

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

MONDAY, 16TH MAY 2022, AT 6.01 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors H. J. Jones (Chairman), A. D. Kriss (Vice-Chairman), A. J. B. Beaumont, G. N. Denaro, S. P. Douglas, A. B. L. English (during Minute No 94/21), M. Glass, J. E. King (during Minute No's 92/21 and 93/21), P. M. McDonald, C. J. Spencer and M. Thompson (substituting for Councillor M. A. Sherrey)

Observers: Mr. R. Keyte, Legal Services via Microsoft Teams and Mr. G. Day, Democratic Services Officer

Officers: Ms. C. Flanagan via Microsoft Teams, Mr. D. M. Birch, Mr. S. Jones, Mr. P. Lester, Mr. S Edden, Ms. K. Hanchett, Worcestershire County Council, Highways and Mrs. P. Ross

88/21 **TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor M. A. Sherrey with Councillor M. Thompson substituting.

89/21 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

90/21 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 11th April 2022 were received.

RESOLVED that, the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 11th April 2022, be approved as a correct record.

91/21 **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 all Members if they had received and read the Committee Update.

All Members agreed that they had received and read the Committee Update.

92/21

20/00643/FUL - FULL PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE USE OF LAND FOR THE STATIONING OF 90 STATIC RESIDENTIAL PARK HOMES FOR THE OVER 55S, WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING, INTERNAL SERVICE ROADS, AND LANDSCAPING AND ACOUSTIC FENCE TO THE NORTH, EAST AND WEST BOUNDARIES - CORBETT BUSINESS PARK, SHAW LANE, STOKE PRIOR, BROMSGROVE, WORCESTERSHIRE, B60 4EA - MONGOOSE LTD

Officers verbally reported the views of the Core Waste Team Leader, which were received on 16th May 2022, as included in the published Committee Update.

“The refuse tracking does not appear to show that our fleet would be able to access the properties on this application. We would request a developer contribution towards bins which are currently priced at £18.69/container, with each property needing 2 containers, one Grey (domestic waste) and one Green (recycling waste)”, as detailed in the published Committee Update, copies of which were provided to Members of the Committee and published on the Council’s website prior to the commencement of the meeting.

Officers confirmed that a developer contribution of £3364.20 would be required for waste containers.

Officers presented the report and in doing so drew Members’ attention to the presentation slides, as detailed on pages 56 to 72 of the main agenda report.

Planning permission was being sought for the use of land for the stationing of 90 static residential park homes for the over 55s, with associated parking, internal service roads, landscaping and acoustic fencing to the north, east and west boundaries.

Officers further reported that the Applicant’s Planning Agent had been in contact, earlier in the day, with regards to an inconsistency between the disposition of proposed caravans detailed on the Acoustic fencing plan, landscaping plan and site location plan not aligning with the correct arrangement as detailed on Layout Plan Revision C. Officers clarified that this was a minor inconsistency, and as such did not create an obstacle to determining the application tonight.

Members were informed that an earlier scheme was proposed and deferred, as detailed on page 11 of the main agenda report. The earlier scheme showed a proposed footpath through an area of landscaping running parallel to the southern boundary alongside Worcester and Birmingham Canal. The proposed footpath was deleted at the suggestion of the Local Planning Authority, as it did not connect and was seen as a threat to the important existing vegetation screening alongside the canal.

In the south west corner, there was a pre-existing bridge, however, this did not form part of the proposed application. The bridge was in private ownership and officers had not received a response from the owners, so officers had been unable to explore the potential of using the pre-existing bridge as a further means of pedestrian access to the site. Therefore, there would be a single access as illustrated on the illustrative CGI presentation slide, as detailed on page 62 of the main agenda report.

Officers drew Members' attention to page 25 of the main agenda report, and that following a query from the Chairman; officers clarified that there was a Davenal House Surgery in Bromsgrove Town Centre, which was the main GP surgery. However, the Davenal House Surgery referred to in the report, was the Stoke Prior GP surgery on Ryefields Road (part of the same GP practice) and would be a 16 minute walk from the proposed site.

In conclusion officers had recommended that planning permission be refused for the reasons as detailed on page 52 of the main agenda report.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. O. Cooper, Planning Agent, on behalf of the applicant addressed the Committee. Mr. P. Williams, Chairman, Stoke Parish Council, also addressed the Committee in objection to the Application.

Members then considered the application, which officers had recommended be refused.

Members questioned if the footpaths would have dropped kerbs, as it would prove difficult to access the village on a mobility scooter, taking into consideration that the proposed development would be for the over 55s.

Members also raised some concern that there was no external storage provided at the park homes (for storing gardening and sports equipment and mobility scooters).

Members raised further concerns with regard to traffic. Commenting that the area had grown and was accessed by very narrow roads and that during the busy periods in the day, that the area did become a bit of a 'bottle neck' due to the volume of traffic. Therefore, some Members expressed concerns from a safety point of view and commented that whilst admiring the proposed development for the over 55s, the proposed development was in the wrong location. There would be increased traffic entering / exiting the proposed development as residents would be unable to safely walk on / off the proposed site.

Members thanked the public speakers and further commented that this was a difficult application to determine, due to the need for additional homes. However, it was not an application that could be determined in

isolation. Members also needed to consider the number of public objections received; and the objections received from North Worcestershire Economic Development and Regeneration (NWEDR) and Worcestershire Regulatory Services (WRS), Noise, as detailed in the main agenda report.

Members further referred to the 'Planning Balance' information, as detailed on pages 51 and 52 of the main agenda report. Members also stated that there was a shortage of employment land within the district and that the land should be kept as employment land.

In response to the concerns raised by the Committee with regard to highways safety. Officers reiterated that Worcestershire County Council, Highways, had not raised any objections to the proposed application.

On being put the vote, it was

RESOLVED that Planning Permission be refused for the reasons as detailed on page 52 of the main agenda report.

93/21

22/00116/FUL - DEMOLITION OF NO'S. 163 & 165 BIRMINGHAM ROAD AND CONSTRUCTION OF EIGHT DETACHED DWELLINGS.163 - 165 BIRMINGHAM ROAD, LAND TO THE REAR OF 151 AND 157 BIRMINGHAM ROAD AND 73 ALL SAINTS ROAD, BROMSGROVE - WILLIAM & JANE AND S. THORN AND CAMPBELL

Officers reported that following the submission of further information with regard to drainage, from North Worcestershire Water Management (NWWM) that Condition 10, as detailed on page 83 of the main agenda report could now be deleted; as detailed in 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 presentation slides, as detailed on pages 86 to 103 of the main agenda report; and in doing so informed Members that the application sought the demolition of no's 163 and 165 Birmingham Road and the construction of eight detached dwellings; with land to the rear of 151 and 157b Birmingham Road and 73 All Saints Road, Bromsgrove.

As detailed in the main agenda report, the floor area of the development exceeded 1000 square metres, and therefore, under the Council's Scheme of Delegation had to be referred to Planning Committee for determination.

Members' attention was drawn to the 'Relevant Planning History,' as detailed on page 75 of the main agenda report.

The application sought planning permission to demolish the two existing dwellings and to erect eight detached dwellings. This would result in a net increase of 6 dwellings. The application also sought to substitute

house types for previously approved plots 3, 4 and 7 and a revised garage for plot 8.

Plots 1, 2, 3, 7 and 8 would have five bedrooms. Plots 4 – 6 would each have three bedrooms. The application site included part of the rear curtilages of 151 and 157 Birmingham Road and 73 All Saints Road.

The proposed development would be served by two access points onto Birmingham Road.

Members' attention was drawn to 'The Site and its Surroundings' as detailed on page 75 of the main agenda report.

Officers informed the Committee that the proposed application did not entirely comply with Policy BPD7. However, the Committee had approved both previous applications (20/01565/FUL and 20/004863/FUL); and therefore, officers had considered it unreasonable to refuse this application even though there would be a slight conflict with Policy BPD7.

Officers further stated that following the approval of the two previous applications, it was noted that the Conservation Officer had not sought to provide comments on this proposal.

Officers drew Members' attention to 'The Planning Balance and Conclusion,' as detailed on pages 80 and 81 of the main agenda report.

It was noted that Worcestershire County Council (WCC), Highways, had not raised any objections.

Members then considered the application, which officers had recommended be approved.

Officers responded to questions from the Committee with regard to the exact location of Oakland Grove and the exit onto Birmingham Road.

Officers clarified that the site would be accessed off Birmingham Road via 2no. new vehicular access points. The proposal would be adjacent to Oakland Grove.

In response to questions from the Committee with regard to Highways, the Highways Officer, WCC, informed the Committee that Highways were happy with the 2 new vehicular access points and private drive, it was all appropriate. The Highways Officer further reminded the Committee that as referred to by officers, there was a 'fall-back' position with the extant planning permission on this site for eight detached dwellings.

The Highways Officer, WCC, further clarified that the proposed driveway would be a private driveway and would therefore not be adopted by WCC, Highways.

Officers further reiterated that, as detailed in the Committee Update, that Condition 10 would be removed and that the remaining Conditions, as detailed on pages 81 to 84 of the main agenda report, would be renumbered in order to reflect this.

RESOLVED that Planning Permission be granted, with the removal of Condition 10, and as detailed on pages 81 to 84 of the main agenda report; subject to the Conditions being renumbered, as detailed in the preamble above.

94/21

**22/00483/FUL - DETACHED DOUBLE GARAGE (RETROSPECTIVE) -
1A ST CATHERINES ROAD, BLACKWELL, BROMSGROVE, B60 1BN -
MR. D. JONES**

It was noted that there was no Committee Update for this Application.

Officers clarified that the Application had been brought to the Planning Committee for consideration at the request of Councillor J. E. King, Ward Councillor.

It was noted that Councillor J. E. King, had registered to address the Committee for this item as Ward Councillor. Councillor J. E. King left the meeting room and only returned to address the Committee, under the Council's public speaking rules.

Officers presented the report and presentation slides, and in doing so, highlighted that the application was a retrospective application for a detached double garage.

The property was detached and was situated at a road junction with 'Greenhill' to the south, and St Catherine's Rd to the east. Access to the property was via St. Catherine's Rd. The property was constructed in the 1970's as a single storey bungalow. A loft conversion which included the insertion of several dormer windows was implemented following the granting of planning permission for these works in 2019, as set out in the planning history, as detailed on page 106 of the main agenda report.

An earlier application for a detached garage in this location of the site was submitted under planning ref 17/01401/FUL and was refused planning permission on 26.02.2018 for the reason, as detailed on page 106 of the main agenda report.

Despite this, a detached garage was erected in this location. A new planning application was submitted on 01.03.2021 (planning ref 21/00321/FUL) seeking the retention of the garage. This retrospective application was refused planning permission on 26.04.2021 with no appeal being lodged.

Officers highlighted that, the current application before Members, submitted on 01.04.2022, again, sought the retention of the detached garage.

No.1a St Catherine's Road sat at the end of a row of dwellings which were mostly detached and were well set-back from the highway. The application site, like its neighbour, 1 St Catherine's Road had a substantial front garden, and a characteristic and consistent building line existed.

The host dwellings' plan form and plot size were similar to that of No. 1 St Catherine's Road and No. 3 St Catherine's Road which were situated to the north.

The garage was substantial in size and was positioned approximately 8.4m forward of the dwellings' principal elevation. It was located within close proximity of the St Catherine's Road / Greenhill junction. The garage was considered to be prominent in appearance and the siting of a substantial garage adjacent to the highway was considered to be at odds with the pattern of development locally.

Consequently, the garage appeared as an unduly dominant and obtrusive feature at the core of the village, harming the street scene in this highly prominent location.

Officers referred to the objection received from Lickey and Blackwell Parish Council, who had objected to the application, commenting that the garage was too large and that earlier applications had been refused planning permission.

In summary, the garage as erected was unduly prominent within the street scene and at odds with the pattern of development locally, harming the character and appearance of the area.

Approval of this application would conflict with Policy BDP19 of the Bromsgrove District Plan and Policy BD2 of the Lickey and Blackwell and Cofton Hackett Neighbourhood Plan which amongst other matters, collectively required that development enhanced the character and distinctiveness of the local area and provided support for well-designed proposals that were in keeping with their surroundings.

The application would be inconsistent with guidance set out within the Councils High Quality Design SPD which advised that outbuildings set forward of the principal elevation would not usually be appropriate as it may harm the character of the street scene. It would also be contrary to the provisions of the NPPF which seek well-designed places.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor J. E. King, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee.

Members then considered the application, which officers had recommended be refused.

Some Members commented that the structure was not out of character and that a garage, needed for storage, could not have been erected anywhere else on the site.

Other Members commented that if the detached garage was being solely used for storage only, then access could have been gained at the side of the building. Members also commented that the garage was hidden by a laurel hedge, however, the Committee should be consistent with the Councils High Quality Design SPD, with regard to outbuildings.

Members questioned the removal of the dormer windows and in response officers reiterated that the Committee needed to consider the application before them.

Members stated that whilst they respected the statement made by Councillor J E. King, Ward Councillor, in support of the retrospective application; Members agreed with officers that the retrospective application be refused.

RESOLVED that Planning Permission (retrospective) be refused for the reason as detailed on page 107 of the main agenda report.

The meeting closed at 6.58 p.m.

Chairman