

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

MONDAY, 4TH OCTOBER 2021, AT 6.00 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors H. J. Jones (Chairman), P. J. Whittaker (Vice-Chairman), G. N. Denaro, S. P. Douglas, A. B. L. English, J. E. King (during Minute No. 42/21), H. D. N. Rone-Clarke (substitute for Councillor P. M. McDonald, during Minute No's 41/21 and 42/21), M. A. Sherrey and P.L. Thomas

Officers: Mr. A. Hussain, Mr. D. M. Birch, Miss. C Wood, Ms. S Williams, Mr. S. Jones and Mrs. P. Ross

36/21

TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor A. J. B. Beaumont, it was noted that Councillor A.D. Kriss submitted his apologies as the substitute Member for Councillor Beaumont, and Councillor P. M. McDonald with Councillor H. Rone-Clarke in attendance as the substitute Member.

37/21

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor A. B. L. English declared in relation to Agenda Item No. 5 – (Planning Application 21/00561/FUL – 22 Dellow Grove, Alvechurch. Worcestershire, B48 7NR), (Minute No. 40/21), in that she would be addressing the Committee for this item as Ward Councillor under the Council's public speaking rules.

Following the conclusion of public speaking, Councillor A. B. L. English left the meeting room.

38/21

MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 6th September 2021 were received.

It was noted that, on page 3, St. Lawrence's Church yard, should refer to St. Laurence's Church yard.

RESOLVED that, subject to the correction as detailed in the preamble above, the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 6th September 2021, be approved as correct record.

39/21

UPDATES TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS REPORTED AT THE MEETING

The Chairman announced that a Committee Update had been circulated to all Planning Committee Members and she asked if all Members had received and read the Committee Update.

40/21

21/00561/FUL - CONSERVATORY ON THE REAR ELEVATION (PART RETROSPECTIVE) - 22 DELLOW GROVE, ALVECHURCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B48 7NR - MR. M. FOOTES

Officers clarified that the Application had been brought to the Planning Committee for consideration at the request of Councillor A. B. L. English, Ward Councillor.

Officers reported that since the Planning Committee agenda had been published, that an amended site plan had been received. As a result of this, the plan Condition 1 had been amended, as detailed on page 1 of the published Committee Update, copies of which were provided to Members and published on the Council's website prior to the commencement of the meeting.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, informed the Committee that the planning application related to a single storey rear extension (conservatory on the rear elevation, part retrospective) to a recently constructed four bedroom detached dwelling, which, if Members recalled, was granted planning permission on 23rd December 2020 following consideration at Planning Committee.

At the time of receipt of the current planning application, the new dwelling had been substantially completed on site and internally had all the facilities required for day to day living and to function as a dwelling house. Having regard to this, a householder planning application was considered to be the correct application type to pursue.

Officers referred to the Assessment of the Proposal, as detailed in full on page 8 of the main agenda report.

Officers explained that the size and positioning of the proposed extension would usually compromise permitted development and would therefore not require the benefit of planning permission. However, as a planning condition to restrict permitted development rights was placed on the permission for the new dwelling, therefore the proposed development required planning permission.

Given that the application site lay within a residential area, as defined on the proposals map, and identified within policy BDP2 of the Bromsgrove

District Plan (BDP), the principle of the development was considered acceptable subject to other considerations. The main planning considerations that needed to be considered with this planning application were design and appearance, impact to residential amenity and technical matters; as detailed on pages 8 to 10 of the main agenda report.

Officers further informed the Committee that since the submission of the current application, the design of the proposed single storey extension had been amended. The extension would be comprised of a substantial amount of glazing which would reduce the dominance of the structure.

Officers referred to the Residential Amenity, as detailed on page 9 of the main agenda report. This referred to the single storey nature of the development and the intervening boundary feature, highlighting that there would not be any detrimental loss of privacy to the neighbouring occupiers of these dwellings. Therefore, there would be no adverse impact to residential amenity.

Officers further drew Members' attention to the reduction in the size of the garden and the Council's SPD, also detailed on page 9 of the main agenda report.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor A. B. L. English, Ward Councillor addressed the Committee in objection to the Application.

The Committee then considered the Application, which Officers had recommended for approval.

Some Members commented that they were aware of the previous planning application. The officers report had highlighted that the size and positioning of the proposed extension would usually comprise permitted development and would therefore not have required planning permission.

In response to the condition suggested during Councillor English's address to the Committee, officers reminded Members that conditions needed to be reasonable. As detailed on page 9 of the main agenda report, the required minimum garden standards found in the Council's SDP, would not normally be applied to existing dwellings when considering extensions.

RESOLVED that Planning Permission be Granted, subject to the amended Condition as detailed on page 1 of the Committee Update.

41/21

21/00778/FUL - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING 109 DWELLINGS TOGETHER WITH ACCESS, PARKING, LANDSCAPING AND ASSOCIATED WORKS - LONGBRIDGE EAST AND RIVER ARROW DEVELOPMENT SITE, GROVELEY LANE, COFTON HACKETT, WORCESTERSHIRE

Officers reported that Birmingham City Council had confirmed that completions/allocations would be far higher than the total of 1,450 figure required under the Longbridge Area Action Plan (LAAP), and that the anticipated figure was likely to be 1,814. There were also some minor revisions to proposed Conditions 3, 5, 6, 7 and 15, as detailed on pages 1 and 2 of the published Committee Update, copies of which were provided to Members and published on the Council's website prior to the commencement of the meeting.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, reminded the Committee that they may recall that outline planning permission was granted for 150 dwellings on this area under hybrid application ref: 16/1085. Condition 4 was imposed on the hybrid application which restricted the reserved matters application to a total number of no less than 145 dwellings and no more than 150 dwellings.

A reserved matters application (19/00153/REM) and a full application for residential development (19/01152/FUL) were considered and deferred by Planning Committee Members at the Planning Committee held in September 2020. Members had raised concerns with regard to potential overshadowing from the proposed 5 storey apartment building and other reasons, as detailed on page 26 of the main agenda report. By deferring the applications, it enabled officers to negotiate improvements to the schemes.

Officers highlighted that although the applicant made changes to the two applications, they had considered it more appropriate to withdraw the applications completely taking into account local resident and Planning Committee Members views, in order to reconsider the whole scheme.

The proposed scheme, as now presented, was for residential development comprising 109 dwellings together with access, parking, landscaping and associated works.

The key changes to the application were detailed on page 26 of the main agenda report.

Proposal H2 of the LAAP applied and required a minimum of 700 dwellings to be provided on the East Works site. Members may recall that when considering the outline aspect of the hybrid application it was accepted that the minimum requirement of 700 units would not be achieved overall in this location based on the numbers currently developed and approved and a shortfall of 95 dwellings was anticipated, as detailed on page 27 of the main agenda report. It was noted that the density of the outline scheme at the time of consideration was based on 52 dwellings per hectare (dph), the current proposal would provide a density of 34 dph. Whilst this would be lower than that required under Proposal H2 it would still be comparable with the previous approved phases, as detailed on page 27 of the main agenda report.

Officers drew Members' attention to the Viability Statement submitted by

the applicant, which detailed a reduction to 10% affordable housing, as detailed on pages 32 to 34 of the main agenda report. The Council's Viability Advisor was of the opinion that the provision of 10% on site affordable housing on the basis of the unit types and tenure mix, and total Section 106 contributions of £196,343 were considered appropriate.

It was further noted that Birmingham City Council and Cofton Hackett Parish Council had raised no objections to the new proposed scheme.

Officers further drew Members' attention to the contributions, as detailed on page 35 of the main agenda report.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. J. Tait, on behalf of the Applicant, addressed the Committee.

The Committee then considered the Application, which Officers had recommended for approval.

Members commented that the key changes to the revision of the whole scheme, had resulted in a much better design.

In response to questions from Members regards the siting of the 10% affordable housing, officers stated that the affordable housing was located in a similar position to the previous application that the Applicant had withdrawn.

RESOLVED that Planning Permission be granted subject to:-

- a) authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to determine the application following the receipt of a suitable and satisfactory legal mechanism in relation to the following matters:-
 - i. £5,694.00 as a contribution towards the provision of wheelie bins for the scheme.
 - ii. £41,262.00 as a contribution towards the extension of New Road Surgery, Rubery and/or Cornhill Surgery, Rubery.
 - iii. £21,203.00 as a contribution to be paid to the Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust (WAHT) to be used to provide services needed by the occupants of the new homes and the community at large.
 - iv. The securing of 10% provision (11 units) of on-site affordable housing.
 - v. £33,572.00 Cofton Park - contribution towards improvements to access, signage and security and outdoor fitness equipment including additional maintenance costs.
 - vi. £67,144.00 Lickey Hills Country Park - contribution to be applied towards the refurbishment of the toposcope (the folly) and car park at Beacon Hill also general refurbishment of paths and improvements to accessibility inclusive of additional maintenance costs to other key areas such as Warren Lane, Upper Car Park and Visitor Centre car park.

- vii. £27,468.00 Cofton Hackett open space enhancements - general access improvements and refurbishment works to the existing allotment gardens and refurbishment of the local play area off Chestnut Drive, improvements to the car park at Lickey Road, and incidental enhancements including benches and planters in and around Cofton Hackett.
- viii. Planning Obligation Monitoring Fee: £TBC
- (b) And authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to agree the final scope and detailed wording and numbering of Conditions as set out in the report, with Conditions 3, 5, 6, 7 and 15 as amended, as detailed in the Committee Update.

42/21

21/01275/S73 - VARIATION OF CONDITION 1 OF PLANNING PERMISSION 19/00619/REM TO FACILITATE MINOR MATERIAL AMENDMENTS TO APPROVED DRWG 6290 101 REV U TO REV Y INCLUDING - 1 - MAIN GATEHOUSE - CHANGE TO APPROVED 2 INBOUND INSPECTION LANES , TO PROVIDE SINGLE INBOUND INSPECTION LANE AND AN EXPRESS LANE AND THE INCLUSION OF A KERBED ISLAND BETWEEN THE INBOUND LANES WITH A SMALL SECURITY HUT. 2 - PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL AIR HANDLING EQUIPMENT (TO THE NORTH SIDE OF THE WC POD), AND THE TRUCKERS LOUNGE (WEST SIDE OF THE BUILDING) AND CONSEQUENTIAL RELOCATION OF THE SMOKING SHELTER TO THE EAST - REDDITCH GATEWAY LAND ADJACENT TO THE A4023, COVENTRY HIGHWAY, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE - STOFORD GORCOTT LIMITED

Officers reported that further consultation responses had been received from the Environment Agency. That Stratford on Avon District Council had no objections to the proposals, as detailed on page 2 of the published Committee Update, copies of which were provided to Members and published on the Council's website prior to the commencement of the meeting.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, referred to the planning application granted in April 2019, which was made under Section 73 (S73) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Officers briefly explained the criteria for S73.

Officers drew Members' attention to the proposal, as detailed on page 63 of the main agenda report. The application proposed minor changes to the approved scheme, which related to two areas of the site, as detailed on page 67 of the main agenda report. The minor changes were all within the site boundary of the building and yard as previously approved.

Officers referred to the presentation slides and highlighted that the Air Handling Unit (AHU) was tucked away on the rear elevation by an

established woodland, so there would be no adverse impact on any neighbours.

The Committee then considered the Application, which Officers had recommended for approval.

RESOLVED that the variation of Condition 1 of Planning Permission 19/00619/REM be granted, subject to the Conditions as detailed on page 68 of the main agenda report.

The meeting closed at 6.43 p.m.

Chairman