



BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

MONDAY 5TH DECEMBER 2016

AT 6.00 P.M.

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

PLEASE NOTE THE COUNCIL'S NEW PREMISES AS INDICATED ABOVE AND THAT AFTER 5PM, ACCESS TO THE PARKSIDE SUITE IS VIA THE MAIN ENTRANCE DOOR ON THE STOURBRIDGE ROAD. PLEASE ALSO NOTE THAT THERE IS NO PUBLIC PARKING AVAILABLE FOR THE NEW PREMISES. THE NEAREST PARKING IS THE PARKSIDE (MARKET STREET) PAY AND DISPLAY CAR PARK.

MEMBERS: Councillors R. J. Deeming (Chairman), P.L. Thomas (Vice-Chairman), C. Allen-Jones, S. J. Baxter, M. T. Buxton, C.A. Hotham, K.J. May, S. R. Peters, S. P. Shannon, C. J. Spencer and P. J. Whittaker

Updates to the Reports of the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services will be available in the Council Chamber one hour prior to Meeting. You are advised to arrive in advance of the start of the Meeting to allow yourself sufficient time to read the updates.

Members of the Committee are requested to arrive at least fifteen minutes before the start of the meeting to read any additional representations and to ask questions of the Officers who will also make themselves available for at least one hour before the meeting. Members are also requested to give Officers at least forty-eight hours notice of detailed, technical questions in order that information can be sought to enable answers to be given at the meeting.

AGENDA

1. To receive apologies for absence and notification of substitutes
2. Declarations of Interest

To invite Councillors to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests or Other Disclosable Interests they may have in items on the agenda, and to confirm the nature of those interests.

3. To confirm the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 7th November 2016 (Pages 1 - 4)
4. Updates to planning applications reported at the meeting (to be circulated prior to the start of the meeting)
5. 2016/0844 - Proposed extensions to nursery and variation of Condition 1 of Planning Permission granted under Application 2014/0993 to increase the number of children who can attend the nursery at any one time to 81 - Mereside Farm Children's Nursery, Mereside, Peterbrook Road, Majors Green, Solihull, Worcestershire B90 1HZ - Mr Alan Lowe (Pages 5 - 12)
6. 2016/0915 - Retrospective Application for the retention of garden store - The Woodlands, Woodland Road, Dodford, Bromsgrove B61 9BS - Mrs Louise Walters (Pages 13 - 16)
7. 2016/1050 - Change of use of existing agricultural building to retail for the display and sale of ornamental fish and erection of pergola over outside cold water fish area, alterations and improvements to elevations and landscaping - A E Becketts Farm Heath Farm, Alcester Road, Wythall, B47 6AJ - R Cook (Pages 17 - 24)
8. To consider any other business, details of which have been notified to the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services prior to the commencement of the meeting and which the Chairman considers to be of so urgent a nature that it cannot wait until the next meeting

K. DICKS
Chief Executive

Parkside
Market Street
BROMSGROVE
Worcestershire
B61 8DA

23rd November 2016



INFORMATION FOR THE PUBLIC

Access to Information

The Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 widened the rights of press and public to attend Local Authority meetings and to see certain documents. Recently the Freedom of Information Act 2000 has further broadened these rights, and limited exemptions under the 1985 Act.

- You can attend all Council, Cabinet and Committee / Board meetings, except for any part of the meeting when the business would disclose confidential or "exempt" information.
- You can inspect agenda and public reports at least five days before the date of the meeting.
- You can inspect minutes of the Council, Cabinet and its Committees/Boards for up to six years following a meeting.
- You can have access, upon request, to the background papers on which reports are based for a period of up to six years from the date of the meeting. These are listed at the end of each report.
- An electronic register stating the names and addresses and electoral areas of all Councillors with details of the membership of all Committees, etc., is available on our website.
- A reasonable number of copies of agendas and reports relating to items to be considered in public will be made available to the public attending meetings of the Council, Cabinet and its Committees / Boards.
- You have access to a list specifying those powers which the Council has delegated to its Officers indicating also the titles of the Officers concerned, as detailed in the Council's Constitution, Scheme of Delegation.

You can access the following documents:

- Meeting Agendas
- Meeting Minutes
- The Council's Constitution

at www.bromsgrove.gov.uk

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Information for Members of the Public

The Planning Committee comprises 11 Councillors. Meetings are held once a month on Mondays **at 6.00 p.m.** in the Parkside Suite, Parkside, Market Street, Bromsgrove, B61 8DA - access to the Parkside Suite after 5pm is via the main entrance door on the Stourbridge Road. The nearest available public parking for the new premises is Parkside (Market Street) Pay and Display. .

The Chairman of the Committee, who is responsible for the conduct of the meeting, sits at the head of the table. The other Councillors sit around the inner-tables in their party groupings. To the immediate right of the Chairman are the Planning Officers. To the left of the Chairman is the Solicitor who provides legal advice, and the Democratic Services Officer who takes the Minutes of the Meeting. The Officers are paid employees of the Council who attend the Meeting to advise the Committee. They can make recommendations, and give advice (both in terms of procedures which must be followed by the Committee, and on planning legislation / policy / guidance), but they are not permitted to take part in the decision making.

All items on the Agenda are (usually) for discussion in public. You have the right to request to inspect copies of previous Minutes, reports on this agenda, together with the background documents used in the preparation of these reports. Any Update Reports for the items on the Agenda are published on the Council's Website at least one hour before the start of the meeting, and extra copies of the Agenda and Reports, together with the Update Report, are available in the public gallery. The Chairman will normally take each item of the Agenda in turn although, in particular circumstances, these may be taken out of sequence.

The Agenda is divided into the following sections:-

- Procedural Items

Procedural matters usually take just a few minutes and include: apologies for absence, approval of the Minutes of the previous meeting(s) and, where necessary, election of a Chairman and / or Vice-Chairman. In addition, Councillors are asked to declare whether they have any disclosable pecuniary and / or other disclosable interests in any items to be discussed. If a Councillor declares a disclosable pecuniary interest, he/she will withdraw from the meeting during the discussion and voting on that item. However, it is up to the individual Councillor concerned to decide whether or not to declare any interest.

- Reports of the Head of Planning and Regeneration

(i) **Plans and Applications to Develop, or Change of Use** - Reports on all applications will include a response from consultees, a summary of any observations received and a recommendation. Recent

consultation responses will be reported at the meeting within the Update Report.

Each application will be considered in turn. When the Chairman considers that there has been sufficient discussion, a decision will be called for. Councillors may decide that, in order to make a fully informed decision, they need to visit the site. If this is the case, then a decision on the application will be deferred until the next meeting of the Committee. Alternatively, a decision may be deferred in order that more information can be presented / reported. If the Councillors consider that they can proceed to making a decision, they can either accept the recommendation(s) made in the report (suggesting any additional conditions and / or reasons for their decision), or they can propose an amendment, whereby Councillors may make their own recommendation. A decision will then be taken, usually by way of a show of hands, and the Chairman will announce the result of the vote. Officers are not permitted to vote on applications.

Note: **Delegation** - All items are presumed to be matters which the Planning Committee has delegated powers to determine. In those instances where delegation will not or is unlikely to apply, an appropriate indication will be given at the meeting.

Any members of the public wishing to make late additional representations should do so in writing, or by contacting their Ward Councillor(s) well in advance of the Meeting. You can find out who your Ward Councillor(s) is/are at www.writetothem.com.

Members of the public should note that any application can be determined in any manner, notwithstanding any (or no) recommendation being made to the Planning Committee.

- (ii) **Development Control (Planning Enforcement) / Building Control** - These matters include such items as to whether or not enforcement action should be taken, applications to carry out work on trees that are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order, etc.. 'Public Speaking' policy does not apply to this type of report, and enforcement matters are normally dealt with as confidential items (see 'Confidential / Exempt Business' below).

- Reports of the Head of Legal and Democratic Services

These reports relate to, for example, cases where authority is sought to commence legal proceedings for non-compliance with a variety of formal planning notices. They are generally mainly concerned with administrative and legal aspects of planning matters. 'Public Speaking' policy does not apply to this type of report, and legal issues are normally dealt with as confidential items (see 'Confidential / Exempt Business' below).

- Urgent Business

In exceptional circumstances, and at the discretion of the Chairman, certain items may be raised at the meeting which are not on the Agenda. The Agenda is published a week in advance of the meeting and an urgent matter may require a decision. However, the Chairman must give a reason

for accepting any "urgent business". 'Public Speaking' policy would not necessarily apply to this type of report.

- Confidential / Exempt Business

Certain items on the Agenda may be marked "confidential" or "exempt"; any papers relating to such items will not be available to the press and public. The Committee has the right to ask the press and public to leave the room while these reports are considered. Brief details of the matters to be discussed will be given, but the Committee has to give specific reasons for excluding the press and public.

Public Speaking

Where members of the public have registered to speak on planning applications, the item will be dealt with in the following order (subject to the discretion of the Chairman):-

- Introduction of item by the Chairman;
- Officer's presentation;
- Representations by objector;
- Representations by applicant (or representative) or supporter;
- Parish Council speaker (if applicable) and / or Ward Councillor;
- Consideration of application by Councillors, including questions to officers.

All public speakers will be called to the designated area by the Chairman and will have a maximum of 3 minutes to address the Committee.

Feedback forms will be available within the Council Chamber for the duration of the meeting in order that members of the public may comment on the facilities for speaking at Planning Committee meetings.

NOTES

Councillors who have not been appointed to the Planning Committee but who wish to attend and to make comments on any application on the attached agenda are required to inform the Chairman and the relevant Committee Services Officer before 12:00 noon on the day of the meeting. They will also be subject to three minute time limit.

Councillors who are interested in the detail of any matter to be considered are invited to consult the files with the relevant Officer(s) in order to avoid unnecessary debate on such detail at the meeting. Members of the Committee are requested to arrive at least one hour before the start of the meeting to read any additional representations and to ask questions of the Officers who will also make themselves available for at least one hour before the meeting. Members are also requested to give Officers at least forty-eight hours notice of detailed, technical questions in order that information can be

sought to enable answers to be given at the meeting. Councillors should familiarise themselves with the location of particular sites of interest to minimise the need for Committee Site Visits.

Councillors are respectfully reminded that applications deferred for more information should be kept to a minimum and only brought back to Committee for determination where the matter cannot be authorised to be determined by the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services.

In certain circumstances, items may be taken out of the order than that shown on the agenda and, therefore, no certain advice can be provided about the time at which any item may be considered. However, it is recommended that any person attending a meeting of the Committee, whether to speak or to just observe proceedings and listen to the debate, be present for the commencement of the meeting at 6.00 p.m.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985 - SECTION 100D

1. All applications for planning permission include, as background papers, the following documents:-
 - a. The application - the forms and any other written documents submitted by the applicant, the applicant's architect or agent, or both, whichever the case may be, together with any submitted plans, drawings or diagrams.
 - b. Letters of objection, observations, comments or other representations received about the proposals.
 - c. Any written notes by officers relating to the application and contained within the file relating to the particular application.
 - d. Invitations to the Council to comment or make observations on matters which are primarily the concern of another Authority, Statutory Body or Government Department.
2. In relation to any matters referred to in the reports, the following are regarded as the standard background papers:-

Policies contained within the County Structure Plan and Local Plan below, and Planning Policy Statements, specifically referred to as follows:-

WCSP	-	Worcester County Structure Plan 2001
BDLP	-	Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004
DCS2	-	Draft Core Strategy 2
PPG's	-	Planning Policy Guidance Notes
PPS's	-	Planning Policy Statements
SPG	-	Supplementary Policy Guidance (Bromsgrove District)

3. Any other items listed, or referred to, in the report.

Note: For the purposes of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, unless otherwise stated against a particular report, "background papers" in accordance with Section 100D will always include the Case Officer's written report and any letters or memoranda of representation received (including correspondence from Parish Councils, the Highway Authority, statutory consultees, other 'statutory undertakers' and all internal District Council Departments).

Further information

If you require any further information on the Planning Committee, or wish to register to speak on any application for planning permission to be considered by the Committee, in the first instance, please contact Jan Smyth, Democratic Services Officer, at jan.smyth@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk, or telephone (01527) 64252 Extn. 3266.

ABBREVIATIONS

ADR	Area of Development Restraint
AGLV	Area of Great Landscape Value (Structure Plan)
CA	Conservation Area
DS	Development Site
EMP	Employment
GB	Green Belt
LB	Listed Building
LPA	Landscape Protection Area
OPS	Open Space
PSS	Primary Shopping Street
RES	Residential
RETAIL	Retail
SAM	Scheduled Ancient Monument
SSS	Secondary Shopping Street
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
SWS	Special Wildlife Site
TCZ	Town Centre Zone
TPO	Tree Preservation Order
VE	Village Envelope
WH	Worcestershire Highways
WCC(CA)	County Archaeology
WCC(EA)	County Education Authority
WCC(PROW)	Public Rights of Way
WCC(SS)	County Council Social Services
WCC(Landscape)	County Landscape Officer
BCO	Building Control Officer
CCO	Climate Change Officer
CLO	Contaminated Land Officer
CO	Conservation Officer
EDO	Economic Development Officer
ENG	Drainage Engineer
LS	Legal Services
SHM	Strategic Housing Manager
SPM	Strategic Planning Manager
TO	Tree Officer
WRS	Worcestershire Regulatory Services
AC	Agricultural Consultant
AMS	Ancient Monuments Society
AWM	Advantage West Midlands
BW	British Waterways
CAA	Civil Aviation Authority
CABE	Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment
CBA	Council for British Archaeology
CE	Centro
CN	Central Networks
CPRE	Campaign for the Protection of Rural England

ABBREVIATIONS (cont'd)

CSO	Community Safety Officer
EA	Environment Agency
EH	English Heritage
FC	Forestry Commission
GHSoc	Garden History Society
GG	Georgian Group
HA	Highways Agency
H&WGT	Hereford and Worcester Garden Trust
HLS	Head of Leisure and Cultural Services
HSE	Health and Safety Executive
ICNIRP	International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection
IWA	Inland Waterways Association
JRC	The Joint Radio Company Limited
NE	Natural England
NG	National Grid
NR	Network Rail
NT	National Trust
RA	Ramblers Association
SE	Sport England
SPAB	Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
STW	Severn Trent Water
TCo	Transco
TCS	Twentieth Century Society
UD	Urban Designer
VS	Victorian Society
WMC	West Mercia Police
WMP	West Midlands Police
WWT	Worcestershire Wildlife Trust

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

7TH NOVEMBER 2016 AT 6.00 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors R. J. Deeming (Chairman), P.L. Thomas (Vice-Chairman), C. Allen-Jones, S. J. Baxter, M. T. Buxton, C.A. Hotham, K.J. May, S. R. Peters, S. P. Shannon, C. J. Spencer and C. B. Taylor

Officers: Mr. D. M. Birch, Mr. S. Hawley (Worcestershire Highways Authority), Mrs. S. Hazlewood, Mrs. T. Lovejoy, Mrs. S. Sellers and Mrs. J. Smyth

41/16 **APOLOGIES**

An apology for absence was received on behalf of Councillor P.J. Whittaker. Councillor C.B. Taylor was confirmed as Councillor Whittaker's substitute for the meeting.

42/16 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following Declaratons of Interest were made:

Councillor R.J. Deeming (Chairman), declared an Other Disclosable Interest in Agenda Item 7 (Planning Application 2016/0894 – New Road Dental Surgery, 68 New Road, Bromsgrove B60 2LA), in that he had used the services of the Dental Practice in the past.

Councillor C.B. Taylor declared an interest in Agenda Item 7 (Planning Application 2016/0894 – New Road Dental Surgery, 68 New Road, Bromsgrove B60 2LA) in that he was the County Councillor for the Division in which the application site was located.

Councillor P.L. Thomas declared an Other Disclosable Interest in Agenda Item 7 (Planning Application 2016/0894 – New Road Dental Surgery, 68 New Road, Bromsgrove B60 2LA) in that he had called in the matter as the application site was in his Ward. Councillor Thomas declared, however, that he had no predetermined view on the Application.

43/16

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 3rd October 2016 were submitted.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting be approved as a correct record.

44/16

2016/0690 - FORMATION OF BEDROOM ACCOMMODATION IN NEW ROOFSPACE AT FIRST FLOOR OVER EXISTING KITCHEN EXTENSION - TANNERS GREEN COTTAGE, BARKERS LANE, WYTHALL, B47 6BP - MR MICHAEL GOULDEN-PAGE

Officers reported on additional information relating to the Planning history of the application site, which has been omitted from the Officer's report in error, as detailed in the Update Report, copies of which were provided to Committee Members and the public gallery prior to commencement of the meeting.

Officers provided clarification on the terms of the Legal Unilateral Undertaking that had been entered into with the Applicant in regard to implementation of permitted development and the development as proposed by the planning application. Members were advised that the agreed undertaking with the Applicant would be directly referenced as an Informative for the Decision Notice for the application. .

RESOLVED that Planning Permission be granted, subject to the Conditions and Informatives detailed in pages 9 to 10 of the main agenda report, and the following additional Informative:

- 5) The Applicant's attention is drawn to the contents of the Unilateral Undertaking dated 18th September 2016, which accompanies this Application.

45/16

2016/0726 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND ERECTION OF REPLACEMENT 4 BEDROOM DWELLING, INCLUDING RELOCATION OF PART OF ACCESS TRACK - SUNNY BANK FARM, STONEY LANE, BROAD GREEN, B48 7DG - MR AND MRS PINFIELD

This matter was **WITHDRAWN** from the Agenda by Officers and was not discussed.

46/16

2016/0894 - SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO PROVIDE A SEPARATE DATA STORAGE AND PRIVACY ROOM - NEW ROAD DENTAL SURGERY, 68 NEW ROAD, BROMSGROVE B60 2LA - DR R SOLANKI

Officers reported on an additional letter of objection that had been received as detailed in the published update report, copies of which were provided to Committee Members and the public gallery prior to commencement of the meeting.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr R. Hood, addressed the Committee on behalf of himself and Mr R. Mainwaring, objecting to the application.

The Committee then considered the Application, which had been recommended for approval by Officers. Having considered the Officer's report and representations made, Members were of the view that the proposal would represent over-development of the site and would harm the character and appearance of the property and wider streetscene. The Committee agreed that the reasons in paragraphs 6 and 15 of the Planning Inspector's previous decision applied to this Application and were therefore minded to refuse the application for the reason detailed in the resolution below.

RESOLVED that planning permission be refused for the following reason:

The proposed extension would result in a cluttered complexity to the appearance of the building that is already incongruous in the context of the simpler elevation of its immediate neighbours. The extension would, therefore result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and wider street scene that would represent an over-development of the site. This would be contrary to Policies DS13 and E4 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004, Policy BDP1 and BDP19 of the Emerging District Plan and the relevant guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.

The meeting closed at 6.48 p.m.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Name of Applicant	Proposal	Plan Ref.
Mr Alan Lowe	Proposed extensions to nursery and variation of condition 1 of planning permission granted under application 14/0993 to increase the number of children who can attend the nursery at any one time to 81. Mereside Farm Childrens Nursery Mereside, Peterbrook Road, Majors Green, Solihull, Worcestershire B90 1HZ	16/0844

Councillor Turner has requested that this application be considered by Planning Committee rather than being determined under Delegated Powers

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be **Refused**

Consultations

Wythall Parish Council Consulted 04.11.2016

Objection. Green Belt. Overdevelopment of the site. Further child spaces would result in more movement of vehicles on and off the site.

Highways Department- Worcestershire County Council Consulted 04.11.2016

Has No Objection to the grant of permission.

Worcester Regulatory Services- Noise, Dust, Odour & Burning Consulted 04.11.2016

I have had a look at the property history and cannot see any complaints about anything. Obviously there is the potential for increased noise from additional traffic and children but I would say it will be up to the business owners to ensure noise from the commercial operation is controlled as far as possible so as not to cause any nuisance to the nearby neighbour.

Regarding the proposed demolition / construction activities, in order to minimise any nuisance during these phases the applicant should refer their contractor to the WRS Demolition and Construction Guidance and ensure it recommendations are complied with.

Social Services Early Years and Childcare Service Consulted 04.11.2016

Views awaited.

Letter from Babcock Prime Education Services submitted with the application and dated 24/08/2016:

Mereside Farm Children's Day Nursery provides full day care for children ages 3 months to 5 years. This contributes to Worcestershire County Councils Statutory duty under the Childcare Act 2006 (section 6) to secure sufficient childcare for working parents. There

will be a need for more child places all over Worcestershire with the increase of the free nursery entitlement from 15 hours to 30 hours in September 2017.
Mereside is the only nursery in the ward of Wythall East.

Solihull Council Consulted 04.11.2016
No objections.

Letter from Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council Children's Services and Skills submitted with the application and dated 05/10/2016:

I understand that you are now seeking planning permission for the expansion of your childcare premises in order to support the Government initiative to provide extended childcare for working families and I would like to support this application.

Your bid to provide additional childcare for 3 and 4 year olds of eligible working families has been included as one of the bids submitted to the Education Funding Agency on behalf of Solihull Council. If successful Mereside Farm Nursery will form part of Solihull Council's response to the requirement to provide an extended 30 hour offer from September 2017. Without the development of this accommodation the additional places offered would be restricted and may not meet the demand from families living in the area.

Parks & Green Space Development Officer Martin Lewis Consulted 04.11.2016
I have no issues with the proposals, subject to conditions relating too:

Any proposed landscape, car park or external building lighting needs to be either PIR activated (as appropriate) or timed, and appropriately designed to prevent light pollution or spill, as such this element should be subject to design approval to minimise potential disturbance of potential bat/bird/mammal forage or roosting sites and routes.

In line with the NPPF, to ensure developments result in a 'net gain' for biodiversity - enhancement of the local ecology and its opportunities shall be require through the provision of suitable Schwegler (or similar approved) bird and bat boxes on and around the buildings proposed to provide roosting opportunities suitable for species likely to be using the local urban environment such as house sparrows, finches, tits, starlings etc. Boxes should be located in warm locations where they will receive full/partial sun in a variety of orientations to receive a range of climatic conditions. The boxes must be at least 3 metres above ground to prevent disturbance from people and/or predators. Exact locations and types should be determined and agreed with an ecologist.

Site clearance or tree/shrub/undergrowth removal to take place outside the bird nesting season - (March - August inclusive) - or otherwise under the direction of a suitably qualified ecologist or ecological clerk of works.

Publicity

4 neighbouring properties were consulted 4.11.2016 (expires 25.11.2016)
Site notice posted on 7.11.2016 (expires 28.11.2016)

1 objection has been received from the adjoining property to Mereside Nursery.

- Concern over the impact of the nursery expansion on their amenities through: increase in noise levels and increase in volume of traffic.

- Concern over the impact of the proposed extension on the character of the semi-detached Victorian properties and in particular the original Victorian Wall between the two properties.

Councillor L. J. Turner

Regarding the above application I request that it be sent to the Planning Committee for discussion if there is any chance that Officers are minded not to approve.

My reasons are:

- The Childcare Act 2016 requires Councils to make arrangements to extend childcare support to 30 hours per week for 38 weeks of the year, for 3 and 4 year olds, to support working families. There is a shortage of child nurseries in the Wythall / Solihull area which have the required capability to meet the new demand, and that have good drop off and parking facilities such as is the case at Mereside. I consider these factors to be very special circumstances.
- There would be minimal affect on the amenity of the green belt. Except for the adjoining neighbours, who have not objected to my knowledge, there is no visual impact on nearby residents.
- There will be a small increase in traffic movement along the entrance road but not sufficient to be a problem and for very limited amounts of time.
- There appears to be different opinion on the size of the original building footprint according to which of two older maps are taken to be relevant.
- The application has the approval of the agency providing childcare on behalf of Worcestershire County Council.

Relevant Policies

Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004 (BDLP):

DS1 Green Belt Designation
DS2 Green Belt Development Criteria
DS13 Sustainable Development
S19 Incompatible land uses
S31 Development at Educational Establishments
C27 Re-Use of Existing Rural Buildings
C27C Extensions to Converted Rural Buildings

Emerging Bromsgrove District Plan

BDP1 Sustainable Development Principles
BDP4 Green Belt
BDP12 Sustainable Communities
BDP19 High Quality Design
BDP21 Natural Environment

Others:

SPG4 Conversion of Rural Buildings
NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

NPPG National Planning Practice Guidance

Relevant Planning History

14/1016	Discharge Section 106 Agreement dated 29.12.1994 and attached to Planning Application: 93/0988	Approved	05.06.2015
14/0993	Variation of Condition 3 of Planning Permission granted under Application Reference: 2000/0279. Condition 3 states: The number of children attending the day nursery use hereby approved shall not exceed 22.	Approved	05.06.2015
14/0489	Discharge of Section 106 Agreement dated 29.12.1994 and attached to Planning Application: 93/0988	Withdrawn	18.07.2014
14/0362	Removal of Condition 3 of Planning Permission granted under Application Reference: 2000/0279. Condition 3 states: The number of children attending the day nursery use hereby approved shall not exceed 22.	Withdrawn	18.07.2014
14/0361	Removal of Condition 5 of Planning Permission Granted under Application Reference: 93/0988. Condition 5 states: This permission shall enure for the benefit of the applicants V. Featherstone and B. Cusworth only.	Approved	23.07.2014
08/0971	Proposed conversion of existing outbuilding to office and wc for use in connection with children's nursery.	Approved	14.01.2009
B/2000/0279	Change of use of Mereside Farm from residential dwelling to day nursery in conjunction with existing Mereside Day Nursery.	Approved	19.06.2000
B/1993/0988	Conversion of redundant buildings to children's day nursery	Approved	09.01.1995
B/19597/1990	Conversion of stable to living accommodation.	Refused	08.10.1990

Assessment of Proposal

Mereside Nursery is situated in the Green Belt.

In 2014 applications were submitted for this site to remove restrictions on the number of children that could attend the nursery at any one time from 46 to 62 children.

This current application is to extend the existing buildings on the site and to vary condition 1 of planning permission granted under application 14/0993 to increase the number of children who can attend the nursery at any one time from 62 to 81.

Green Belt

The Council's records indicate that the original outbuilding was extended back in the 1980s. This extension was to create a double garage and is shown to have increased the floor space of the original outbuilding by approximately 47 square metres.

The current proposal is for two separate extensions to the nursery buildings. One being a link extension between the original farm house and the outbuilding and the other is a linear extension at the end of the existing outbuilding. These extensions would increase the floor space of the original buildings by approximately 114 square metres.

Cumulatively, the existing and proposed extensions would increase the floor space of the original buildings by approximately 161 square metres, which would equate to an overall increase of 82%.

The proposal does also include the removal of an existing outbuilding which is situated within the footprint of one of the proposed extensions. This outbuilding has a floor space of approximately 10 square metres. When this is offset against the total increase in floor space, the percentage increase would equate to 77%.

An increase of this size is not considered to be a proportionate to the original building. As such, it is considered that the proposal would amount to inappropriate development in the Green belt. Inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The NPPF sets out that 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Very Special Circumstances

Very special circumstances (VSCs) have been put forward by the applicant in this case. These VSCs relate to the introduction of the Childcare Bill and the new provision for providing working parents with the entitlement for an additional 15 hours of free childcare for their three and four year olds. Solihull Council have put Mereside Children's Nursery forward to the Department for Education as a nursery that could help it offer additional childcare to working parent families in the area, however only if it were to carry out a funded project and extend its current buildings and facilities. The current extensions that have been proposed would enable the nursery to offer up to 42 three and four years olds 30 hours of child care, whereas currently it appears that the nursery would only be able to offer 30 hours of childcare to approximately 13, three and four year olds.

Mereside Children's Nursery is noted to be the only nursery in the Wythall East Ward. Although, it is noted that this ward is situated at the edge of the Solihull Conurbation and within close proximity to the Birmingham Conurbation and the main settlement of Wythall. These areas all have nurseries within them.

Although both Solihull and Worcestershire County Council are in support of the proposal to extend Mereside due to the number of places it would be capable of providing, no clear information or evidence has been provided to indicate that the number of child places could not be provided by the other nurseries within the neighbouring urban areas, if they were to put forward expansion projects. Furthermore, such circumstances could be repeated on any site within the Green Belt across the District.

On balance therefore, although the proposal could benefit the local community by helping to provide more nursery places in this area, it is not considered that any very special circumstances have been put forward or exist that would outweigh the presumption against inappropriate development and the harm that the proposal would have on the openness of the Green Belt.

Appearance and Design

The proposal is to extend the building with two separate extensions. One would be a rear extension to the former farm house which would partly link onto the outbuilding and the other would be a linear extension onto the end of the former outbuilding and garage.

The link extension would be flat roofed, with a fully glazed side elevation, which would form the link between the two buildings. The glazed element would be the most visible element of the extension from within the application site.

Generally extensions to rural outbuildings which detract from the original character and form of the building would not be acceptable. In this case, it is considered that the design, appearance and location of the proposed extension would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the original buildings and as such could be acceptable.

The other extension would be a linear extension and would follow the form and layout of the existing building. It would be set down and appear subservient to the existing building. As such it is not considered that it would detract from the character and appearance of the building.

Amenity

The proposed rear extension to the former farm house has been set in by approximately 0.3metres from the boundary with the neighbouring property. It would extend out along the boundary by approximately 6.5metres. The neighbouring property has a window which serves their kitchen within the rear elevation of their property. The proposed extensions would breach the 45 degree line when taken from this window.

However, the proposed extension would be replacing an existing outbuilding located along the boundary with the neighbouring property, which does already breach the 45 degree line. Also, the height of the proposed extension has been kept as low as possible, with a flat roof design. As such it is not considered that this element of the proposal would

have an unacceptable impact on the existing amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring property.

Members will note the Worcestershire Regulatory Services have stated that there would be potential for there to be increased noise from additional traffic and children. I have also received an objection from the owner of the adjoining property in regards to the impact on the nursery on their amenities in terms of noise and traffic.

From this I accept that the existing nursery does already have an impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property. However it is considered that increasing the size of the nursery and allowing more children to attend at any one time would serve to impact further on their amenities. As such, it is considered that this proposal would be detrimental to the existing amenities of the neighbouring property.

Conclusion

The proposal would represent inappropriate development within the Green Belt which would by definition be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt. The benefits of the scheme put forward as VSC by the applicant are not sufficient to clearly outweigh the substantial weight which should be given to the harm to the Green Belt and therefore cannot justify the development. The proposal would also affect the amenities of the adjoining occupiers. Overall therefore it is considered that the proposal would be contrary to policy.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be Refused.

Reasons for Refusal

- 1) The proposal would result in the addition of disproportionate additions to the original buildings, which would reduce the openness of the Green Belt. The proposal would therefore amount to inappropriate development in the Green belt. Inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The NPPF sets out that 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. It is not considered that the Very Special Circumstances that have been put forward in this case would outweigh the harm that the proposal would have on the Green Belt. The proposed development is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy DS2 of the Bromsgrove District Plan, Policy BDP4 of the Emerging Bromsgrove District Plan and the NPPF.
- 2) The proposed development would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining residential property by virtue of noise disturbance. The application is therefore contrary to Policy DS13 of the Bromsgrove District Plan, Policy BDP1 of the Emerging Bromsgrove District Plan and the NPPF.

Case Officer: Claire Gilbert Tel: 01527 881655
Email: claire.gilbert@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Name of Applicant	Proposal	Plan Ref.
Mrs Louise Walters	Retrospective application for retention of garden store The Woodlands, Woodland Road, Dodford, Bromsgrove, B61 9BS	2016/0915

Councillor May has requested that this application be considered by Planning Committee rather than being determined under delegated powers

RECOMMENDATION: that planning permission is **REFUSED**

Consultations

Conservation Officer Consulted 21.09.2016

Objection

The siting of the new shed will not preserve or enhance the character of or appearance of the Conservation Area. In addition in terms of the NPPF I do not think the harm to the heritage asset, in this case the Conservation Area, has been justified.

As the harm would be less than substantial, Paragraph 134 of the NPPF has to be considered, and I do not consider that there are any public benefits which outweigh the harm.

Dodford with Grafton Parish Council Consulted 21.09.2016

Dodford with Grafton Parish Council would question the location of the new garden store being on the boundary and not away from the boundary as shown in the existing site plan drawing and with regards permitted development the Parish Council would also question that the garden shed is in front of the house.

Public Comments

Two letters sent 21.09.2016 (expired 12.10.2016): no response received

Site notice displayed 26.10.2016 (expired 16.11.2016): no response received

Press notice 04.11.2016 (expired 18.11.2016): no response received

Councillor May: response received 18.10.2016

The application should be discussed and determined at Planning

Committee, if the recommendation is for refusal as there is a lot of community interest.

Relevant Policies

Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004 (BDLP):

DS2 Green Belt Development Criteria

DS13 Sustainable Development

S35A Development in Conservation Areas

Emerging Bromsgrove District Plan 2011-2030

BDP4 Green Belt

BDP20 Managing the Historic Environment

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraphs 87-90, 132, 134.

Relevant Planning History

B/2004/0177 Extensions to the rear of dwelling. Replacement ancillary outbuilding- Resubmission of B/2003/1062. Approved 22.06.2004.

B/2003/1168 Demolition of outbuilding, renovation works to dwelling. Consent. 16.10.2003

B2003/1062 Extensions to the rear of dwelling. Replacement ancillary outbuilding. Withdrawn 11.11.2003

B/2001/1426 Residential extension Refused 12.02.2002

B13161/1985 Porch Approved: 12.08.1985

B12617/1984 Roof replacement and new entrance. Approved 18.02.85

Assessment of Proposal

Site Description

The application site is on the north western side of Woodland Road, Dodford, within the Dodford Conservation Area. It comprises an extended detached bungalow with detached double garage. The site has a level front garden between the bungalow and Woodland Road, and a steeply sloping extending towards Chaddesley Wood to the rear. The site is located in the Green Belt.

Proposed development

The application is retrospective for the retention of a garden store, The building is 9.5 metres long by 5.6 metres wide by 4 metres high to ridge built in brick clad in waney edge timber boarding, with a pitched slate effect roof The building is positioned in the side garden of the property towards the boundary with the adjoining bungalow,

'Woodbury', but projecting in front of the application bungalow. The building has two timber faced up and over doors.

Planning considerations

The main consideration in this location is whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the impact on the character and appearance of the Dodford Conservation Area having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004 and the Emerging Bromsgrove District Plan.

Paragraph 89 of the NPPF states that, a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Policies DS2 and DS13 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and BDP4 of the emerging Bromsgrove District Plan reflect national policy. Paragraph 87 of the NPPF indicates that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in 'very special circumstances'. Paragraph 88 of the NPPF advises that 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt, by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. When considering any planning application local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm within the Green Belt. In the submitted supporting statement the applicant the applicant contends that the garden store has a similar volume to the three sheds it replaced, is sited further from Woodland Road than the demolished larger wooden shed, the design is 'visually more suitable' and the steeply sloping levels to the rear of the bungalow prevent the siting of the garden store in that area.

Openness is identified in paragraph 79 of the NPPF as one of the two essential characteristics of the Green Belt i.e. openness and permanence. The original sheds have been removed and no weight can be given to this in determining this application. Any such building in this situation would have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt and would constitute substantial harm and an inappropriate development. The siting, scale and design and design of the building is considered harmful and detrimental to the visual amenity of the Green Belt.

With regard to the Conservation Area the siting of the garden store it does not contribute to the preservation or enhancement of the Conservation Area. There are no public benefits to outweigh harm to the Conservation Area. The garden store is contrary to policies C35A, and C36 of the District Local Plan and BDP20 of the emerging District Plan in that it does not preserve, nor enhance the conservation area. Additionally it is not sympathetic nor compatible with the design and character of the existing dwelling.

It is necessary to consider the effect on the openness of the Green Belt and assess whether any considerations that amount to the very special circumstances required

to justify it. Whilst I note the applicants claim that the new structure replaced three previous structures, Members will be aware that the application is retrospective and thus I apply no weight to this. The garden store is situated in an isolated position but close to the boundary with 'Woodbury', forward of the front of the existing dwelling and 25 metres from a double garage, approved in 2004. Given the position of the garden store between the principal elevation of the existing bungalow it cannot be classified as permitted development and therefore there is no fall-back position in this case. The siting, scale and design of the building is therefore considered harmful to the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt. No very special circumstances have been put forward or exist to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.

Conclusion

The development is unacceptable for the above reasons.

RECOMMENDATION That planning permission is refused

Reasons for Refusal

- (1) The development does not fall within any of the categories of appropriate development specified at Policy DS2 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan, Policy BDP4 of the Bromsgrove District Plan or at paragraph 90 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Thus the proposal constitutes an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt which harms the Green Belt by virtue of inappropriateness and harm to openness. No very special circumstances exist or have been put forward to outweigh the harm that would clearly outweigh the identified harm to the Green Belt. This is contrary to Policy DS2 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004, Policy BDP4 of the Bromsgrove District Plan and the provisions of the NPPF.
- (2) The design, architectural detailing, scale and siting of the structure would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the designated Conservation Area, contrary to Policies DS13 and S35a of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan, Policy BDP20 of the Bromsgrove District Plan and the provisions of the NPPF.

Case Officer

Richard Lambert

Tel: 01527 881779

E mail: richard.lambert@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

Name of Applicant	Proposal	Plan Ref.
R Cook	Change of use of existing agricultural building to retail for the display and sale of ornamental fish and erection of pergola over outside cold water fish area, alterations and improvements to elevations and landscaping. A E Becketts Farm Heath Farm , Alcester Road, Wythall, B47 6AJ,	16/1050

Councillor Geoff Denaro has requested that this application be considered by Planning Committee rather than being determined under delegated powers.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be **Refused**

Consultations

Wythall Parish Council Consulted 07.11.2016
No objection

Highways Department- Worcestershire County Council Consulted 07.11.2016
No objection

Parks & Green Space Development Officer Martin Lewis Consulted 07.11.2016
No objection subject to conditions

North Worcestershire Economic Development and Regeneration Consulted 07.11.2016

We are very supportive of the proposal which has a number of clear benefits. The proposed investment would create a further 16 FTE jobs within the business, meaning a total of 40 jobs would be sustained through this facility. Furthermore, we feel the proposal would make better use out of an existing building and would provide additional economic growth in line with the surrounding facilities available at Becketts Farm. We therefore feel that the application should be supported.

Publicity:

12 letters sent on the 7th November 2016 (expires 28th November 2016)

1 site notice posted on the 10th November 2016 (expires 1st December 2016)

1 press noticed published in the Bromsgrove Standard on the 18th November (expires 2nd December)

Neighbour Responses
None Received

Councillor Denaro: If Officers are minded to refuse the application, I would like the application to be heard at Planning Committee so the economic benefits of the scheme can be considered by Members.

Relevant Policies

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004 (BDLP):

DS2 Green Belt Development Criteria

DS13 Sustainable Development

C27 The Re-use of Existing Rural Buildings

TR11 Access and Off-Street Parking

Emerging Bromsgrove District Plan

BDP1 Sustainable Development Principles

BDP4 Green Belt

BDP15 Rural Renaissance

BDP16 Sustainable Transport

BDP21 Natural Environment

Others:

SPG4 The Conversion of Rural Buildings

Relevant Planning History

None

Assessment of Proposal

The site and its surroundings

The application site consists of an agricultural building, which is a substantial metal clad structure. The building is sited adjacent to the Becketts Farm Complex. This is an agricultural business that has diversified into a range of uses including retail, a restaurant and a golf driving range. The application site is in close proximity to the existing large car park that serves the complex and is accessed via wooden gates.

The proposed development

The proposal seeks to convert the existing building into a retail unit with a footprint of 385sqm. A mezzanine is also included to provide additional floor space at first floor level. The proposal also includes extensive landscaping around the building and a pergola to provide cover to an outdoor area used for the storage and sale of koi carp.

Planning Considerations

The main issues to be considered in assessing the application are the following:

- (i) Policy Background
- (ii) Green Belt
- (iii) Residential amenity
- (iv) Access, highways and parking
- (v) Street Scene and Character Impact
- (vi) Ecology

(i) Policy Background

Policy DS2 of the BDLP and paragraph 90 of the NPPF support the principle of the conversion of rural buildings in the Green Belt. Further detail is provided in both C27 of the BDLP and SPG4.

Paragraph 28 of the NPPF supports economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity. In particular the development and diversification of agricultural businesses is encouraged by this paragraph of the NPPF. The emerging BDP supports economic development in rural areas through policy BDP15 (Rural Renaissance). Particular reference within the policy is made to the conversion of buildings and rural diversification schemes.

(ii) Green Belt

The site is located in the Green Belt outside of any defined settlement. It is necessary to consider whether the proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt and if so whether any very special circumstances exist that outweigh any identified harm.

Paragraph 90 of the NPPF and Policy DS2 of the BDLP highlight that the re-use of rural buildings can be an appropriate form of development in the Green Belt where they preserve openness and do not conflict with purposes of including land within the Green Belt. More detailed policy guidance on the reuse of rural buildings can be found in Policy C27. This generally accords with guidance within the NPPF but applies a more stringent test in relation to the quality of the agricultural building. Criteria c) of C27 requires buildings to be of a permanent and substantial construction and be capable of conversion without major works or complete reconstruction and a structural survey is requested. The NPPF simply states that buildings need to be of a permanent and substantial construction. The greater weight must therefore be placed on the NPPF wording in this instance. This is a permanent modern steel framed agricultural building. It is therefore clear that there is no structural reason why the building cannot be refurbished to give a retail use.

It is next important to consider whether the proposed development would impact on the openness of the Green Belt. If only the conversion of the building was proposed there would be no impact on openness. In this case though the area within the redline around the building extends to approximately 1,900sqm. In floor area terms this is almost 5 times the size of the building. Currently this is an open parcel of agricultural land with low level post and rail fencing to most boundaries. The applicant contends that the landscaping takes the form of low level gardens and has virtually no impact on openness. However, it is considered that this represents an over simplification of the proposals. The application introduces a range of features and structures that all detract from the

openness of the Green Belt. The largest addition is a pergola which is 3m high and covers an area of approximately 210sqm. Within the pergola are raised tanks within which koi carp would be stored. No details of the height of the tanks have provided but they are likely to be at least 1m high to reduce the likelihood of any accidents. In addition substantial fencing would also be required around the pergola to protect the valuable koi carp, which would add to the sense of enclosure. The outside area would also include permanent water features, planting, benches, a bin store and additional hard standing. It assumed that some external lighting would also be required to enable this outside area to be used all year round during opening hours. The applicant has highlighted that any parcel of land could be enclosed by 2m fencing. This is not disputed however there would no reason for a farmer to separate individual fields in this manner and in terms of the application it is more pertinent to compare the current situation with what is proposed. Currently there is only low level post and rail fencing which would be clearly not practical for a retail business.

The combination of this range of additions fundamentally changes the appearance of this parcel of land creating a more urban environment and causes substantially greater harm to the openness of the Green Belt when compared to the current situation. It is therefore considered that the proposal constitutes an inappropriate form of development that by definition cause harm to the Green Belt.

In addition to harm by definition it is also necessary to consider whether the proposal causes harm to any of the 5 purposes of including land within the Green Belt. In this instance it is considered that the proposal leads to a level of encroachment into the countryside. The site is currently agricultural in appearance with an agricultural building surrounded by a parcel of pasture land. The range of features and structures proposed in the landscaped garden serve the purpose of creating an area to show how products available for sale on the premises can be used to inspire customers. This will fundamentally change the character and appearance of the land and thereby encroaching into the rural environment.

In summary, in addition to the harm by definition the proposed change of use causes harm to 1 of the purposes for including land within the designated Green Belt whilst also having a substantial impact on openness of the Green Belt in this locality. It is therefore considered that the proposal causes substantial harm to the Green Belt.

In accordance with paragraph 87 of the NPPF inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should only be approved in very special circumstances. The applicant has put forward the following factors for consideration:

- 1, The considerable economic benefits that will arise in the form of inward investment and job creation from this development.
- 2, The pergola would not result in a disproportionate addition.
- 3, Taking into account the context of Becketts Farm there is no impact on the openness of the Green Belt

Each of the factors put forward by the applicant have been considered below:

- 1) Economic Factors

The applicant has an existing premises on the Stratford Road in Shirley within Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council. The applicant is proposing to relocate the business to the application site. The existing business has the equivalent of 24 full-time employees. It is proposed the relocation would create the equivalent of 40 full-time jobs. It is assumed that the existing workforce would be retained due to the short distance between the sites and therefore the equivalent of 16 full-time jobs would be created in the district. There would also be wider economics benefits associated with the addition of a successful retailer to the district. Whilst such economic factors could amount to very special circumstances in certain circumstances it is not considered that such factors exist in this case. Whilst there are clearly some benefits such circumstances could be repeated on any site within the Green Belt across the district. In this respect they do not meet the 'very special' test. More importantly, there is no evidence to suggest that the business would need to be located in this location and there may be other locations in the North Worcestershire region.

2) Proportionate Extension

The appellant argues that the pergola area should be treated as a proportionate extension to the existing building. Whilst more permeable than a conventional extension it does still increase the original floor area of the building by approximately 55%. It is therefore considered to represent a disproportionate addition. This adds to the Green Belt harm arising from the development.

3) The Site Context

The appellant contends that as the site forms part of the wider Becketts Farm site and is heavily developed by a range of uses the impact on openness is not as great as it would be in an isolated Green Belt location. However, whilst the application site is accessed via the same entrance as the remainder of the Becketts Farm units the site is physically separate and visually distinct as the site currently consists of an agricultural building surrounded by pasture land which is flat, open and free from any structures. It is considered the associated development of the land around the building materially harms the openness of the Green Belt when compared to the current situation.

In summary, the proposal amounts to an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt. In addition to the harm by definition, the proposed change of use causes harm to 1 of the purposes for including land within the designated Green Belt whilst also having a substantial impact on openness of the Green Belt in this locality. When considered individually or cumulatively it is not considered that the very special circumstances put forward by the applicant clearly outweigh this substantial harm to Green Belt. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DS2 and C27 of the BDLP, Policy BDP4 of the BDP and paragraphs 79, 87, 88 and 90 of the NPPF.

(iii) Residential amenity

The proposal is located away from residential properties and effectively extends the retail area associated with Becketts Farm. The scheme therefore has no impact on residential amenity in accordance with Policy DS13 of the BDLP and Policy BDP1 of the BDP.

(iv) Access, highways and parking

The County Council Highway Engineer has confirmed that the extensive parking area at Becketts Farm is sufficient to cope with the proposed retail unit without any additional provision. The proposal is considered to accord with policy TR11 of the BDLP and Policy BDP16 of the BDP.

(v) Street Scene and Character Impact

The current structure is a typical metal clad agricultural building. This relatively modern building has no architectural merit. The proposal seeks to renovate the external appearance to create a more desirable and attractive entrance for customers. The front of the building would be clad with timber. Large windows and doors would be added to the front to replace the existing roller shutter. It is not considered that the proposals harm the character of the building or impacts on the wider street scene. The proposal therefore accords with policy C27 of the BDLP, policy BDP19 of the BDP, SPG4 and the NPPF.

(vi) Ecology

In accordance with the relevant legislation, the planning authority has a duty to ensure any proposal will not impact adversely upon protected species. An Ecological Appraisal has been submitted with the planning application. The appraisal highlights that the building and surrounding land is not used by protected species. The Councils Ecology Officer raises no objections but recommends the retention of the existing hedgerow and considers that bird boxes could be added to the building. In summary it is considered there would be no undue harm to protected species in accordance with policy BDP21 of the BDP and the NPPF.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of character, amenity, highways and ecology considerations. However the proposal amounts to an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt. It is considered that very special circumstances do not exist to clearly outweigh the substantial harm to the Green Belt.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be Refused

Reasons for Refusal

- 1) The proposal does not fall within any of the categories of appropriate development specified at Policy DS2 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004 (BDLP), Policy BDP4 of the Bromsgrove District Plan (BDP) or at paragraph 90 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF). Thus, the proposal constitutes an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt which harms the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and harm to openness. No very special circumstances have been put forward or exist that would clearly outweigh the

Agenda Item 7

identified harm to the Green Belt. This is contrary to Policy DS2 of the BDLP, Policy BDP4 of the BDP and paragraphs 79, 80, 87, 88 and 90 of the NPPF.

Case Officer: Mr Andrew Fulford Tel: 01527 881323
Email: a.fulford@bromsgrove.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank