>Members should not that the retention of the trees in question will be secured by a condition attached to any planning permission granted. Members are also reminded that all trees are protected within a Conservation Area and this affords the trees further protection in future.</i></li> <li>• The letter refers to the ‘developer’s’ Viability Consultant. <i>Members are advised that the Viability Consultant referred to in the report is acting on behalf of the Council and not the developer.</i></li> </ul>
<p>12/0585/NC 41-47 St Georges Rd</p>	<p>Comments from Hereford and Worcester Fire Service – 5.11.2012</p> <p>Hereford and Worcester Fire Service have raised no objections to the proposal. They are satisfied that the access arrangements are adequate for a fire engine to enter and exit the site in case of an emergency.</p> <p>Comments from Terry Williams, 41 George Road (Neighbour and Objector)– 4.11.12</p> <p>Points raised additional to main report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• during construction the lorries will damage the lower branches of the Oak tree</li> <li>• cramped style of development</li> </ul> <p>The Council’s Arboriculture Officer has addressed in his report that it would be acceptable to crown lift the lower part of the canopy of the tree to give clear access. This work would be carried out to the canopy as a whole which would negate the likelihood of any damage or imbalance to the tree.</p>

<p>12/0600/SG 47 Breakback Rd</p>	<p>This matter has, in consultation with the Chairman, has been <b>WITHDRAWN from the Agenda</b> by Officers in order to seek further clarification on a number of matters raised during recent additional consultation meetings.</p>
<p>12/0645/MT Trentham House</p>	<p>The cumulative parking effect of this proposal and the pending application for the change of use of Trentham House to two dwellings (12/0643) is noted. Members will note the parking provision for this application (2 spaces) complies with the relevant parking standard for a three bedroom dwelling. Members should also be advised that 4 no. spaces for the change of use of Trentham House are indicatively featured on the proposed site plan for this application. This complies with the parking standard for the two dwellings proposed by 12/0643 and no objection has been raised by the Highways Authority to that application.</p>
<p>12/0701/MT The Sugarbrook PH</p>	<p>In light of WRS concerns in relation to odours from the proposal, further information has been received (24.10.12) on the proposed flue and extraction system.</p> <p>Revised comments received from WRS 31.10.12:</p> <p>Proposed extraction details considered to be acceptable. In reference to noise levels it is recommended that a close board timber fence is considered. Otherwise no conditions in relation to noise or odour are required.</p> <p>In light of the additional information received and the subsequent comments of WRS, Condition 7 can be removed from the Officer's recommendation.</p> <p>In relation to the fencing requirement, Members will note from their site visit that a close board timber fence already exists along the site boundary with residential properties. This fence should be included as a retained feature as part of the Landscaping Scheme required by Condition 4 of the recommendation.</p> <p>Further representation received from Cllrs S and Mrs E Shannon 26.10.12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A drive through restaurant is completely dissimilar to a public house. The existing use does not therefore render the site appropriate in principle;</li> <li>• Concerns are raised over the loss of a community facility;</li> <li>• Concerns are raised over highway safety;</li> <li>• Concerns are raised over drainage;</li> <li>• Concerns are raised over litter and odours;</li> <li>• Concerns over obesity and the proximity of the site to schools;</li> <li>• Concerns over effects of noise and pollution from vehicles on residential amenity;</li> <li>• There are more suitable sites in the town centre.</li> </ul>

	<p>Further representation received 26.10.12; concerns raised over highway safety, proximity to schools, litter and parking difficulties associated with school.</p> <p>Members are advised that, for clarity, the comments of the Retail Consultant presented in the Officer's report to Planning Committee include only those points made in relation to retail specific matters and the sequential test provided with the application. The remaining points made by the consultant in relation to the fallback position, job creation, opening hours and the loss of the pub are discussed by the officer in detail in his report.</p>
<p>Redditch Branch Line Consultation Report</p>	<p>For clarity:</p> <p><b>(a) Bridge Works</b> The only bridge alterations proposed are at the road bridge at Alvechurch Station where some minor parapet improvement works are necessary to accommodate the overhead line equipment.</p> <p><b>(b) Car-Parking</b> There are no current proposals to increase car park provision at Alvechurch Station.</p> <p>As part of our pre-application public consultation, car park use has been discussed and Network Rail has liaised with Alvechurch Parish Council and other stakeholders in this regard.</p> <p>A recent Parish meeting was attended by London Midland, the train operating company with responsibility for the car park. The Parish Council is to arrange a car park user survey and any issues arising are likely to be discussed with Worcestershire County Council.</p> <p>Further discussion could include alternative means of transport to the station, in particular bus services. Network Rail and the train operating company are fully aware of car park usage and it is intended to monitor this with the relevant parties.</p> <p>Some recent minor re-surfacing work to the car park took place in May 2012.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank