



BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

MONDAY 3RD JULY 2017
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 - 2)

Parkside
Market Street
BROMSGROVE
Worcestershire
B61 8DA

K DICKS
Chief Executive

**Bromsgrove District Council
Planning Committee**

**Committee Updates
3 July 2017**

16/1150 1 Plymouth Drive, Barnt Green

1 further objection received but no new issues have been raised.

16/1148 Newhouse Farm, Lea End Lane

To clarify:

The building would be positioned on part of the site which is gently sloping, with the land rising up to the north. The proposal is for the finished floor level of the proposed building to be the same as the existing hay barn. To do this the proposed building would be cut into the slope. The excavated spoil would then be spread across the rest of the field.

17/0200 Laurel Farm, Dagnell End Road

No Updates

17/00353/FUL 2 Thicknall Rise, Hagley

One further objection received 02/07/2017 from Cllr Steve Colella Hagley West Ward stating:

The latest application (17/00353) is the same as that originally submitted (10/1222), which was rejected Bromsgrove Planning Committee who decided that the extension was not appropriate for the area.

The earlier appeal for the extension was upheld by Bristol on the basis of the Bromsgrove District Plan (2004). A new Bromsgrove District Plan (2017) is now in force and Mr Sikham's recent appeal for the new house was rejected on the basis of this and this application should therefore be judged on this latest plan.

There are several points in the Inspectorate's latest decision rejecting the most recent appeal which also apply to this latest application for the extension.

The proposed extension would substantially fill the space at the side of the existing dwelling thereby bringing the built form at the end of Thicknall Rise much closer to Newfield Road.

At present the existing dwelling forming no 2 Thicknall Rise is positioned such that its southern flank wall is set well back from Newfield Road and even with the presence of the existing garage at its side, this layout maintains the openness of the area around the junction of Thicknall Rise and Newfield Road that is characteristic of the area's overall spaciousness. The layout at no 2 also mirrors the positioning of the dwelling on the opposite corner which creates a pleasing symmetry to the built form at the end of Thicknall Rise. This is replicated by the comparison of other properties nearby.

This extension would occupy the same space and bulk of the recent application for a house on the site. On his recent site visit the Bristol Inspector observed that the forward-most projection of neighbouring dwellings is formed by single storey garages. However, the southern flank wall of the proposed extension would still breach it to a considerable degree.

In his rejection of the house, the Inspector stated that the building line formed by single-storey

Agenda Item 4

structure (the garage) does not justifies permitting a building of substantially greater bulk and mass in comparison. This obviously applies to this proposed extension.

Taking all of these points into account, the proposal would result in there being an overly dominant building in a prominent corner location thereby appearing as an incongruous and obtrusive feature in the Thicknall Rise and Newfield Road street scenes. It would also have a marked effect on the characteristic spaciousness of the area and have an unacceptable relationship to its immediate neighbours. It would run counter to BDP Policy BDP7, which whilst it requires development to make efficient use of land, clearly says that character and local distinctiveness must also be maintained.

Officer Response:

The latest appeal decision was for a new dwelling (not reported to Members in your report given this has limited relevance to the current application). This application is for an extension to a dwelling and therefore BDP Policy BDP7 is not relevant.

The proposal currently in front of Members has a different policy base and this is clearly outlined and assessed in the report.

17/00359/FUL 452 Birmingham Road, Marlbrook

No Updates

17/00428/FUL 9 Withybed Lane, Alvechurch

No Updates

17/00554/FUL 40 Penshurst Road, Bromsgrove

No Updates