



BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

MONDAY 8TH JANUARY 2018, 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)

K. DICKS
Chief Executive

Parkside
Market Street
BROMSGROVE
Worcestershire
B61 8DA

8th January 2018

This page is intentionally left blank

Bromsgrove District Council Planning Committee

Committee Updates 8th January 2018

15/0548 Sheltwood Grange, Sheltwood Lane

No Updates

17/00482/OUT 9 Bromsgrove Road, Romsley

Comments received from Romsley Parish Council 16.11.2017 - No objections

The applicant has brought to Officer's attention the case of Braintree District Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government decided in November 2017. This recent judgement considers the meaning of the word "isolated" used within paragraph 55 of the NPPF. The judge noted that the word isolated is not defined in the NPPF, and in the absence of a definition it should be given its ordinary meaning of far away from places, buildings or people.

Following the outcome of this case, it is Officer's understanding that the consideration of whether a new dwelling would be isolated is a separate consideration to the broader aim of paragraph 55 of the NPPF which is to promote sustainable development within rural areas, where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.

In relation to the current proposal it is noted that the new dwelling would be proximate to other nearby dwellings, most notably number 9 Bromsgrove Road, and therefore would not be considered isolated by its ordinary definition. On the basis of this the second refusal reason contained within the Officer report has been amended to remove reference to the proposed dwelling being isolated, but instead focus on the unsustainable location of the site. The proposed amended condition is as follows:-

"The proposed dwelling by reason of its distance from essential services, job opportunities and the future occupier's reliance upon motor vehicles as a means of transport would result in an unsustainable form of development which would fail to enhance or sustain the vitality of the rural community. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies BDP1 and BDP2 of the Bromsgrove District Plan (2011-2030) and paragraphs 7 and 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework."

17/00872/FUL Heath Farm, Wythall

Application **WITHDRAWN**

17/01153/FUL Clent Vets, 5 Kidderminster Road, Bromsgrove

1 Objection received from the owners of 7 Kidderminster Road Bromsgrove as follows:

We have looked at the application drawings and read the Statement of Significance.

Firstly, for the purposes of this formal objection, our property at 7 Kidderminster Road sits next door to Clent Hills Veterinary Practice. We purchased our property at the beginning of 2017 to move our small professional services business into and have since set about submitting our own significant plans for the total renovation of the building. In doing so, we have worked closely with Nick Joyce Conservation Architects, Mary Worsfold and yourself, in order to agree a design and refurbishment plan which is sympathetic to both the building and the conservation area it sits within. As stated in the Statement of Significance for Clent Hills, works to our property have begun and are due for completion mid-January.

We have not yet been able to physically measure how far away this proposed first floor extension

Agenda Item 4

would sit from our window, only around 12 feet or so before we would be presented with overpowering brick work, roof tiles and roof lights which would be directly positioned across the full width of the back of our property. Surely there is some protection from such applications being approved when they are positioned in such a way? There are 2 photos in the Statement of Significance on pages 8 and 9 which show exactly how impacted we would be, however the Statement itself casually suggests that only 'the loss of view would be marginally detrimental' when referencing this part of their submitted plans. This is a huge understatement and in addition, there are other key considerations which have not been omitted as follows:

1. There would be an adverse and detrimental effect on sunlight and natural daylight entering into our building, halving the light coming in to our first floor office. This is where all of our employees are accommodated.
2. The only light into the back of our single story rear extension is via means of a new glass roof light being installed this week to make the meeting room usable and some very small top windows running along the back of the building. Again there is no doubt that this proposed extension will impact the whole of the use of our single storey rear extension, in terms of sunlight and natural daylight.
3. The impact on the wellbeing of all our employees who would be working in what would be a dark and frankly depressing upstairs office.
4. The current view, which although as the Statement suggests is 'hardly picturesque', is at least open and light towards the view of conifers and gives some element of greenery and pleasure.
5. An adverse effect on resale and the value of our property.

Furthermore, we'd like to make clear that the Statement of Significance does not reference the fact that although our building has previously been altered the works which are currently underway are to fully restore and enhance this building. The Statement infers that because our building is in its current 'unsympathetic' state, this should be considered as more acceptable to grant the permissions Clent Hills are seeking, we disagree with this. We have always been aware that our building sits within a conservation area and all works are being meticulously carried out against this backdrop.

The Statement of Significance seems to further infer that because our building has been converted into office use, these proposed plans should be more acceptable. Again, we strongly disagree with this inference and stress that the building use should make no difference and the impact would be extremely high to anybody whether residential or commercial.

Whilst we understand the need for expansion, this building appears to be already over developed and evidently envelopes the more historical row of terraced houses of 7-9 Kidderminster Road. In our opinion it should not be allowed to sprawl further in this area of conservation.

We would urge you to please consider our views as this is a huge worry for us at this time.

1 representation from Cllr Buxton:

The nature of the application requires a balancing of the need for the facility against the impact of the design of the proposal on the conservation area.

Publicity:

Site Notice posted 06.11.17: expired 27.11.17

Press Notice published 10.11.17: expired 24.11.17

17/01237/FUL The Mount School, 277 Birmingham Road, Bromsgrove

Application **WITHDRAWN**

17/01302/FUL Bankside, Kidderminster Road, Dodford

The proposal description contained within the published committee report refers to a rear extension, however due to original orientation of the property, the proposed extension is in actual fact a side extension. The proposal description has therefore been amended to the following:-
"Removal of existing conservatory and erection of extension to original side of property."