



BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

MONDAY 7TH MARCH 2016
AT 6.00 P.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBER, PARKSIDE SUITE, PARKSIDE, MARKET STREET,
BROMSGROVE, B61 8DA

:

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)

Parkside
Market Street
BROMSGROVE
Worcestershire
B61 8DA

K DICKS
Chief Executive

**Bromsgrove District Council
Planning Committee**

**Committee Updates
7th March 2016**

15/0834 29 Birmingham Road, Bromsgrove

Two additional representations have been received in relation to the scheme - one objecting and one supporting the scheme.

The objection raises concerns relating to the capacity of the road network and junction in proximity to the application site. This matter has already been addressed in the main report. In support, the comments relate to the additional shopping facilities that that scheme will provide and the quality and service level that the developer provides.

An error has been identified in the drafting of recommended condition 7. An amendment is therefore proposed:

Prior to the first use of the building hereby approved, secure parking for 6 cycles to comply with the Council's standards shall be provided within the application site and these facilities shall thereafter be retained for the parking of cycles only.

Reason: To comply with the Council's parking standards.

15/0944 28 Bittell Road, Barnt Green

Amended plans received 3 March 2016 following discussions with the applicant and the occupiers of 30 Bittell Road.

This steps the front bedroom extension in from the boundary facing 30 Bittell Road by 0.6 metres. The forward projection of the front bedroom extension remains as previously at 2.8 metres.

Condition 2 should now be amended to read:

Location Plan 28-103 received 30 October 2015

Site Plan 28-1000 received 3 March 2016

Existing Ground Floor Plan 28-001 received 30 October 2015

Existing Roof Plan 28-002 received 30 October 2015

Existing Elevations Plan 28-003 received 30 October 2015

Proposed Ground Floor Plan 28-100 received 3 March 2016

Proposed Roof Plan 28-101 received 3 March 2016

Proposed External Elevations 28-102 received 3 March 2016

15/0947 Sugarbrook Mill , Buntsford Hill

No Updates

15/0969 118 Kidderminster Road, Bromsgrove

No updates

15/1064 George House, Worcester Road

Publicity (omitted from the Agenda report)

50 letters sent 21 December 2015 (expire 11 January 2016)

2 identical site notices posted 22 December 2015 (expire 12 January 2016)

1 press notice published 15 January 2016 (expires 29 January 2016)

No responses received

With respect to the sycamore facing St John Street (to the right of George House), clarification on the status of the tree has been sought from the Council's Tree Officer. This tree is scheduled for removal as part of the resulting tree and landscaping strategy for the entire site (Phase One and Phase Two). The Tree Officer has raised no objection to the loss of this specimen.

15/1080 44 Church Street, Hagley

1 additional representation received 7 March 2016

Issues raised as per report

Additional Highway comments

The Highway Authority has undertaken further research and concluded that the available evidence implies the whole of the passing bay area as observed on site forms part of the publicly maintained highway. The application site partially encloses this land and the application proposes physical development on the highway, therefore the applicant should submit revised drawings which address the highway boundary by either:

- o Removing the dwarf wall and landscaping from this area, and retain the highway as is can be seen today,
- o Remove the passing bay in its totality apart from a 2m footway across the frontage and progress a stopping up order to extinguish the highway rights.

Neighbour comments

1 letter of support. Land is scruffy and the scheme would be a lovely development. I also believe that access is off Church Street not Summervale Road so it would have little effect on the surrounding neighbours and their parking.

1 further letter received in objection. Comments are as summarised on Page 54 of the main report.

Additional comments

Following comments from the Highways Department, the applicant has revised the plan to retain the passing bay as part of the overall scheme. This should resolve concerns raised by neighbours, the Parish Council and local councillor in respect to the potential reduction of the passing bay. Officers consider the revised scheme to be acceptable.

Additional conditions

- 9) Before any materials or machinery are brought on to the site or any development,

Agenda Item 4

demolition, installation of services or site clearance works of any kind are commenced, the developer shall erect protective fencing as illustrated by BS5837:2012 on a line concurrent with the tree protection distances given in BS 5837:2012 and to the specific approval of the local planning authority. The developer shall maintain such fences to the satisfaction of the local planning authority until all development has been completed. No activities on the land within the fenced areas shall be permitted including excavation, changing of levels or disturbance in any way from the passage or storage of vehicles and machinery unless such activity is given the specific prior permission of the local planning authority.

Reason: In order to protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the site in accordance with policies DS13 and C17 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan January 2004.

10) Any section of the drive that incurs into the BS 5837:2012 Recommended Root Protection Area of any tree to be retained will need to be constructed using a suitable grade of cellular ground support material.

Reason: To ensure no detrimental impact is caused by the development to the health and stability of valuable tree stock either within the site or in adjoining land.

16/0081 Hollys Cottage, The Fordrough

No Updates

16/0095 Becks Corner , Banks Green

Neighbour Responses

1 further representation received in support.

Comments are as summarised on Page 61 of the main report.

Assessment of Proposal

Amended plans were received on Friday 4th March 2016. These plans propose to reduce the height of the proposed two storey replacement dwelling.

Page 65 of the agenda papers comment that the proposed replacement dwelling would measure 9.5 metres to ridge.

The amended plans reduce the height of the dwelling to a maximum of 8.2 metres. The reduction in height has been achieved through a reduction in eaves height in the new dwelling from 6.1 metres to 5 metres. Minor alterations to the design of the dwelling have been introduced including reducing the height of first floor windows.

The amended plans now show that the proposed dwellings' finished ground level would be set at level 142.75 AOD instead of level 143.50 (the ground level of the existing bungalow). In other words, the ground level of the proposed dwelling would be excavated into the existing ground level on which the bungalow sits by a distance of 0.75 metres. This means that the proposed replacement dwelling would be approximately 350mm higher than the highest point of the existing bungalow (7 metres).

Whilst there would no longer be a difference in overall height between the dwellings of 2.5 metres (the difference between 9.5 and 7 metres), as stated on Page 65, the shape of the existing buildings 'pyramid' shaped hipped roof, with an eaves highest of 2.75 metres above ground level means that the impact on the openness of the green belt is markedly different from that which would occur if permission were to be granted for a two storey dwelling, where eaves height alone

Agenda Item 4

would be significantly higher (5 metres compared with 2.75 metres as existing).

Although the height of the replacement dwelling has been lowered, the floor space calculations as set out on Page 64 have not changed. These show that habitable floorspace of the proposed new dwelling would be almost double that of the existing dwelling and therefore the new dwelling could not possibly be viewed as 'not materially larger than the one it replaces' as required under the terms of Paragraph 89 of the NPPF.

The recommendation remains that planning permission be refused as per the refusal reason on Page 69 of the main report.