



BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

MONDAY 3RD OCTOBER 2016
AT 6.00 P.M.

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

Agenda Item 4

Bromsgrove District Council Planning Committee

Committee Updates 3rd October 2016

16/0832 The Greyhound [PH], 30 Rock Hill

No Updates

0723 47 Fiery Hill Road, Barnt Green

An amended site plan has been received by the Local Planning Authority on 27th September. The site plan has been amended to ensure that the parking spaces meet the size required for a standard vehicle. Condition one is therefore amended to condition the accordance with plan reference 02 Rev F Proposed Site Plan.

One additional letter of objection has been received from a member of the public, reiterating there concerns regarding the highways impacts. In addition, they also note planning application 16/0319 for redevelopment of site at 10 Cherry Hill Drive was refused by virtue of the density on the plot and the impact to the conservation area.

16/0787 Land At E400623 N273946, Fiery Hill Road

1 additional letter of objection raising concerns that granting permission to build remaining homes waters down the developer's commitment to the junction improvements. There is already an increased burden on the road, with construction traffic as well as new residents.

Additional comments

The applicant has confirmed that they will be in a position to undertake the works around 9th January 2017 onwards, and as such will be able to avoid any potential road disruption during the festive period.

16/0790 26 Tollhouse Road, Bromsgrove

No Updates

16/0820 40 Marlborough Avenue, Bromsgrove

Two additional letters of objection received following the amendment of the plans. The letter states that the amendment has not overcome the concerns raised on the previous appeal decision. No new material considerations have been raised.

16/0841 and 16/0842 The Granary, Dagnell End Road

Updates in relation to both Applications 16/0841 and 16/0842

Members should note that Cllr Griffiths requested that this application is considered by Planning Committee rather than being determined under delegated powers.

Four additional representations received summarised as follows:

The applicants make an important contribution to the community
The proposed extension has been thoughtfully designed
The proposal represents a positive and refined solution to the idea of growth

Additional Plan submitted by the Applicant's Agent 26.09.2016 to address the concerns raised in the Officers Report in respect of the proposed parking to the north of the application site and impact on the setting of the listed building.

Further response from Worcestershire Highways 26.09.2016: No objection.

The applicant's Agent has also provided a historic photograph of the site to show the nature of the building which previously existed to the north of the present building. However, a building in this position is barely discernable in the photograph although a brick boundary wall is visible. The Agent has also suggested alteration to the position/orientation of the extension. This does not change the objection of Officers to the scheme. The alteration of the parking arrangements has been taken into account.

The refusal reason is hereby amended as follows:

The proposed extension would not respect the architectural character or setting of the listed building by virtue of its position, design, size, height and materials and would result in a highly visible, dominant structure, out of scale with the building. The matters raised by the applicant do not justify the clear harm to the character and setting of the listed building. Therefore, the proposal would result in harm to a designated heritage asset contrary to Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy S39 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004, the guidance of SPG 4 (Converted Rural Buildings) and paragraphs 132 - 134 of the NPPF.

Additional Statement provided by the Applicant 02.10.2016 to address the matters raised in the Committee Report and provide a summary of the design approach and pre application process. This statement has been reviewed by both Officers and the Conservation Officer and the points raised addressed as follows. The Statement has been accompanied by Appendix A (the response of the Applicant's Conservation Design Advisor to the Committee Report)

Weight to be attached to SPG4 (Conversion of Rural Buildings). The Council remains of the view that the principles of the approach outlined in SPG4 remain a relevant planning consideration and a planning application does not represent an opportunity to rewrite policy. The appeal decision referred to (Chadwich Grange Farm) has already been addressed in paragraph 5.14 of the committee report and the Inspector took the view that the principles of good design outlined in SPG4 are reiterated in the NPPF, carry weight and the appeal was dismissed. It should be noted that this building, which was the subject of this application was not listed. In terms of the specific points raised, the applicant has cited the relevant paragraphs in the committee report and the response below refers to the same paragraphs.

2.1 The additional representations received have been reported above.

5.6 The point raised relates to a building which was historically located to the north of the present Granary building. The matter has been addressed above and in paragraph 5.15 of the Committee Report. Limited weight is afforded to a building which was removed more than 30 years ago and no evidence of it remains.

Agenda Item 4

5.8 In relation to roof pitch, the Council still objects to the proposed roof pitch and the applicant has referred to further dialogue in relation to this point and refers to the context of the Granary and surrounding buildings. This overlooks the fact the principle of the extension is not acceptable.

5.8 The Council accepts that the property can be accessed using the access immediately to the west of Dagnell End Farm in addition to the access from the north east used on the site visit. The matter of visibility from Dagnell End Road does not change the principle objection of the Council to the proposal.

5.9 The applicant refers to discussion with Historic England in relation to the proposal. No consultation response has been provided and the applicant's informal discussion with Historic England cannot be afforded weight. The matter of the impact of the proposal on the setting and character of the listed building has been covered in extensive detail in the Conservation Officer's consultation response.

In terms of additional appraisal - (Appendix 1) provided by the applicant, the Council has taken the applicant's original Heritage Statement (Received 24th Aug) into account in assessing the application. The additional Appendix A (Received today) raises matters of disagreement in terms of scale and dimension but the in principle objection of the Council is not fully addressed. Thereby the principle of an extension remains unacceptable. The applicant's reference to para 5.5 in the committee report relates solely to matters of Green Belt policy and does not infer than the proposal is acceptable in terms of the impact on the listed building.

5.11 The Council notes the cooperation of the applicant in terms of the choice of materials but this is a separate issue to the principle set out above.

5.12 The Granary is clearly functioning as a dwelling house and is not redundant and the optimum viable use has been fulfilled without the need for an extension.

5.13 The fact that the applicant has cared for the property is not a matter which would make the extension acceptable.

5.15 and 5.16 The matter of the weight to be attached to SPG4 and the existence of a previous building has already been addressed above.

5.17 The applicant does not address the point that the appeal decisions referred to are not related to listed buildings and therefore not directly comparable and the context of the these proposals was different.

5.18 The reference made to the extension of a listed building in Gloucestershire is noted but the context of that decision is not before us for consideration and each application must be considered on its individual merits.

The applicant raises the matter of local support and personal circumstances but these matters have already been dealt with in the committee report at paragraph 5.18.

The applicant's statement that the proposal has been considered in a simplistic way is refuted. The proposal has been the subject of detailed pre application discussions with Officers, the report to Committee contains 18 paragraphs which analyse the proposals and draw an appropriate conclusion on the basis of planning polices and relevant legislation.

This page is intentionally left blank