

**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**TUESDAY 14TH JANUARY 2025, AT 6.00 P.M.**

PRESENT: Councillors M. Marshall (Vice-Chairman), A. Bailes, S. J. Baxter, J. Clarke, S. M. Evans, D. J. A. Forsythe, E. M. S. Gray, R. E. Lambert, S. T. Nock (substituting for Councillor H. J. Jones) and J. D. Stanley

Officers: Mr. D. M. Birch, Mr. A. Hussain, Ms. S Williams, Mr. K. Lander and Mrs. P. Ross

63/24

**TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors H. J. Jones and B. McEldowney, with Councillor S. T. Nock in attendance as the substitute Member for Councillor H. J. Jones.

64/24

**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor M. Marshall declared in relation to Agenda Item Number 5 (Minute No 67/24) – 24/00246/REM – Land at Kidderminster Road, Bromsgrove, in that he had personally excluded himself from previous discussions on the Perryfields Development Phase 1 because of his prior public statements with regard to a detailed aspect of the design, which was not included within the Phase 2 application before Members tonight. The legal advice that he had received was that he did not need to exclude himself from this reserved matters application, as he had stated that he would be approaching the application with a fair and open mind.

Councillor A. Bailes also declared in relation to Agenda Item Number 5 (Minute No 67/24) – 24/00246/REM – Land at Kidderminster Road, Bromsgrove, in that he had stood down from the Perryfields Development Phase 1 due to his involvement with Whitford Vale Voice and the Planning Enquiry. We were now in Phase 2, reserved matters, as the outline planning application had now been accepted; and he would be approaching this application with an open mind.

65/24

**MINUTES**

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> December 2024, were received.

With regards to the minutes, Councillor A. Bailes asked for the following amendments: -

Page 7, Minute No. 56/24, paragraph 9, be amended to read:

'At the invitation of the Chairman, Debbie Farrington, the applicant's Agent addressed the Committee in support of the application. Councillor Steve Hornsby, on behalf of Alvechurch Parish Council addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Councillor A. Bailes, Ward Member addressed the Committee regarding outstanding issues, which he wished Members to consider.'

Page 12, Minute No. 59/24, typographical error, amend from Councillor E. McEldowney to Councillor B. McEldowney.

**RESOLVED** that, subject to the amendments, as detailed in the preamble above that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> December 2024, be approved as a correct record.

66/24

**UPDATES TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS REPORTED AT THE MEETING**

The Chairman announced that there was no Committee Update.

67/24

**24/00246/REM - RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION FOR PHASE 2. 437 RESIDENTIAL UNITS (CLASS C3) ON LAND ABUTTING KIDDERMINSTER ROAD/PERRYFIELDS ROAD, IN ACCORDANCE 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 KIDDERMINSTER ROAD, BROMSGROVE. TAYLOR WIMPEY UK LTD.**

The Chairman took the opportunity to remind Planning Committee Members that Outline Planning Permission had previously been allowed at appeal. Members were therefore being asked to consider the Reserved Matters Application, seeking consent in line with Condition 1 for detailed matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

Officers drew Members' attention to the presentation slides, as detailed on pages 28 to 50 of the main agenda pack.

Officers presented the report and in doing so highlighted that the Reserved Matters application was for Phase 2, comprising of 437

dwellings (Class C3) on land abutting Kidderminster Road/Perryfields Road, in accordance 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 sought consent in line with Condition 1 for detailed matters of appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale.

Officers clarified that the position of the proposed roundabout junction off Kidderminster Road, had been determined as part of the Outline Planning Application 16/0335 allowed at appeal. So was therefore not for Members consideration in the Reserved Matters application before Members tonight.

Members were reminded that the principle of stopping up Perryfields Road had already been factored into the decision-making of the Outline appeal and had been conditioned (Condition 35) accordingly within that decision and approved in principle with its severance clearly indicated within the suite of approved plans including the Access and Movement Parameters Plan.

A total of 437 dwellings of varying house types were proposed in this phase generally comprising of 2 storey dwellings, however, 8 bungalows were also proposed, and 35 dwellings would be 2.5 storeys. 39 apartments would be provided in the form of three separate L-shaped 3 storey apartment blocks. Officers referred to the total provision of open market dwellings and affordable housing dwellings, as detailed on pages 15 and 16 of the main agenda pack.

The Phase 2 scheme proposed a total of 134 affordable units which was slightly more than the 30% requirement as it included 3 additional affordable dwellings to make up for the identified shortfall approved under Phase 1.

The approved plans also included parameter plans that showed indicative details of the access and movement of the potential development. The Access and Movement Plan showed a 'main movement route corridor.' The layout of the scheme had been defined by the main route corridor. The stopping up of Perryfields Road would enable the main route corridor to become the formal route into this strategic site.

As detailed in the report the application included the stopping up of Perryfields Road in three locations, as follows :-

- T-junction of Perryfields Road and Kidderminster Road
- Perryfields Road south of The Orchards School
- Perryfields Road adjacent to Red Cross Farm

Officers highlighted that Active Travel England (ATE) and Worcestershire Highways – Bromsgrove had no objections to the application, and that Mott MacDonald supported the proposal.

An existing Public Right of Way (PRoW) (footpath No. BM 591) diagonally crossed the field from Perryfields Road, south of Red Cross Farm and linked into Carol Avenue. The layout of the scheme indicated that the footpath would be diverted and incorporated within the layout of scheme. Further dialogue was taking place with the applicant and The Ramblers Association (RA), to address their concerns. County Public Rights of Way have commented on the scheme and also acknowledged that an application to divert the footpath has been submitted. The County Public Rights of Way Officer noted and fully supported the intention to include the full length of the diverted footpath within the Section 38 highway adoption scheme, as detailed on page 20 of the main agenda pack.

Permeability directly to The Orchards School was considered to be convoluted given that pedestrian access/drop off area to the school had been designed towards the rear of the school via Grayshott Close. As highlighted in the report, Mott MacDonald had made reference for some form of pedestrian link to Grayshott Close.

A footpath link from the site to the drop off area of the School had been negotiated. Details of the full provision of the footpath/gate and landscaping details could be conditioned. This link would encourage occupiers to walk their children to the school site without the need to use a car.

Officers referred to the comments received from North Worcestershire Water Management and the drainage strategy and the two attenuation ponds, as detailed on page 11 of the main agenda pack.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. J. Gerner, addressed the Committee on behalf of The Bromsgrove Society, in objection to the application. Ms. G. Johnson, Stantec, addressed the Committee in support of the Application, on behalf of the Applicant Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd.

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

Members raised a number of queries with regards to connectivity and the active travel plans. Connectivity with the middle schools and high schools, how would children be able to access these schools, as they would be unable to walk to these schools.

Officers stated the Connectivity Plan showed footpath links towards Kidderminster Road and bus stop facilities enabling good links to existing bus routes on the Kidderminster Road. Also, that another school

was proposed to be built in the future on this strategic site. There was adequate connectivity.

Members stated that not everyone was able to walk everywhere; and that connectivity seemed to be reliant on everyone walking and residents not using their vehicles.

Officers clarified that these issues would have been addressed during the Outline Planning application; and that Members were being asked to consider the Reserved Matters application.

Members raised further questions with regard to information on page 9 of the main agenda pack which stated that:-

“ Across the site, a network of footpath connections are proposed within the public open space. The Applicant should note that Worcestershire County Council will not adopt footpaths/ links shown in the areas of public open space”

Members questioned as to who would be responsible and were seeking reassurance that footpath links would be maintained to safe standards.

Members also raised concerns with regard to bus stop facilities and sought assurance that Worcestershire County Council (WCC) would ensure that decent bus stops with seated facilities and bus stop kerbs would be installed and not just bus stop poles.

At this stage in the meeting, some Members expressed deep concerns that there was no representation from WCC Highways in attendance in order to respond to Members concerns and questions on a major planning application. Therefore, Members requested that their concerns and questions be raised by the case officer with WCC Highways.

In response officers commented that with regard to the public open spaces, it had not been confirmed as to whether the Council would adopt these or a management company but would be addressed at a later date. Officers clarified that sheltered bus stops would be provided and not flagpoles, and that officers would check with WCC Highways if there would be bus stop kerbs and seating.

The Chairman reiterated that officers would report back to WCC Highways the concerns raised by Members, as detailed in the preamble above.

Members further referred to the concerns raised by The Bromsgrove Society, as detailed on page 13 of the main agenda pack.

Officers informed Members that the existing PRoW to Carol Avenue was actually outside of the application site boundary. However, officers could liaise with County PRoW to see if the condition of the footpath route could be improved.

A drop off link to The Orchards School had been negotiated directly with the school and they were also happy with the pedestrian link as proposed. General access arrangements to the school off Perryfields Road would be managed by the school.

In response to further questions from Members with regard to the maintenance of open public spaces, the Development Management Manager reassured Members that the s106 agreement captured this. There would be an 'either or option' for the Council to adopt it or a management company. There would be a trigger point as to when this would be made valid; and this would have to happen.

In response to a question on drainage, officers stated that the Environment Agency had no concerns; and that North Worcestershire Water Management would be very strict to ensure that any conditions were discharged appropriately.

In response to the Chairman, officers reassured Members that their concerns raised during the course of the meeting would be raised with WCC Highways and PRow.

On being put to the vote, it was

**RESOLVED** that the Reserved Matters application be approved and that

- a) Delegated powers be granted to the Assistant Director for Planning, Leisure and Cultural Services to agree the final scope and detailed wording and numbering of conditions, as set out in pages 25 And 26 of the main agenda pack.

68/24

**24/01218/FUL - SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO PROVIDE LARGER KITCHEN/DINING/FAMILY AREA. 477 BIRMINGHAM ROAD, MARLBROOK, WORCESTERSHIRE, B61 0HZ. MR. A. GODWIN**

The Application had been brought to the Planning Committee as the applicant was a Bromsgrove District and Redditch Borough Council employee.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides as detailed on pages 56 to 60 of the main agenda pack.

The application was for a single storey rear extension to provide a larger kitchen/dining/family area. A workshop currently existed at the rear of the house, which would be removed. The site was located within a residential area where it was considered that the principle of residential development was acceptable.

As detailed in the preamble above, the proposal involved the removal of an existing rear workshop and side-garage, to be replaced by a single

storey extension to the side and rear of the property to provide a larger kitchen/dining/family area, in addition to a W.C. and utility room.

The proposed extension would project 3 metres from the rear of the dwelling and 1.8 metres to the side of the dwelling. The height of the extension would be 3 metres. Which would be a vastly reduced footprint.

The extension would have a flat roof and would include bi-folding doors on the extended rear elevation, a window to serve the new kitchen and a pedestrian door on the side elevation.

The materials used would match existing (UPVC double glazed windows/ UPVC double glazed doors/rendered brick).

Members then considered the application.

On being put to a vote it was:

**RESOLVED** that Planning Permission be granted, subject to the Conditions as detailed on page 53 of the main agenda pack.

69/24

**PLANNING PERFORMANCE INFORMATION - QUARTER TWO (1 JULY 2024 - 30 SEPTEMBER 2024)**

The Chairman took the opportunity to remind the Committee that the report was for noting only.

The Development Management Manager explained that the Planning Performance Information was for Quarter 2 – 1<sup>st</sup> July to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2024; and that he was happy to take any questions on the information provided.

The Development Management Manager further highlighted that the assessment periods had traditionally been over a 2-year period (with a 9-month lag for the quality measure to enable the processing of associated appeals).

In December 2024, the Government updated its criteria document. The updated document retained the same performance thresholds but confirmed the new assessment periods which included a change to the assessment period for speed of decision-making from 24 months to 12 months. This change had been made so designation decisions were made on more up-to-date data and were more responsive to changes in performance and had come into effect from the period ending September 2024. The updated document would be used for designation decisions in the first quarter of 2025 and 2026. There were no changes regarding the period over which the quality measure was assessed.

The Development Management Manager drew Members' attention to Appendix 1 to the report, the Major Appeal Decisions Quarter 2 and the Non-Major Appeal Decisions Quarter 2.

Officers were not overly concerned with the Non-Major Appeal Decisions, in terms of the decisions made, as sometimes the officer's recommendation did not always tally with the appeal decision, as some of this was to do with subjectivity in terms of design, impact on neighbours, and therefore the inspectorate had made a different decision.

In response to questions from Members, the Development Management Manager referred to page 63, paragraph 7.3 of the main agenda pack, that the current published data ran for the period July 2021 - June 2023. The data was intentionally nine months behind the date of publication to allow a time lag for appeals in the pipeline to be determined.

With regards to costs against the Council for the Non-Major Appeal Decisions detailed on pages 70 of the main agenda pack, there were no costs against the Council. The rules had recently changed to allow household applications (non-major) applications to apply for a cost award.

Members asked if the costs against the Council figures could be included in future reports.

The Development Management Manager explained that cost submissions set out as to why costs have been awarded. There could also be some negotiation between the Council and the applicant. The Planning Inspector would be quite precise on costs awarded. Members were further informed that there could be a 'lag' in getting the information on costs awarded and preparing these quarterly reports. With this in mind, officers would be happy to provide this information separately to Planning Committee Members.

Members agreed that good planning decisions needed to be made, and that Members should not have to be mindful, when making such decisions, of the possibility of costs against the Council being made.

Members suggested that future Planning training could include looking at previous Planning Committee decisions as lessons learnt and to also build up Members skills sets.

**RESOLVED** that the Planning Performance Information report, Quarter 2 – 1<sup>st</sup> July to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2024, be noted.

70/24

**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**

There was no Urgent Business on this occasion.



Planning Committee  
14th January 2025

The meeting closed at 6.56 p.m.

Chairman