BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

MONDAY, 3RD APRIL 2023, AT 6.03 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors A. J. B. Beaumont, G. N. Denaro, S. P. Douglas,

A. B. L. English (in the Chair), J. E. King, M. A. Sherrey and

C. J. Spencer (during Minute No's 50/22 to 57/22)

Observers: Councillor S. J. Baxter, Councillor A. D. Kent and

Councillor L. C. R. Mallett

Officers: Mr R. Keyte, Mr. A. Hussain (via Microsoft Teams), Mr. D. M. Birch, Ms. S Williams, Ms. E. Darby, Mr. S. Jones, Ms. K. Hanshatt, Warrantershire County Council Highways

Ms. K. Hanchett, Worcestershire County Council, Highways, Mr. G. Nock, Mott McDonald (via Microsoft Teams),

Mrs. J. Bayley-Hill, Mr. G. Day and Mrs. P. Ross

50/22 **ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN FOR THE MEETING**

RESOLVED that Councillor A. B. L. English be appointed as Chairman for the meeting.

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and informed all those present that the meeting was being Live Streamed on the Council's YouTube channel; and requested that Members and Officers remembered to use their microphones and to speak clearly during the course of the meeting.

51/22 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors H. J. Jones, A. D. Kriss, M. Glass and P. M. McDonald.

52/22 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

53/22 <u>UPDATES TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS REPORTED AT THE MEETING</u>

The Chairman announced that one Committee Update had been circulated to all Planning Committee Members and asked all Members whether they had received and read the Committee Update.

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

54/22 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on 6th February and 6th March 2023, were received.

Councillor S. P. Douglas asked for it to be noted that on page 6 on the minutes of the meeting held on 6th February 2023, there was a spelling error and that her surname was misspelt.

RESOLVED that, subject to the amendment, as detailed in the preamble above that the minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on 6th February and 6th March 2023; be approved as a correct record by those Members who were in attendance.

21/01626/REM - RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION OF PHASE 1,
149 RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON LAND ABUTTING STOURBRIDGE
ROAD/PERRYFIELDS ROAD, WHICH IS IN LINE WITH THE OUTLINE
PLANNING PERMISSION FOR 1,300 DWELLINGS (APPLICATION
REFERENCE 16/0335) ALLOWED AT APPEAL UNDER REFERENCE
APP/ P1805/W/20/3265948. THE RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION
SEEKS CONSENT IN LINE WITH CONDITION 1 FOR DETAILED
MATTERS OF APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT, AND SCALE.
LAND AT, PERRYFIELDS ROAD, BROMSGROVE. TAYLOR WIMPEY
UK LTD

The Chairman asked the Committee Members to note that as detailed in the Officer's report, this was an allocated development site and that outline planning permission with the Reserved Matters of Access had been allowed on appeal in 2021.

Therefore, for consideration by Members at the meeting was the Reserved Matters Application which sought consent in line with Condition 1 for detailed matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

Officers drew Members' attention to the Committee Update, which detailed three additional comments received and the Officers responses; and also included four additional conditions as requested by North Worcestershire Management - Conditions 6, 7, 8 and 9. A copy of the Committee Update was provided to Members and published on the Council's website prior to the commencement of the meeting.

Officers presented the report and the presentation slides, as detailed on pages 46 to 76 of the main agenda report.

The Reserved Matters Application of Phase 1, for 149 residential units on land abutting Stourbridge Road/Perryfields Road, which was in line with the Outline Planning Permission for 1,300 dwellings (application

reference 16/0335); that was allowed at appeal under reference APP/P1805/W/20/3265948.

The Reserved Matters application sought consent in line with Condition 1 for detailed matters of appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale, land at Perryfields Road, Bromsgrove.

Officers drew Members' attention to the comments received from Highways – Bromsgrove and Mott McDonald, who had no issues or objections, as detailed on pages 27 and 28 of the main agenda report.

The major urban design criteria was connectivity and the layout related well on this criterion, for both pedestrians and vehicles, with links to the neighbouring residential development under construction on Perryfields Road, as well as Stourbridge Road. The revised plans showed a footpath link onto Perryfields Road adjacent to the smaller open space area to the southern boundary of the site. Officers clarified that the issue of external access off the Stourbridge Road had already been determined and approved, so was therefore not included in the current application.

The footpath link at Perryfields Road would involve the removal of hedgerow in order to achieve the access and adequate visibility. Whilst it was regrettable that a section of hedgerow along Perryfields Road would need to be removed to enable this provision, the hedgerow mainly contained a fair volume of Elm which would in time, be most likely to die out. Therefore, it would be appropriate to replace the hedgerow with a better-quality hedge for the longer term.

Officers referred to the comments received from the Council's Arboricultural Officer, as detailed on page 31 of the main agenda report.

Officers further explained that the developers had clarified that whilst there was a shortfall of affordable housing on this phase by 2 dwellings, this shortfall would be made up in the next phase of the development. Officers had accepted this approach in respect to the affordable housing provision for this phase and considered that the proposed development met the development policies in respect of affordable housing requirements.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Ms. J. Slade, Chair of the Bromsgrove Society, addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Councillor L. Mallett also addressed the Committee in objection to the application and in doing so, also read out the speech received from Mr. G. Dallas, local resident who was also in objection to the application.

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

Members stated that having read and listened to the concerns raised by the Bromsgrove Society and those in objection to the application, who

had addressed the Committee; that they still had some concerns with regard to the volume of additional traffic the development would create in Sidemoor. There were some traffic calming solutions, however, the crossing by Perryfields Road was already considered really difficult, due to the volume of traffic.

Members further stated that apart from the obvious traffic concerns, the comments from Community Safety, as detailed on page 30 of the main agenda report, should be taken into consideration and mitigated.

Officers responded and stated that the scheme had been amended to address the concerns raised by Community Safety; and that with regards to cameras, these were not required as there would be natural surveillance now due to the revisions being made to the scheme.

Following on from the concerns and issues raised, Committee Members suggested deferring the reserved matters application, in order for Committee Members to conduct a Site Visit.

In response, Officers confirmed that a Site Visit could be arranged. Officers sought further clarification from the Committee as to their main concerns, were they access, crossing and the scheme? Members agreed and were of the opinion that a Site Visit was necessary in order to provide a clearer picture of the scheme. This was a very sensitive application and Members felt that they needed to be scrupulous and that a Site Visit was therefore necessary. It was important for members of the public to see that the Committee were taking this application seriously. There were a lot of mixed feelings about this development and Ward Members and residents of Bromsgrove, and every measure needed to be taken.

In response to further questions from the Committee with regard to timescales, Officers highlighted that the Site Visit would be caried out in a timely manner and referred to a future meeting of the Committee. Members were asked to note that there were no scheduled meetings of the Planning Committee in this Municipal Year.

Following on from this debate, an Alternative Recommendation was proposed that the Reserved Matters Application be deferred in order for Committee Members to attend a Site Visit.

On being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED that the Reserved Matters Application be deferred and brought back to a future meeting of the Committee once Planning Committee Members had carried out a Site Visit.

22/01042/FUL - THE USE OF LAND FOR THE STATIONING OF CARAVANS FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES AND THE ERECTION OF A DAYROOM AND LAYING OF HARDSTANDING ANCILLARY TO THAT USE. MINTOLA CORRAL, BATEMANS LANE, WYTHALL,

WORCESTERSHIRE, B47 6NG. MR. M. DOHERTY

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

Officers presented the report and in doing so drew Members' attention to the presentation slides, as detailed on pages 88 to 94 of the main agenda report.

The application sought full planning permission for the use of land for the stationing of caravans for residential purposes and the erection of two dayrooms and laying of hardstanding ancillary to that use.

Officers drew Members' attention to the two reasons for refusal, as detailed on

page 85 of the main agenda report.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. A. Kent addressed the Committee and in doing so, commented that he was representing a number of residents as the County Councillor for this ward area and also as the District Councillor for the neighbouring ward to this ward area. Mr. N. Green, the applicant's agent addressed the Committee and Councillor S. Baxter, Ward Councillor also addressed the Committee.

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

In response to questions from the Committee, the Chairman took the opportunity to read out the 'Procedural Matter' as referred to on page 79 of the main agenda report; and further referred to the 'Need and Supply of Pitches', as detailed on page 81 of the main agenda report, which stated that:

"In 2021 the Council commissioned external consultants to update the current supply and future need position for Travellers in the District. The conclusion of this report is that over the period 2021/22 to 2039/40 there is a need for 14 traveller pitches. As of 1st April 2021, the Council currently has a supply of 4.07 years for traveller pitches".

Some Members highlighted that travellers were "suspended in animation" and were being failed due to the delay in reviewing the Council's Local Plan. There was a need for more traveller sites, and it was wrong that travellers and their children were being denied this opportunity. Children needed to access education and there was a need to care for a family member, as briefly detailed in the report.

Other Members supported the comments made by Councillor S. Baxter in that the proposed development was inappropriate development in the Green Belt; and were therefore in support of the Officers recommendation to refuse the application.

Officers responded to a question with regard to previous use of the site and in doing so referred Members to the 'Relevant Planning History' which detailed that in 2019 planning permission was granted for a change of use of the land for equestrian use and replacement stables together with a tack room.

Members further reiterated that additional sites needed to be identified when carrying out the Local Plan Review.

On being put to the vote it was

RESOLVED that Planning Permission be refused for the two reasons, as detailed on page 85 of the main agenda report.

57/22 22/01530/FUL - ERECTION OF EMPLOYMENT AND COMMERCIAL UNITS USE CLASS E(G)(II) AND (III), B2, B8 WITH ANCILLARY OFFICES. WITH VEHICLE PARKING AND ALL **ASSOCIATED** ENGINEERING, INCLUDING SITE **CLEARANCE** AND ASSOCIATED WORKS. PLOT AT BUNTSFORD GATE BUSINESS PARK, BUNTSFORD DRIVE, BROMSGROVE, WORCESTERSHIRE. HORGAN HOMES AND DEVELOPMENTS LTD

> Officers presented the report and the presentation slides, as detailed on pages 108 to 118 of the main agenda report.

> The application was for the erection of employment and commercial units use class E(g)(ii) and (iii), B2, B8 with ancillary offices, vehicle parking and all associated engineering, including site clearance and all associated works.

> The application site was located within Buntsford Hill Business Park which had been allocated as Designated Employment Land within the Bromsgrove District Plan 2011-2030.

> The applicant had put forward some mitigation to reduce the harm to the Listed Buildings which included, relocating the cycle storage away from the southwest boundary and also included some additional landscaping along the boundary of Buntsford Drive to help screen the development from the nearby Listed Buildings.

> Members' attention was drawn to the 'Noise' information, as detailed on page 100 of the main agenda report, which provided information with regard to the submitted noise assessment being satisfactory and predicted a low impact at the nearest sensitive receptor.

> Officers referred to the comments received from Stoke Parish Council as detailed on page 96 of the main agenda report. Members were informed that, as detailed on page 100 of the main agenda pack 'Third Party Comments' that; the hedge referred to was outside of the red line of this application and therefore did not form part of the application site.

However, the applicant had proposed some further planting on this boundary and there would be an acoustic fence.

In conclusion, it was considered that the proposed development was in accordance with the relevant polices of the Bromsgrove District Plan and could be properly characterised as sustainable development for the purposes of the NPPF. The harm to the Listed Buildings was considered to be less than substantial and given the public benefits of the development, this harm was considered to be outweighed.

It was noted that there were no public speakers.

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

It was noted that Members commented that they were glad that this application was before them and delighted to be helping to develop businesses further.

RESOLVED that Planning Permission be granted subject to the Conditions, as detailed on pages 101 to 105 of the main agenda report.

At this stage in the meeting, the Chairman announced a comfort break.

Accordingly, the meeting stood adjourned from 19:14 p.m. to 19:26 p.m.

58/22 **LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972**

Having reconvened it was

RESOLVED that under Section 100 I of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A to the Act, as amended, the relevant paragraphs of that part, in each case, being as set out below, and that it is in the public interest to do so:-

Minute No. Paragraphs 59/22 1, 2 & 6

59/22 **ENFORCEMENT MATTERS**

RESOLVED that the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Leisure Services be authorised to issue and serve a Stop Notice (subject to statutory limitations) if deemed expedient on the basis of the circumstances which prevailed at the time.

(During the consideration of this item, Members discussed matters that necessitated the disclosure of exempt information. It was therefore agreed to move to exclude the press and public prior to any debate on

the grounds that information would be revealed which related to; information relating to any individual, information which was likely to reveal the identity of any individual and information which revealed what the authority proposed (including the authority holding that information)).

The meeting closed at 7.58 p.m.

Chairman