

**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**5TH NOVEMBER 2018, AT 6.00 P.M.**

PRESENT: Councillors R. J. Deeming (Chairman), P.L. Thomas (Vice-Chairman), S. J. Baxter, C.A. Hotham, S. R. Peters, S. P. Shannon, M. A. Sherrey, C. J. Spencer and P. J. Whittaker

Officers: Mrs. T. Lovejoy, Mr. D. M. Birch, Mr. P. Lester and Ms. A. Scarce

42/18 **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors C. Allen-Jones and M. Buxton.

43/18 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

44/18 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning committee held on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2018 were received.

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2018 were received.

45/18 **18/01001/FUL - PROPOSED AGRICULTURAL STORAGE BUILDING AND ACCESS TRACK - LAND OPPOSITE CROFT COTTAGE, WOODGATE ROAD, STOKE PRIOR, BROMSGROVE, WORCESTERSHIRE, B60 4HG - MR. D. BADGER**

Officers clarified that the Application had been brought to the Planning Committee for consideration at the request of Councillor M. Glass, Ward Member.

Officers also provided a verbal update in respect of the application, as follows:

- In respect of consultee comments, Stoke Parish Council had stated in a letter dated 1st November 2018 that they understand from Councillor Malcolm Glass that the above application will be considered by the Planning Committee on the 5th November, 2018. The Parish Council has not received any formal notification

of this fact nor have they been invited to either attend the meeting or to submit any written statement which is the normal practice.

In the circumstances, they would be grateful if officers would ensure that this letter is submitted to the Committee at the meeting. It was also stated that the report submitted to the Committee made no reference to the points outlined in the earlier email of 17 October, which set out the Parish Council's position on this application.

- Members of the Parish Council attended a site visit with Mr Badger at which it was verbally agreed with Mr Badger that he proposed to re-position the building, reduce the size of the building, plant appropriate trees to screen the building from the highway and neighbouring properties and to ensure that the gate giving access to the public footpath would remain unlocked and uninhibited.
- Since that meeting took place, the Parish Council has not received any written confirmation from neither the applicant nor the officer that the above actions would take place. In the circumstances, the Parish Council's position remains that the building is too big and sited in the wrong place causing it to be unsightly.
- In respect of Worcestershire County Council Countryside Service - Public Rights of Way, Officers had discussed with Patrick White, the Senior PROW Officer for Operations in that area, who was satisfied with the proposed access track material where it affects the public right of way.
- Further information from Agent had been provided which confirmed the applicant's land ownership. Their animal health registration and a Rural Payments Agency letter confirming the County Parish Holding Number and Single Business Identifier. All of these have been viewed by the planning officer.
- In respect of objector comments, Mr Banham an objector had provide further comments and evidence regarding quad biking on grazing land within Woodgate which the applicant has identified as having access to graze sheep. He had also sought clarification on public consultation. In relation to this, two letters were sent to 10 neighbours in the vicinity of the site, the first related to the original scheme which proposed the agricultural building in the corner of the field, and allowed 24 days to comment on the proposal. A second letter was also sent to neighbour notifying them of the amendment to the scheme, this allowed 17 further days for comments. There had been some confusion locally due to the discussions between the applicant and Parish Council, which he was not party to.

- The application had not changed following the first amendment, all comments received from the public had been summarised in the report.
- It was confirmed that Members had also been sent an email providing photographs of the site.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mrs H. Moule, the applicant's representative, addressed the Committee, followed by Mr. R. Banham, objector.

The Committee then considered the Application, which Officers had recommended be granted. Members discussed the application in detail and Officers responded to a number of queries raised, in particular concerns were raised in respect of the location of the building itself, within the site, the applicant's intended use of the building, other agricultural uses that could take place in the building following grant of the building and the possible impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties of those uses, and potential vehicle access across the public right of way. Members also raised concerns over the proximity of the building to nearby properties and questioned the reasons for the revised location of the building. Members also discussed the use of the building and officers advised that it was not possible to place any further conditions restricting the agricultural uses of the building.

There was a brief adjournment of the meeting whilst clarification was sought in respect of motor vehicle access across the public footpath. The Officers read a brief statement clarifying advice from the Public Rights of Way officer.

Following the adjournment the Committee was minded to refuse Planning Permission.

**RESOLVED** that Planning Permission be REFUSED on the grounds of the location of the building and the adverse impact on residential amenity.

The meeting closed at 6.42 p.m.

Chairman