

Public Document Pack



BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

THURSDAY 9TH OCTOBER 2025
AT 6.00 P.M.

PARKSIDE SUITE, PARKSIDE, MARKET STREET, BROMSGROVE, B61 8DA

MEMBERS: Councillors H. J. Jones (Chairman), M. Marshall (Vice-Chairman), A. Bailes, S. J. Baxter, J. Clarke, D. J. A. Forsythe, E. M. S. Gray, R. E. Lambert, S. R. Peters, J. Robinson and J. D. Stanley

AGENDA

1. To receive apologies for absence and notification of substitutes
2. Declarations of Interest

To invite Councillors to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests or Other Disclosable Interests they may have in items on the agenda, and to confirm the nature of those interests.
3. To confirm the accuracy of the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Committee held on 29th July and 7th August 2025 (Pages 7 - 28)
4. Updates to planning applications reported at the meeting (to be circulated prior to the start of the meeting)

5. 24/00960/FUL - Proposed Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) and associated infrastructure, Land off Illey Lane Hunnington, Mr George Watson (Pages 29 - 108)
6. 25/00055/OUT - Outline planning permission for two dwellings (landscaping reserved), 39 Parish Hill, Bournheath, B61 9JH, Chapel Hill Homes Ltd. (Pages 109 - 130)
7. Planning Performance Report: Quarter One (Pages 131 - 140)
8. To consider any Urgent business, details of which have been notified to the Assistant Director of Legal, Democratic and Procurement Services prior to the commencement of the meeting and which the Chairman, by reason of special circumstances, considers to be of so urgent a nature that it cannot wait until the next meeting.

J. Leach
Chief Executive

Parkside
Market Street
BROMSGROVE
Worcestershire
B61 8DA

1st October 2025

If you have any queries on this Agenda please contact

**Pauline Ross
Democratic Services Officer**

Parkside, Market Street, Bromsgrove, B61 8DA

Tel: 01527 881406

Email: p.ross@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

If you have any questions regarding the agenda or attached papers, please do not hesitate to contact the officer named above.

Please note that this is a public meeting and will be live streamed for general access via the Council's YouTube channel.

PUBLIC SPEAKING

The usual process for public speaking at meetings of the Planning Committee will continue to be followed subject to some adjustments.

For further details a copy of the amended Planning Committee Procedure Rules can be found on the Council's website.

The process approved by the Council for public speaking at meetings of the Planning Committee is (subject to the discretion and control of the Chair), as summarised below: -

- 1) Introduction of application by Chair**
- 2) Officer presentation of the report**
- 3) Public Speaking - in the following order: -**
 - a. objector (or agent/spokesperson on behalf of objectors);**
 - b. applicant, or their agent (or supporter);**
 - c. Parish Council representative (if applicable);**
 - d. Ward Councillor**

Each party will have up to a maximum of 3 minutes to speak, subject to the discretion of the Chair.

Speakers will be called in the order they have notified their interest in speaking to the Democratic Services Officer and will be invited to

unmute their microphone and address the Committee face-to-face or via Microsoft Teams.

4) Members' questions to the Officers and formal debate / determination.

Notes:

1) Anyone wishing to address the Planning Committee on applications on this agenda must notify the Democratic Services Officer on 01527 881406 or by email to p.ross@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk before 12 noon on Tuesday 7th October 2025.

2) Advice and assistance will be provided to public speakers as to how to access the meeting and those registered to speak will be invited to participate face-to-face or via a Microsoft Teams invitation. Provision has been made in the amended Planning Committee procedure rules for public speakers who cannot access the meeting via Microsoft Teams, and those speakers will be given the opportunity to submit their speech in writing to be read out by an officer at the meeting. Please take care when preparing written comments to ensure that the reading time will not exceed three minutes. Any speakers wishing to submit written comments must do so by 12 noon on Tuesday 7th October 2025.

3) Reports on all applications will include a summary of the responses received from consultees and third parties, an appraisal of the main planning issues, the case officer's presentation and a recommendation. All submitted plans and documentation for each application, including consultee responses and third party representations, are available to view in full via the Public Access facility on the Council's website www.bromsgrove.gov.uk

4) It should be noted that, in coming to its decision, the Committee can only take into account planning issues, namely policies contained in the Bromsgrove District Plan (the Development Plan) and other material considerations, which include Government Guidance and other relevant policies published since the adoption of the Development Plan and the "environmental factors" (in the broad sense) which affect the site.

5) Although this is a public meeting, there are circumstances when the Committee might have to move into closed session to consider exempt or confidential information. For agenda items that are exempt, the public are excluded.



INFORMATION FOR THE PUBLIC

Access to Information

The Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 widened the rights of press and public to attend Local Authority meetings and to see certain documents. Recently the Freedom of Information Act 2000 has further broadened these rights, and limited exemptions under the 1985 Act.

- You can inspect agenda and public reports at least five days before the date of the meeting.
- You can inspect minutes of the Council, Cabinet and its Committees/Boards for up to six years following a meeting.
- You can have access, upon request, to the background papers on which reports are based for a period of up to six years from the date of the meeting. These are listed at the end of each report.
- An electronic register stating the names and addresses and electoral areas of all Councillors with details of the membership of all Committees etc. is available on our website.
- A reasonable number of copies of agendas and reports relating to items to be considered in public will be made available to the public attending meetings of the Council, Cabinet and its Committees/Boards.
- You have access to a list specifying those powers which the Council has delegated to its Officers indicating also the titles of the Officers concerned, as detailed in the Council's Constitution, Scheme of Delegation.

You can access the following documents:

- Meeting Agendas
- Meeting Minutes
- The Council's Constitution

at www.bromsgrove.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 29TH JULY 2025, AT 6.00 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors H. J. Jones (Chairman), M. Marshall (Vice-Chairman), A. Bailes, S. J. Baxter, J. Clarke, D. J. A. Forsythe, E. M. S. Gray, S. R. Peters, J. Robinson (during Minute No's 25/25 to part of 28/25) and J. D. Stanley

Officers: Mrs. R. Bamford, Mr. D. M. Birch, Mr. M. Howarth (Anthony Collins Solicitors), Mr. P. Lester and Mrs. P. Ross

25/25

APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was received from Councillor R. E. Lambert.

26/25

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor A. Bailes explained that he was an Authority Member on the Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service (HWFR) Board.

In response to the Council's Legal Advisor, Councillor A. Bailes stated that he was not declaring a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) and that he would determine the application with an open mind.

27/25

MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 23rd June 2025, were received for Members consideration.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 23rd June 2025, be approved as a correct record.

28/25

UPDATES TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS REPORTED AT THE MEETING

It was noted that the Chairman had announced a 15 minute adjournment at the commencement of the meeting, in order for Members to read the three Committee Updates published during the afternoon of the meeting.

The Chairman asked Committee Members if they had had sufficient time to read all three Committee Updates, which had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting commencing, with a paper copy also made available to Members at the meeting.

Agenda Item 3

Planning Committee
29th July 2025

Some Members indicated that they had not had sufficient time to read the detailed contents of all three Committee Updates.

Councillor J. Robinson stated to the Chairman, that it was ok if other Members had read all three Committee Updates, however, he felt that 15 minutes was not long enough for him to read the detailed information contained in all three Committee Updates, in order to determine the application. Councillor J. Robinson informed the Chairman that he would be leaving the meeting.

Councillor S. J. Baxter commented that she had read all three Committee Updates but could not fully understand all of the technical information as provided, it was too technical. A representative from Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service (HWFR) should be in attendance to explain the technical information.

Councillor D. J. A. Forsythe further commented that 15 minutes was not enough time to read something that was highlighted to the applicants in 2024. In his opinion the application should be deferred until a full explanation was given to HWFR.

In response the Assistant Director for Planning, Leisure and Culture Services, stated that she could understand Members wanting to defer the application. However, Officers had received the questions / updates from HWFR at 09:30 a.m. that morning. Officers and the applicant had worked through the questions / updates and had responded to HWFR. Their detailed responses were included on the Public Access Planning Portal.

With the agreement of the Chairman, the Council's Legal Advisor, asked the Committee to consider receiving the Officers detailed report and presentation, the Public Speakers comments, then ask questions of Officers. If Members were still of the opinion that they could not make an informed decision, Members could then debate deferring the application and the reason(s) for deferring.

At this stage in the meeting, Councillor J. Robinson left the meeting room.

Councillor M. Marshall commented that Members had previously deferred this application, and that a second deferral could see the applicant appealing on the grounds of non-determination.

The Council's Legal Advisor reiterated to Members, as detailed in the preamble above; to consider receiving the Officers detailed report and presentation, listen to the comments made by the Public Speakers, and then ask questions of Officers. If Members were still of the opinion that they could not make an informed decision, Members could then debate deferring the application and the reason(s) for deferring.

Councillor S. J. Baxter further emphasised that Members were in receipt of the responses to the questions / updates requested by HWFR, which were requested at 09:30 a.m. However, you could not expect Members to process late information. HWFR had asked these questions back in October 2024.

The Planning Case Officer explained that the applicant had responded to the original HWFR comments, which had dictated the Risk Management Plan as provided. The applicant had sent questions to HWFR on fire risk and fire water management, but no comments were received from HWFR.

Councillor S. J. Baxter questioned as to why, having received such a detailed list of questions from HWFR in October 2024, a response was sent to North Worcestershire Water Management and not HWFR.

With the agreement of the Chairman, the Development Management Manager stated that from the Officers perspective the questions from HWFR had been replied to and that the application could be determined at this meeting.

In response Councillor D. J. A. Forsythe stated that with all due respect to Officers, he personally thought it was unfair to ask Members to come to a conclusion at tonight's meeting. Members needed to understand the contents of the documents, in order to be able to ask specific questions. In his opinion the application should be deferred, enabling Members to look at the detail in order to ask legitimate questions.

The Council's Legal Advisor informed Members that should they defer the application, then the applicant could appeal to the Planning Inspectorate for non-determination. As stated earlier, Members could receive the Officers detailed report and presentation, the comments from the Public Speakers, and then ask questions of Officers. If Members were still of the opinion that they could not make an informed decision, and that further information was still required, Members could then debate deferring the application and the reason(s) for a deferral.

Having listened to the concerns raised by Committee Members, the comments from Officers and the Council's Legal Advisor; the Chairman requested that the Planning Case Officer presented their report and presentation.

29/25

24/00960/FUL - PROPOSED BATTERY ENERGY STORAGE SYSTEM (BESS) AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE. LAND OFF ILLEY LANE, HUNNINGTON. MR. G. WATSON (GREENERGY RENEWABLES UK)

As detailed in the preamble above, Councillor J. Robinson left the meeting room prior to the consideration of this item.

Members had been made aware of the three Committee Updates, as detailed in the preamble above.

Committee Update One – detailed information from National Grid (Asset Protection), public comments and the applicants comments.

Committee Update Two - detailed further comments regarding the proposed scheme, received on 29th July 2025, from Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service (HWFR); the responses from Greenergy Renewables UK; and the Local Planning Authority (LPA) commentary.

Committee Update Three - detailed updates to Conditions 4 and 16, following a discussion with HWFR.

The Committee Updates 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 61 to 80 of the main agenda pack.

The application was for a proposed Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) and associated infrastructure.

The application site extended to approx. 3.8ha and lay to the south of Illey Lane, and comprised agricultural land and encompassed several fields, with the proposed development situated towards the middle of the site area.

Full planning permission was being sought for the erection of Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) to provide energy balancing services to the National Grid. The application proposed the erection of storage containers, support infrastructure and security fencing along with landscaping and associated works.

Members' attention was drawn to the 'Proposal' information, specifically as to what the proposed development would comprise of, as detailed in paragraph 8.2, page 24 of the main agenda pack.

The battery units were laid out in 5 rows of 12 battery units, with 2 sets of power stations within each row. The frontage of the battery storage facility was a substation, switchgear buildings and monitoring room/office. Of the 3.8ha application site the developable area of the site was around 1ha.

Access to the site would be taken via an existing access point located along Illey Lane and would be upgraded as required to provide suitable access. The compound would be surrounded by a fence, with an appropriate landscaping scheme around the perimeter and the BESS. Remaining spacing outside the fence line would be utilised for new

woodland, hedgerow and tree planting as well as rough/wildflower grassland

The proposed development would be time-limited to 35 years, after which time all infrastructure would be removed from the site.

This type of facility operated by taking excess electricity from the grid at times of low demand when energy would otherwise be lost, storing it in batteries, and releasing it back to the Grid when demand was high.

The point of connection (PoC) for the facility would be into the Kitwell Substation which was located approximately 2km east of the application site on Kitwell Lane.

Members were informed that the applicant Greenergy Renewables UK Ltd were an Independent Power Producer (IPP) that designed, developed, implemented and operated renewable energy plants on a large-scale across the globe.

Officers highlighted that within the vicinity of the application site two BESS were allowed, since September, following planning appeals:-

- Land at Illeybrook Farm, Illey Lane
- Land at Lowlands Farm, Illey Lane, Halesowen

The application site was located on land outside of a settlement hierarchy outside of the settlement hierarchy outlined in Policy BDP2 Settlement Hierarchy.

The proposed development was intended to serve as infrastructure supporting the National Grid network and therefore, it was considered that the relationship with National Grid infrastructure (in this case the Kitwell substation) was the determining factor in identifying an appropriate location for this type of development. It was acknowledged that the location of a battery storage site was unlikely to be accommodated within designated settlement areas where the availability of land was typically more constrained.

Policy BDP22 focused on how the Council would deliver viable low carbon climate resilient developments. Specifically, the policy stated that the Council would support low carbon energy generation schemes when adverse impacts were addressed satisfactorily.

At national level, whilst there was no specific policy for BESS development in the Framework, there were policies for mitigating the impacts of climate change and specifically relating to the development of renewable energy projects. These were set out in the Framework in Chapter 14: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change with Paragraph 161 confirming that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts.

As detailed in the Officers report, it was of note that the Framework revisions in December 2024 had highlighted a stronger focus on tackling climate change to align with the government's push for renewable energy in order to help achieve the net zero targets.

There were a number of Government documents that referenced Climate Change and Energy requirements, as referred to on page 27 of the main agenda pack.

In 2019 Bromsgrove District Council and many other Councils across the country had declared a climate emergency. The Council had made a commitment to reduce carbons emission by 50% by 2030 and achieve Net Zero by 2024.

Officers informed the Committee, that the application site was within the Green Belt. The main issue in establishing the principle of the development was firstly, whether or not the proposal constituted inappropriate development in the Green Belt for the purposes of BDP 4 Green Belt and the Framework.

Paragraph 153 of the Framework stated that inappropriate development was, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 154 outlined a list of exceptions where development might be acceptable in the Green Belt, and these aligned with BDP4. Members were asked to note that there were now further exemptions since the Framework was amended in December 2024 in paragraph 155 which were not reflected in BDP4.

Members' attention was drawn to pages 30 to 32 of the main agenda pack, which contained detailed information on the 'Grey Belt', including:-

- Purpose a – Sprawl
- Purpose b – Merging
- Purpose d – To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. (This was not relevant).

The proposal site did not strongly contribute to any of the three Green Belt purposes required to be considered in a Grey Belt assessment, as clearly demonstrated in the report.

Pages 33 to 35 of the main agenda pack, contained detailed information on Paragraph 155 'Grey Belt' criterions namely:-

- Criterion A
- Criterion B
- Criterion C
- Criterion D (which did not apply)

Officers briefly further referred to:-

- Impact on Landscape Character
- Loss of Agricultural Land
- Neighbouring Amenity and Public Health
- Ecology and Biodiversity

With regards to Highways, Access and Parking, as detailed in the report, the Highway Authority did not object to the proposals subject conditions, as detailed on page 42 of the main agenda pack. It was considered reasonable and necessary that these conditions should be attached.

On the basis, it was considered that there would be an acceptable impact on highway safety subject to conditions, it was considered that there would not be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network.

Officers then referred to 'Flood Risk and Drainage,' as highlighted on page 45 of the main agenda pack; North Worcestershire Water Management (NWWM) had raised no objections to the scheme. However, they had recommended the imposition of a pre-commencement planning conditions stipulating the provision of a detailed surface water drainage scheme and Construction Surface Water Management Plan. NWWM had also recommended conditions regarding at least a 5m Buffer strip being maintained alongside any watercourse and a permeable access track.

Concerns were raised by members of the public in relation to flooding, some in connection with leakage of chemicals from the facility. However, in the event of fire, water used to treat this would be fully contained in that surface water would drain through the internal drainage basin into the attenuation basin on site. This basin would be lined to stop any water leaching into the ground and also sealed by a firewater isolation valve.

The Council's Arboricultural Officer, the Council's appointed Ecological Consultant, Natural England, Worcestershire Regulatory Services – Contaminated Land and Noise had raised no objections to the application.

With regards to Heritage and Archaeology, the application site was in close proximity to a number of heritage assets. However, the application was supported by an Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment (HEDA) the Council's Conservation Officer had assessed the proposal and HEDA and had concurred that there would be a degree of less than substantial harm to the significance and setting of the Grade II Oatenfields Farmhouse through the proposed development.

Officers further referred to 'Fire Risk and Fire Water Management, and in doing so highlighted that HWFR were not a statutory consultee, however, the LPA and applicants were encouraged to engage with their local Fire and Rescue service; and the National Fire Chief was encouraged to also engage and respond. HWFR had raised further comments, as detailed in Committee Update Two. Members were asked

Agenda Item 3

Planning Committee
29th July 2025

to note that HWFR had no objections to the application, and that as highlighted in Committee Update Two,

‘The LPA have reviewed both comments and remains of the view that subject to the imposition of condition 6 regarding the requirements for fire safety arrangements, that the matters raised by the Hereford & Worcester Fire and Rescue Service as highlighted above have been satisfactory addressed’.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. A. Perry, speaking on behalf of local residents in objection to the application, addressed the Committee.

Mr. G. Thorpe, the Planning Agent for Grenergy Renewables UK Ltd, addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. I. McGregor addressed the Committee on behalf of Hunnington Parish Council, who had objected to the application.

Councillor S. Nock, Ward Member also addressed the Committee.

Members raised a number of questions with regard to the site access and roadway, and in doing so, expressed their concerns that only one access point was shown on the Proposed Access Plan slide, on page 69 of the main agenda pack.

Officers referred to Committee Update Two - Site Access and Roadways. The issue of access had been addressed, with the developer providing an emergency response plan and business continuity plan to cover, amongst other matters contained within the Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning – Guidance for FRS published by NFCC National Fire Chiefs Council, allowances for the consequences of ‘not having at least two separate access routes to the site.’ Members were informed that there would be an internal access road and various passing places.

Councillor S. J. Baxter expressed her concerns again, in respect of fire safety and the safety of local residents. Had HWFR seen the proposed map and were they now happy with the application. Members did not want to put residents at risk until they were reassured that HWFR were happy with the application as presented to Planning Committee Members.

Councillor A. Bailes referred to page 8 of Committee Update Two ‘Vapour Cloud, Explosion & Deflagration’. The applicant had not commented on this. Was there a Comprehensive Risk Management Plan, whereby all risks were mitigated? Was the Council at risk with no Comprehensive Risk Management Plan?

Councillor A. Bailes further referred to paragraph 20.2, page 49 of the main agenda pack –

'The guidance further states that the Local Planning Authority are encouraged to consult with their local Fire and Rescue Service as part of the formal period of public consultation prior to deciding the planning application. This is to ensure that the fire and rescue service are given the opportunity to provide their views on the application to identify the potential mitigations which could be put in place in the event of an incident, and so these views can be considered when determining the application.'

In response Officers reiterated that the applicant had submitted a Fire Strategy Plan and that subject to the imposition of Conditions 6, 4 and 16 regarding the requirements for fire safety arrangements, that this was considered robust and that HWFR would be satisfied.

Some Members stated that they were not convinced that the information in Committee Update Two told Members that HWFR were happy and that any fire risks could be mitigated and contained. Members needed to ensure that any conditions being included, met with the requirements of HWFR.

Some Members further commented on 'supply and demand.' Was there more than adequate provision currently. Further information on the need for such a development was required.

In response the Assistant Director for Planning, Leisure and Culture Services, stated that there was no national standard required for a desire for these facilities. There was no information from Central Government not to process such applications, or if a monetarism should be applied.

During the debate and questions to Officers, Members highlighted that they were just seeking reassurance that Conditions 4 and 16 would be adhered to in conjunction with and subject to consultation with HWFR.

Some Members further questioned the timing of Condition 6, and two amendments were suggested with the wording being amended as follows:-

Amend

'Upon commencement of the development, a Risk Management Plan and Emergency Response Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority,' amend to

1. 'Prior to commencement of the development, a Risk Management Plan and Emergency Response Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with HWFR.'
2. 'No development shall take place until a Risk Management Plan and Emergency Response Plan is submitted to and approved in

writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with HWFR.'

Members felt that there was a fire risk when the batteries would be first brought onto the site and during construction.

Officers acknowledged that there was not specifically a reference to the Fire Service in Condition 6, however, Officers further reassured Members that any required documentation would be developed subject to consultation with HWFR. The developer would be making a substantial investment and had other schemes across the country, so had a good knowledge of such developments; and any conditions being adhered to.

Some Members continued to express their concerns in respect of a Comprehensive Risk Management Plan and the fact that there was only one access road shown.

Councillor D. J. A. Forsythe commented that the proposed amendment to Condition 6 would just protect a badly managed application. If Members were minded to refuse the application, the applicant could appeal, and as stated in the Officer's report within the vicinity of the application site two BESS had been allowed following planning appeals. In his opinion the application should be deferred until more information was received. Members should be mindful of the comments made by the public speakers.

With the agreement of the Chairman, the Council's Legal Advisor informed Committee Members that three options had been alluded to, as follows:-

1. Grant planning permission with amended Conditions.
2. Refuse planning permission with sound planning reasons.
3. Defer the application, with clear reasons for deferring. The applicant could appeal to the Planning Inspectorate for non-determination, with potential costs awarded against the Council.

Some Members referred to deferring the application, highlighting that the application needed to come back to Committee Members with more detailed information. Members did not want to put residents at risk.

Members further debated the amendment to the wording for Condition 6, whereby the Council's Legal Advisor asked Committee Members if they would be happy for Officer's to determine the final wording, in agreement with the Planning Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

Members commented that there was a large number of conditions and following recent events with conditions being breached, Members questioned as to how such conditions would be monitored.

The Development Management Manager stated that the onus was on developers to adhere to any conditions. The Council had a monitoring process; however, this was dependant on resources.

Councillor S. J. Baxter reiterated that the amended conditions would not address the need for two site entrances. There was a split into two on the site but not two actual site entrances. Members needed to know that HWFR were happy with the applicant's responses, as Members did not have the knowledge to understand such technical information.

Councillor D. J. A. Forsythe further stated the Members should refuse or defer the application with good reasons. Some crucial questions were raised by the fire service in October 2024 which the applicant had not addressed.

With the agreement of the Chairman, the Council's Legal Advisor commented that it was perceived that it had taken so long for a response. The applicant had now answered the questions raised by HWFR; it would be seen as unreasonable behaviour for Members to refuse the application for this reason.

A proposal to defer application was seconded.

With the agreement of the Chairman, Councillor J. Clarke explained that he could understand the concerns raised and expressed in respect of HWFR. The points raised could be included in the conditions. HWFR had approved the plans. He would agree that Officers could determine the wording of any amended conditions in consultation with the Planning Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman. This would allow the Council to stay in charge of processes and address the concerns raised by residents, with greater fire safety.

Some Members referred to the proposal to defer the application and further commented that the developer and HWFR could work together to address the concerns raised. It was suggested to defer the application until answers were received from the applicant in liaison with HWFR.

The Assistant Director for Planning, Leisure and Culture Services and the Council's Legal Advisor questioned if this could be addressed by rewording the conditions, which Members had alluded to during the course of the meeting. Officers had noted the comments made by Committee Members with regards to two access points. Could this be further addressed with HWFR and if this could not be achieved then the application would be brought back to Planning Committee Members for consideration. The access was down to the applicant.

Councillor S. J. Baxter took the opportunity to read out the comments from HWFR on 'Site Access and Roadways,' as detailed on page 3 of Committee Update Two. This highlighted that HWFR had clearly asked for two separate access points to the site.

Agenda Item 3

Planning Committee
29th July 2025

At this stage in the meeting the Chairman announced an adjournment, in order for Members and Officers to have a comfort break; and for Officers to find a more detailed plan of the site access point.

The Council's Legal Advisor took the opportunity to advise Members that the second access could not be secured via a condition as this was an amendment to the layout of the site. The second access could only be secured by the applicant amending their application to amend the layout.

Accordingly the meeting stood adjourned from 20:13 hours to 20:27 hours.

Having reconvened, amended Condition 6 was briefly referred to, as was the proposal to defer the application, which was proposed by Councillor S. J. Baxter and seconded by Councillor A. Bailes. HWFR had commented about the proposed development having only one access to the site, as detailed on page 3 of Committee Update, 'Site Access and Roadways' and some Members had expressed some serious concerns about this during the debate and questions to Officers.

On being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED that the application be deferred.

30/25

TO CONSIDER ANY URGENT BUSINESS, DETAILS OF WHICH HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED TO THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF LEGAL, DEMOCRATIC AND PROCUREMENT SERVICES PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE MEETING AND WHICH THE CHAIRMAN, BY REASON OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, CONSIDERS TO BE OF SO URGENT A NATURE THAT IT CANNOT WAIT UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING.

There was no urgent business to be considered.

The meeting closed at 8.28 p.m.

Chairman

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

THURSDAY 7TH AUGUST 2025, AT 6.00 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors H. J. Jones (Chairman), M. Marshall (Vice-Chairman), A. Bailes, J. Clarke, D. J. A. Forsythe, E. M. S. Gray, S. R. Peters, J. Robinson, J. D. Stanley and B. McEldowney (substituting for Councillor S. J. Baxter)

Officers: Mrs. H. L. Plant, Mr. M. Howarth (of Anthony Collins Solicitors), Mr. A. Hussain (Via Microsoft Teams), Mr. P. Lester, Mr. J. Pavey-Smith and Mr G. Day

31/25

TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S. J. Baxter with Councillor B. M. McEldowney in attendance as substitute.

Apologies were also received from Councillor R. E. Lambert.

32/25

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor A. Bailes declared an Other Disclosable Interest, in relation to Agenda Item Number 4 (Minute No 34/25) 23/01141/FUL - Land adjoining Heath End Road, Belbroughton, Worcestershire, DY9 9XG.

Councillor A. Bailes left the meeting room for the duration of the relevant agenda item and took no part in the Committee's consideration nor voting on this matter.

Councillor D. J. A Forsythe declared in relation to Agenda Item Number 5 (Minute No 35/25) 24/01225/FUL - Wythall Business Centre, May Lane, Hollywood, Worcestershire, B47 5PD. In that he was the District and Parish Councillor for the application and had had discussions with Officers at the start of the application process in 2024.

Councillor Forsythe stated that he was satisfied that he was not predetermined and would approach the application with an open mind and would therefore, stay for the consideration of the item.

33/25

UPDATES TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS REPORTED AT THE MEETING (TO BE CIRCULATED PRIOR TO THE START OF THE MEETING)

The Chairman announced that a Committee Update was circulated to Members prior to the meeting commencing, with a paper copy also made available to Members at the meeting.

Members indicated that they had sufficient time to read the contents of the Committee Update and were happy to proceed.

34/25

23/01141/FUL - CHANGE OF USE OF LAND FOR DOG WALKING FIELD AND ASSOCIATED WORKS. LAND ADJOINING, HEATH END ROAD, BELBROUGHTON, WORCESTERSHIRE, DY9 9XG. MR. R. HORTON

The Application had been brought to the Planning Committee for consideration at the request of Councillor K. J. May, Ward Councillor.

Officers drew Members' attention to the Committee Update, whereby an objection received by Belbroughton and Fairfield Parish Council was detailed. The update further detailed information from Worcestershire County Council Highways (County Highways) along with the Officer response. Furthermore, additional Conditions (17 and 18) were proposed.

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 presentation slides, as detailed on pages 19 to 27 of the main agenda pack; and in doing so, highlighted that the application was for the Change of use of the land for a dog walking field and associated works

The site location was 0.63hectares in size and situated in the Green belt, 130m West of the 5 ways road junction.

Officers detailed that the stable building on site was granted planning permission in 2004 and would be used for storage associated with the proposed use. The current access to the site would be retained with modification to increase the width to 6.5m and visibility viewing splays to 120m in both directions. There would also be a 1.5m fence erected encompassing the site.

41 objections had been received which included the Parish Council, the main concerns of which were Highways matters, ecology and noise. Officers noted that there were no objections subject to Conditions from statutory consultees in relation to the aforementioned concerns.

Agenda Item 3

Planning Committee
7th August 2025

At the invitation of the Chairman, Dan Hughes, the Applicant's Planning Agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application. Ian Saddler, on behalf of Belbroughton & Fairfield Parish Council and Councillor S. Nock, Ward Member, addressed the Committee in objection to the application.

Members then debated the application, during which a number of points were clarified by Officers.

- That the maximum number of dogs on site would be 3 and that this would be managed via an online booking system.
- 4 parking spaces were deemed appropriate as the site was bookable for 50-minute time periods with a 10-minute turnaround time which should prevent overlap time with arrivals.

In addressing concerns regarding traffic accidents in the locality, Officers detailed that three accidents were reported in the preceding 5-year period, on 15th September 2020, 31st May 2022 and 11th May 2023. Members commented that near misses or those incidents handled privately would not come up in the data and therefore, suggested that the Police should be consulted with regarding the application.

Officers clarified that the relevant authority for highways matters would be County Highways and therefore, it would not be appropriate to consult the Police on this matter. Officers further clarified that Members could only consider the evidence before them and that the relevant consultee had determined that the impact of the development could not be considered severe, therefore, no objection was raised subject to appropriate Conditions.

Members expressed the opinion that of the objections raised, concerns regarding ecology, noise and light pollution were of a lower concern especially considering the public footpaths in the area which could have a similar impact. However, the matters regarding highway safety were of a greater concern.

Members asked for some clarity regarding the application before them and the application 22/01129/FUL which was previously refused. Officers drew Members' attention to page 9 of the main agenda pack outlining the reasons for refusal, noting that the refused application did not supply enough evidence to prove that there was not a serious impact in regard to ecology and noise concerns. Officers further clarified that the application before Members must be considered on its own merits but detailed that much of the missing evidence had now been provided for the current application.

On being put to the vote it was

RESOLVED that having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, the application be approved subject to the Conditions as detailed on pages 14 to 16 of the main agenda pack with

the additional Conditions 17 and 18, as detailed on page 4 of the update reports pack.

35/25

24/01225/FUL - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDING AND ERECTION OF A CARE HOME (USE CLASS C2). WYTHALL BUSINESS CENTRE, MAY LANE, HOLLYWOOD, WORCESTERSHIRE, B47 5PD. MR. J. GREEN (HCD)

Officers drew Members' attention to the Committee Update, detailing an updated recommendation to include **"c) Submission of updated biodiversity metric to include watercourse units to ensure 10% BNG is delivered"**, otherwise the recommendation remained the same as detailed in the Officers report.

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 presentation slides, as detailed on pages 49 to 64 of the main agenda pack; and in doing so, highlighted that the application was for the demolition of the existing building and erection of a Care Home (use Class C2)

Officers drew Members' attention to the site location which was approximately 0.34 hectares and comprised of a vacant business centre with an office and library as well as a car parking area. The site had been vacant since 2016 when the library was relocated.

The proposed building would consist of a three-storey care home with parking to the north providing 28 car parking spaces. The building included dining rooms, a cinema, lounges, and treatment and meeting rooms. The care home would provide a mix of care to physically challenged and/or frail residents and would require a change to a C2 planning use class.

The site was located within the defined residential area under policy BDP2. Additionally, the NPPF emphasised the need to deliver housing to different sizes, types and tenures and for different groups in the community, which included the older population and care homes, this was further supported by policy PDP10 in the district plan which encourages the provision of housing for the elderly and for people with special needs. Officers detailed that local need was currently unmet and was forecasted to remain unmet in the foreseeable future. The most recent housing and economic development needs assessment in February 2022 calculated that there would be a requirement for 756 additional care spaces between 2023 and 2040. Officers concluded that overall, when taking all matters into consideration, the principle of development and the loss of the existing commercial use was considered acceptable.

Officers detailed that the proposed care home was designed to have a contemporary look. All bedrooms would be provided with Juliet balconies, and the proposed building met the provisions of the care standards act, including all room and internal spacing. Additionally, almost 14,000 square meters of landscaped external amenity space was proposed, which was considered sufficient for residents.

It was detailed that local residents had expressed concern regarding the potential impact on their properties. However, Officers highlighted that the applicant designed the scheme to be in line with the high-quality design SPD and the minimum separation distances were met to ensure that the effects on residential amenity were minimized. Additionally, Worcestershire Regulatory Services (WRS), the relevant consultee in matters of noise disturbance, had not objected to the scheme on noise grounds subject to the imposition of a suitable condition.

No objection was raised by County Council Highways (County Highways), subject to the imposition of Conditions together with the delivery of a Section 106 contribution. The Application was considered to mitigate against the impact of the development; therefore, the proposal was considered to be acceptable in terms of highway safety matters. There was also a Condition regarding the incorporation of drop curves with tactile paving being provided in the wider area as part of the development.

Severe flooding was noted in the local area, which the application did not originally address adequately. However, the applicant and agent had taken on board the comments raised and had instructed new consultants, Waterco, to produce a robust flood risk assessment plan to address the flooding concerns raised by North Worcestershire Water Management (NWWM) and the objections to the development. The flood risk management plan included an alternative pedestrian access/egress shown in yellow on page 55 of the main agenda pack. NWWM had withdrawn their previous objection to the scheme based on these submissions and additions, subject to Conditions 22, 23 and 24 as outlined on page 47 of the main agenda pack.

Officers clarified that there was no requirement for an affordable housing contribution under policy BDP8 as the nature of the accommodation was a class C2 residential institution and not a class C3 dwelling house. The change of use class use would be controlled by Condition 25.

The proposed development was considered an acceptable use in principle, location, design and scale of the proposal and was deemed a betterment on the site considering the vacant building. Living conditions, highways impacts, flooding, parking provision and the impact on community infrastructure were all considered acceptable by Officers subject to the updated recommendation, as outlined in the update report, the application was recommended for approval.

At the invitation of the Chairman and in line with the Councils' public speaking policy, the following individuals addressed the Committee.

In objection

- Mr. A. Kent, the County Councillor (1 Minute)
- Michelle Salkeld, local resident (1 Minute)
- Lorraine Curran, local resident, comments read out by Officers (1 Minute)

In support

- Donna Savage, the Applicant's Planning Agent (3 Minutes)

Members then debated the application, during which a number of points were clarified by Officers.

- A lighting assessment plan to assess the impact on local residents had not been submitted as part of the application.
- Parking was assessed which considered the locality of transport links. It was determined that of the 24 staff on site at one time, 18 would travel by car which would leave 10 spaces for visitors/doctors. Additionally, it was the general assumption for C2 use developments that none of the residents would drive.
- It was not deemed appropriate to contact the Police or fire service regarding the exit route as it would be NWWM who were the relevant consultee when considering matters regarding the flood management plan.
- It would be deemed acceptable to amend the travel plan to include employees and visitors to encourage sustainable forms of transport.

Members expressed concerns regarding the proposed alternative emergency pedestrian access/exit route. Members noted that the route would connect to a pathway leading away from the site and towards Beaudesert Nature Park. If heavy rainfall was to occur, residents would not be able to go left (north) as that would take them towards the culvert (which would be the likely source of the flooding) so would only be able to head south down this path. Members further stated that the distance to the nearest road in that direction was 400m, and that the path was not tarmac but an unlit gravel path. Members expressed the opinion that, considering the age and physical ability of the residents, it would be difficult for them to traverse the path to get to safety. Additionally, any emergency service such as paramedics would need to make their way down the path to reach residents if there were any incidents whilst the main entrance was flooded.

Following comments made by Councillor D. J. A. Forsythe, the Legal advisor to the Committee invited him to reconsider his previous declaration of interest in that he was approaching the application with an open mind, as considering the representations he had made it would suggest he may be leaning one way regarding the application. However, the Legal Advisor clarified that it was a matter for Councillor Forsythe to determine if he was predisposed or predetermined. To which Councillor Forsythe reconfirmed that he did not consider himself pre-determined

and was approaching the application with an open mind. He further clarified that he was the Parish and Ward Councillor for the area and that he had been working with NWWM and the County Councillor to address the local flooding problem.

Officers clarified that the additional pedestrian exit route was one part of the wider proposed flood risk management plan and that its purpose was to provide an additional safe exit in case of a flooding event. Additionally, any future care home operator would be required to have procedures in place and produce their own flood risk plan to support this, taking into account the specific care needs of the residents, this was secured under Condition 23. Officers further clarified that when addressing flood events various measures were considered, an emergency exit was one of those measures, detailed under guidance in the NPPF, it was noted as the responsibility of the planning department to ensure that appropriate exits were supplied during an application but that it was an operational issue as to how the care home would respond in an emergency.

Members questioned the look of the three-storey building which in their opinion would be out of character to the locality and would visually harm the amenity of the area. Members expressed the opinion that the impact would be made greater with the switching of the orientation of the building in terms of where the carpark and building were situated which would bring a number of dwellings close to the care home and would have an impact on screening and privacy for those residents. Officers reassured Members that the orientation of the building was designed to minimise the impact of amenity for the residents and there would be some tree and vegetation screening to help mitigate these areas.

Members did not wish to move the recommendation, but wished to propose an alternative recommendation to refuse the application on the grounds that the alternative emergency pedestrian access was not a suitable exit as defined under paragraph 181 of the NPPF.

To permit time to Members to organise their reasons for refusal a short recess was requested by Members. Henceforth, the meeting stood adjourned from 19:46 hours to 19:59 hours.

On recommencement of the meeting and following a proposed Alternative Recommendation by Councillor M. Marshall, Members debated the reasons for refusal for the application. Further clarification was also given by the Development Management Manager regarding a number of potential reasons for refusal including their suitability, and defendability if the application was to go to appeal.

Following the debate and advice given, an Alternative Recommendation was put forward by Councillor S. R. Peters and seconded by Councillor E. M. S. Gray, that the application should be refused on the grounds of

1. The inadequacy of the safe access and emergency plan given the expected elderly and vulnerable occupants of the site contrary to NPPF para 181 and;

2. the inappropriate scale, mass and visual appearance of the development and impact on visual amenity and privacy of surrounding residences contrary to the high-quality design required by BDP19.

On being put to the vote it was

RESOLVED that having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, the application be refused subject to the reasons as detailed in the preamble above.

36/25

25/00562/FUL - CHANGE OF USE FROM C3 USE (DWELLINGHOUSE) TO C2 USE (RESIDENTIAL CHILDREN HOME) FOR UP TO 3 CHILDREN WITH ACCESS ALTERATIONS. HIGH BANK NURSERIES, QUANTRY LANE, BELBROUGHTON, WORCESTERSHIRE, DY9 9UU. MR. N. SINGH

The Application had been brought to the Planning Committee for consideration at the request of Councillor K. J. May, Ward Councillor.

Officers presented the report and presentation slides, as detailed on pages 77 to 84 of the main agenda pack; and in doing so, highlighted that the application was for a change of use of a dwelling house (C3) to a residential children's home (C2) for up to three children with alternations to the site access.

The proposed children's home would provide long-term care for 8- to 17-year-olds, who would be educated offsite at school. There would be three staff on site 24/7 with a manager present during the day.

The dwelling was a detached four-bedroom property in a rural location not within walking distance of shops and amenities; therefore, the site was deemed to be in an unsustainable location. The parking plan proposed six car parking spaces and there was an increase in the existing access from 3.2 m to 5 m. No internal or external alterations to the building were proposed as part of the scheme.

36 letters of objection had been received concerning the scheme which included the Parish Council. The main issues for objection were the location, parking, principle of development, residential amenity and the impact on the surrounding highway network.

Officers noted that Condition 3 restricted the scheme to only three children and further restricted the C2 use to only a children's care home. Therefore, no other C2 use could be used without a further planning application being submitted.

At the invitation of the Chairman and in line with the Councils' public speaking policy, the following individuals addressed the Committee.
In Objection

Agenda Item 3

Planning Committee
7th August 2025

- Spencer Jenkins, Local Resident, Comments read out by Officers (1.5 Minutes)
- Donna Westwood, Local Resident, Comments read out by Officers (1.5 Minutes)
- Ian Saddler, on behalf of Belbroughton & Fairfield Parish Council (3 Minutes)
- Councillor S. Nock, Ward Member (3 Minutes)

In support

- Steve Travis, the Applicant's Planning Agent (3 Minutes)

Members then debated the application, during which a number of points were clarified by Officers.

- That a previous certificate of Lawfulness application had been refused. This was on the grounds that a C2 class usage (Children's home) was not the same as a C3 class usage (dwellinghouse) and that a planning application was required for that change.
- A care home provider needed to demonstrate that the proposed location was suitable and appropriately placed to safeguard children. This assessment would be undertaken by Ofsted and was not a planning consideration.

Members expressed an opinion that they did not consider how a care home was fundamentally different from a dwelling when considering that a dwelling could also have four cars in it with a similar number of residents and impact on the highway network. Members expressed the same opinion regarding the sustainability of the location; therefore, they did not consider those to be suitable reasons to refuse the application.

Members questioned that Officers had taken the view that the employment travel plan requested by County Highways was unreasonable due to the small scale of proposal. Members commented that Bromsgrove had a climate emergency agenda and that there was a bus stop within a couple of hundred meters from the site which could be used, expressing the opinion that the cost would be negligible to the applicant and therefore would be a reasonable condition. Members further clarified that it was an employment travel plan they were proposing and not in relation to the children.

Officers clarified in terms of the proportionality of a Condition, given the scale of the proposal and the fallback position of the dwelling, it would be onerous in terms of the tests they had to apply with respect to imposing Conditions, therefore they had taken the view not to impose an Employment Travel Plan on the application. However, Officers noted that it was within Members discretion to impose Conditions, having taken a different view.

Councillor A. Bailes proposed an amendment to the recommendation to include an Employment Travel Plan; the amendment was seconded by Councillor S. R. Peters.

Agenda Item 3

Planning Committee
7th August 2025

On being put to the vote, with the recommendation including the amendment, as detailed in the preamble above, it was:

RESOLVED that having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, the application be approved subject to the Conditions as detailed on pages 14 to 16 of the main agenda pack , and the amendment as detailed in the preamble above.

The meeting closed at 8.44 p.m.

Chairman

Name of Applicant	Proposal	Expiry Date	Plan Ref.
Mr George Watson (Greenergy Renewables UK)	Proposed Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) and associated infrastructure Land Off Illey Lane, Hunnington		24/00960/FUL

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be **GRANTED**

The application was deferred at the 29 July 2025 Planning Committee to address the comments raised by Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service. The committee report has been updated with new comments submitted by Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service and other consultees. As well as a revised section regarding Fire Risk and Fire Water Management and relevant planning conditions that has been agreed between the LPA and the Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service.

1.0 Consultations

Worcestershire Highways - Bromsgrove

Following clarification on several matters, no objection subject to conditions

- Vehicular access
- Site Access and Signing:
- Conformity with Submitted Details
- Vehicular visibility splays approved plan
- Highway Condition Survey

Conservation Officer

- In terms of heritage, as confirmed in the submitted Heritage Statement, there are numerous heritage assets within the localised area, including the Grade I Listed Sy Mar's Abbey Ruins and the associated SM of the Halesowen Abbey and associated water control features, lying some 600m to the north-east; the Grade II listed Oatenfields Farmhouse, lying some 150m to the west, with additional historic barns which may be considered as being curtilage listed; Illey Mill (NDHA) lying adjacent to the proposed site entrance; and Goodrest Farm (NDHA), lying to the south of the site, which dates at least to 1831, being evident on the First Ed of the OS mapping, but most likely has earlier origins, and is characterised by a loose courtyard farmstead.
- I agree with the HS that there will be a degree of less than substantial harm to the significance and setting of the Grade II Oatenfields Farmhouse through the proposed development, resulting from both the alteration of the agricultural nature of the Site, as well as the visual prominence of elements of the scheme, including the scale and size of elements such as the transformer and the high level disconnectors, and that this would be at the low end of the scale of LTS. In line with the NPPF, and with the intentions of S.66 of the P(LBCA)A 1990, such harm should be afforded great weight in undertaking a tilted balance of the harm against the public benefits of the scheme, and that clear and convincing justification has to be provided. In terms of the provision of such, this is set out in the Planning Statement in terms of the need for renewable energy storage

- I disagree that there would be no harm to the setting, insofar as this contributes to significance, of Illey Mill, as part of the rural character of this setting, which does contribute to its significance, would be altered. I consider that this would be a low level of harm to significance, where a balanced judgement has to be given to the scale of harm and the significance of the asset.
- I also agree that there would be some limited harm to the setting and significance (insofar as the former contributes to the latter) of the Goodrest Farm complex, again resulting in the need for a balanced judgement to be given to the scale of harm against the significance of the asset.

Worcestershire Archive and Archaeological Service

- The Proposed Development Site is situated on the eastern-facing slopes of a shallow valley formed by the Illey Brook, which approaches the Site from the southeast and joins with the watercourse that runs through the Site just to the east of the Site boundary. The red line boundary of the proposed development site appears to have been reduced in scale, from that assessed as part of the geophysical survey and Desk Based Assessment.
- Historic cultivation marks ('ridge and furrow') and earthworks of former field boundaries are evident on Environment Agency LiDAR, within the red line boundary. The 'ridge and furrow' is narrow and relatively straight; it does not have the appearance of medieval cultivation and appears post-medieval/modern in date.
- Earthworks potentially associated with the vast estate of the scheduled and Grade I listed St Mary's Abbey, (c. 800m northeast of the site), are recorded along the Illey Brook, c. 215m northeast of the site (HER ref. WSM36168). Deep curvilinear earthworks c.50m east of the site (WSM36170), along the Illey Brook, may be associated with Illey Mill, which is situated c. 30m east of the site's eastern boundary.
- The Worcestershire Historic Environment Record records an area of Palaeolithic Potential, Head Deposits comprising possible deposits of unknown potential for Palaeolithic unstratified and paleoenvironmental remains (HER ref. WSM56936), directly south of the proposed development boundary.
- The Desk Based Assessment (DBA) submitted with application, which considers evidence from both the Worcestershire and Dudley Historic Environment Records, assesses the potential for prehistoric archaeological remains across the site as medium. I would agree with this assessment given the identification of worked lithics, cropmarks, including possible ring ditches and enclosures, and concentrations of heat crazed pebbles (pot boilers) suggestive of burnt mound material, identified within the sites wider setting, and often concentrated around watercourses. As noted in the DBA this may represent dispersed prehistoric settlement and/or funerary activity.
- The DBA considers it unlikely that significant Roman remains will be present on the site. It also assesses the potential for medieval and post medieval activity across the site to be medium, and likely related to agriculture, drainage and enclosure.
- The geophysical (magnetometer) survey undertaken in February 2024 ' during which data was collected at a traversal interval of 2m and sample interval of 0.50m - recorded several anomalies across the survey area, some of which were identified as possibly archaeological (strong and weak possibility) in origin, others of undetermined origin. This included a large series of anomalies in Area B (F12) which cover the length of the area from north to south. As noted in the geophysical survey the exact interpretation of these anomalies is difficult to determine given the size and form, only an archaeological investigation will characterise what these anomalies are.

- The DBA notes that the nature and date of anomalies, recorded during the geophysical survey, is currently undetermined. It tentatively theorises that anomalies could relate to agricultural practices (i.e. ridge-and-furrow agriculture). The DBA also suggests that given the lack of nearby corresponding prehistoric/Roman features, it is improbable that the anomalies are related to these periods. However, given the identification and extent of worked lithics, cropmarks and concentrations of heat crazed pebbles suggestive of burnt mound material, identified within the sites wider setting, I would tentatively theorise that anomalies may alternatively relate to prehistoric activity along the valley of the Illey Brook. As referenced in the DBA, we can only theorise as to what these anomalies attest too, and only further archaeological investigation through evaluation will confirm their nature.
- The areas showing the strongest concentration of anomalies appear to have largely been removed from the red line boundary of the proposed development site. However, given the results of the geophysical survey and medium potential for subtle prehistoric archaeological remains across the site in general ' that would be truncated or totally removed should groundworks be undertaken ' I would suggest that further archaeological investigation is undertaken pre determination, to identify the presence or absence of archaeological remains their character and significance, within the area of the current red line boundary, that may not have been picked up by geophysical survey due to their more subtle, discrete nature.
- In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.
- The application is judged to have the potential to impact heritage assets of archaeological interest that would be significantly altered or lost through development. Further archaeological investigation is recommended within the area of the red line boundary to determine the presence or absence of archaeological remains their character and significance. This should take the form of evaluation predetermination, with a sample rate of 2%. A written scheme of investigation should be submitted to the archaeological advisor for the district for approval prior to any intrusive investigation. Trial trenching predetermination will inform the decision making process and should the application ultimately be approved, the requirement for and scheme for any further archaeological works by condition.
- Should you be minded to grant planning permission for this scheme, without further archaeological investigation predetermination, a programme of archaeological works should be secured and implemented by means of a suitably worded condition attached to any grant of planning permission. This would take the form of evaluation by trial trench initially (at a sample rate to be discussed). This could be followed by further mitigation should the results of the evaluation find evidence to justify further stages.

North Worcestershire Water Management

Following clarification on several matters, no objection subject to conditions:

- Detailed surface water drainage scheme design, including maintenance
- Construction surface water management plan
- Buffering of the watercourse
- Permeable access to remain permeable

Environment Agency

- Whilst we note the reason for your consultation being an application for a Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) site, based on the sites constraints this does not fall within our checklist and would not be a reason for consulting us, therefore we would have no bespoke comment to make.
- We have recently produced some guidance to assist with applications involving BESS that I have attached for your consideration, alongside our checklist for when to consult us on planning applications which we would appreciate being review and filled out on receipt of any future applications.

WRS - Contaminated Land

- No objection

WRS - Noise

No objection subject to conditions

- Pre-occupation noise assessment
- Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)

WRS - Air Quality

- No objection

Consultant Conservation And Landscape Officer

- No objection
- I have no objection to the scheme on landscape grounds providing opportunities for mitigation are maximised and managed to ensure net gains for landscape character are delivered and sustainably managed. Should you be minded to grant the scheme permission then I recommend that landscape and habitat mitigation and BNG objectives are delivered in the context of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP).

Natural England

- No objection
- Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites or landscapes and has no objection.

Ecology (Thompson Environmental Consultants – Bromsgrove DC appointed ecology consultant)

- No objection
- Following receipt of an updated PEA and GCN Survey, these documents are considered sufficient to address the comments raised in the original response. The LPA should note the recommended conditions in the original response.

Worcestershire County Council Countryside Service

- Following information from the applicant, it is confirmed that there is separate access for the PROW. No further information is required in this instance, but applicant should note the general comments made.

Arboricultural Officer

- No objection subject to conditions
- Adherence with the submitted Arboricultural Method Statement
- Should any tree, existing or planted as part of the landscaping proposals, die or become diseased within 5 years of completion of the development they are to be replaced like-for-like within 1 year.
- Should any pruning to retained trees, be necessary to facilitate the development, they are to be done in accordance with BS3998:2010

Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service

Response dated 29 July 2025

- I don't believe that all fire safety matters have been satisfied by the applicant, nor any conditions agreed that may assist you in determining the application. Without copying my officers letter I understand the key issues to be;
- **Water Supply and Fire Suppression** - A minimum flow rate of 1,900 litres/min for 2 hours (i.e. 228,000 litres) Grenergy response seems to reject NFCC water supply guidance as 'not suitable'. Although the fire strategy suggests there will be two hydrants it omits to provide any detail, location, testing data for flow rates etc.
- It is also noted that on p.17-18 of the DNV report (Risk Management Plan by DNV) a reduced volume is suggested (300- 500L/min based on Energy Institutes Code of Practice 2019), referring to fires at petrochemical installations. If correct this does not meet the NFCC guidance.
- Our letter also asks for detail concerning suppression systems, the information provided is relatively brief, with no detailed specification nor performance data provided.
- **Site Access and Roadways** - Our letter clearly asks for two separate access points to the site, this has not been shown on the application. Furthermore, NFCC guidance requests a perimeter road, which I do not believe has been achieved, as the site plan only shows the road to one side of the site. There is also no turning facility provided on-site.
- **Container Separation Distances** - Our letter requests 6 metre separation, and whilst there is a discussion in the DNV report concerning how units will be grouped, they have not provided any fire modelling by a qualified fire engineer to qualify the assumptions.
- **Vapour Cloud, Explosion & Deflagration Risk** - Our letter requests mapping and identification, and also the potential environmental impact of such a scenario, which

again we have not had site of. Whilst there is some generic statements, there is no specific site modelling or plan been provided by the applicant.

- **Operation Response** - No discussion has taken place with the applicant concerning this, which is of concern to HWFRS. Indeed, DNV suggest that a plan will be provided post consent, which I do not consider appropriate. As discussed above, DNV have not engaged with HWFRS, and therefore I am unable to comment further on this particular point.
- **Testing & Design Evidence** - HWFRS have been provided no detail concerning specifications, gas detection, suppression systems etc., which does not meet the NFCC guidance for this application.
- Finally our letter discusses the importance of environmental impact, and potential for contaminated water run-off in the event of a fire incident. We have been provided no evidence of containment, nor any view from the Environment Agency in this regard, which again is a concern.
- I understand that our letter dated 21st October 2024 does not formally object to the scheme, however as you can see from my limited comments above, I do not consider all HWFRS and NFCC Guidance have been satisfied. Therefore, I would urge any decision be postponed until satisfactory information is provided by the applicant, and any planning conditions (including pre-commencement) have been agreed, as again I am unaware we have been consulted on any requirements in this regard.

Final Response Dated 1st October 2025

- Please see our latest response to the above application. Following additional consultation with the applicant and planning authority, we have now reviewed the revised documentation submitted. Our previous concerns centred around the following key points, raised by email on 29 July 2025, notably;
- **Water Supply and Fire Suppression** - A minimum flow rate of 1,900 litres/min for 2 hours (i.e. 228,000 litres) Grenergy response seems to reject NFCC water supply guidance as 'not suitable'. Although the fire strategy suggests there will be two hydrants it omits to provide any detail, location, testing data for flow rates etc.
- It was also noted that on p.17-18 of the DNV report a reduced volume is suggested (300- 500L/min based on Energy Institutes Code of Practice 2019), referring to fires at petrochemical installations. If correct this does not meet the NFCC guidance.
- We believe this issue has now been resolved, with the applicant agreeing to provide relevant hydrants with the required flowrate. However, we would request that the following condition wording be agreed as part of any approval.

Access & Fire Service Equipment Proposed Condition

- Prior to the commencement of any above ground works pursuant to the development permitted, a detail site layout plan shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Authority and Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service. The approved

scheme will require two access points, with appropriate turning and passing laybys, adjacent to site fire hydrants.

- The scheme will include as a minimum two fire hydrants capable of delivering 1,900 litres per minute at the site (unless an alternative is agreed in writing with Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service). The two fire hydrant locations shall be agreed and detailed on the site layout plan and included in the Emergency Response Plan.
- Our letter also asked for detail concerning suppression systems, the information provided was relatively brief, with no detailed specification nor performance data provided.
- This has been discussed with the applicant, and whilst we understand that this detail is often not known at the planning application stage, we would therefore request that the following condition wording be agreed as part of any approval.

Battery Infrastructure / Technology Proposed Condition

- No battery unit or associated electrical equipment shall be brought on the site until details of an overarching Fire Safety Precaution Statement for the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (following consultation with Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service). This statement shall be guided by the applicant's submitted Fire Safety Strategy and the "Grid scale battery energy storage system planning - Guidance for Fire and Rescue Services" published by the National Fire Chiefs Council (or any subsequent update and references). Thereafter, the development shall operate in accordance with the measures outlined in the approved Fire Safety Precaution Statement.
- **Site Access and Roadways** - Our letter clearly asked for two separate access points to the site this had not been shown on the application. Furthermore, NFCC guidance requests a perimeter road, which I do not believe has been achieved, as the site plan only shows the road to one side of the site. There is also no turning facility provided on-site.
- We note that the applicant has revised the site layout providing an additional access to the north-east corner of the compound, a perimeter road around the complete BESS facility, which now provides access at three points. We do note the NFCC Guidance states two separate access points to the site, which can be interpreted as the 'whole site' rather than the facility or compound area. We have reviewed the layout and again and are satisfied with the additional laybys provided, and access to the facility in the north, east and south locations.
- **Container Separation Distances** - Our letter requested 6 metre separation, and whilst there was a discussion in the DNV report concerning how units would be grouped, they had not provided any fire modelling by a qualified fire engineer to qualify the assumptions.

- Concerning this point we have reviewed the detail provided, and proposed container layout with regard to any proposed operational response, boundary container cooling etc. in the event of an incident. At this point we have no further comments.
- **Vapour Cloud, Explosion & Deflagration Risk** - Our letter requested mapping and identification, and also the potential environmental impact of such a scenario, which again we have not had site of. Whilst there were some generic statements, there was no specific site modelling or plan provided by the applicant.
- Following further consultation with the local planning authority and applicant we have reviewed the proposals with regard to the proximity to boundaries and taken account of the compound access points now provided, so make no further comment.
- **Operation Response** - No discussion had taken place with the applicant concerning this, which was of concern to HWFRS. Indeed, DNV suggested that a plan would be provided post consent, which we did not consider appropriate at that time.
- Following further engagement, we do understand that a full response plan is not normally considered at this stage of planning. However, we believe that an extensive, site specific response plan should be agreed prior to any operation on-site, and therefore would request that the following proposed condition be included in any subsequent approval by the local authority.

Fire Incident Response Plan Proposed Condition

- Prior to the commencement of any above ground works pursuant to the development permitted, a detail and site specific Emergency Response Plan shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Authority and Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service. The Emergency Response Plan shall be developed using best practice guidance as detailed and required in the published Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning - Guidance for FRS published by the National Fire Chiefs Council. The development shall be carried out and thereafter operated only in accordance with the approved site specific Emergency Response Plan.

The site specific Emergency Response Plan should cover as a minimum; a) Hazard Information;

- b) Response Procedures;
 - c) Environmental Impact Mitigation;
 - d) Post Incident Operations;
 - e) Communication and Notification;
 - f) Command & Control;
 - g) Training & Exercising Responsibilities;
 - h) All relevant site specific information.
- **Testing & Design Evidence** - HWFRS had been provided no detail concerning specifications, gas detection, suppression systems etc., which did not meet the NFCC guidance for this application. This point is discussed above, with the request of the suggested Battery Infrastructure / Technology Proposed Condition being included as part of any approval by the local authority.

- Finally, our previous letter discusses the importance of environmental impact, and potential for contaminated water run-off in the event of a fire incident. We had been provided no evidence of containment, nor any view from the Environment Agency in this regard, which again was a concern. We have reviewed the scheme proposals for water run-off and environmental impact, and note the containment proposals detailed. We make no comment with reference to environmental impact but would propose the following condition be included in any approval by the local authority.

Drainage / Containment of fire water run-off in the event of an incident Proposed Condition

- No development shall take place until a scheme to dispose of surface water and any contaminated drainage from fire suppression has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service).
- A construction phase Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) should also be submitted and agreed to ensure that surface water run-off and contamination is temporarily intercepted, stored, treated, and discharged from the site during construction of the scheme.
- A management and maintenance plan shall be submitted to ensure surface water drainage systems are maintained and managed for the lifetime of development, including the name and contact details of the body(-ies) responsible. The scheme shall include:
 - a) details of any fire prevention systems;
 - b) evidence of agreement with the Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service to confirm the expected volume and nature of contaminated water which would need to be managed in the event of a fire on the site (subject to an approved fire incident response plan being agreed);
 - c) details of the nature of any contaminants which could be present from a failure and leak from the batteries and/or transformer(s) on site;
 - d) details of fire water containment systems and how these will be designed to prevent infiltration and/or isolated to prevent direct discharges of contaminants to surface water outfalls;
 - e) details of SUDS features and how these will be constructed to prevent the infiltration of contaminated water to ground (e.g. the proposed permeable hardcore will need to be lined to prevent infiltration);
 - f) details of how the drainage system will be designed such that it is resistant to damage and corrosion that may occur during a fire incident;
 - g) a management and maintenance plan to ensure that all drainage features, including penstock valves are maintained and functional throughout the life of the development. This should include plans for replacement and repair of elements that may be damaged as a result of a fire incident;
 - h) evidence that a plan is in place, including the name and contact details of the body(-ies) responsible, to remove and safely dispose of any contaminated water stored on site in the event of an incident, including fire.

- Officers have also reviewed the recently issued fire safety rebuttal submitted by Hunnington Parish Council, report dated 18 September 2025. We note the concerns raised, and believe that the specific fire safety matters have been addressed in the revised plans, or have been captured in the proposed conditions that we believe should all be accepted if the scheme is approved at committee.

National Grid (Asset Protection)

- Regarding planning application 24/00960/FUL, there are no National Grid Electricity Transmission assets affected by the proposal.
- The applicant will need to have a valid connection agreement and agree a cable easement (via the Use of NGET Land Process) with us for their proposed cable routed through are land surrounding the substation.
- Please note this response is only in reference to National Grid Electricity Transmission assets only.

National Grid's Embedded Capacity Register

- The Embedded Capacity Register (ECR) provides essential information on generation and storage resources connected to the National Grid's distribution network, updated monthly for stakeholders.
- No comments received from the National Grid's Embedded Capacity Register following the end of the consultation period

Birmingham City Council

- No comments received

Dudley Metropolitan Council (Neighbouring authority)

- Object to the application on the following grounds:
 1. Area of High Historic Landscape Value
 - The submitted Landscape and Visual Appraisal prepared by Stephen Halliday and the Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment prepared by SLR both fail to acknowledge and assess the impact of the proposals on the significance and setting of the Illey and Lapal Area of High Historic Landscape Value (AHHLV), a non-designated heritage asset, located immediately adjacent to the application site within the Dudley Borough boundary.
 2. Designated heritage assets
 - Figure 4 of the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (considers the Zones of Theoretical Visibility, including screening (areas shaded purple below). It is noted that two designated heritage assets within Dudley's Borough boundary fall within these zones, the Leasowes Registered Park and Garden (Grade I listed) and Halesowen Abbey (Grade I listed and a scheduled Monument). The submitted Landscape and Visual Appraisal and the Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment both fail to consider the requirements of Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 This is contrary to para 200 of the NPPF.
 3. Cumulative Impact of BESS within the wider Green Belt
 - Chapter 13 of the NPPF sets out the Government approach to Protecting Green Belt Land. Para 143 sets out the five main purposes of the Green Belt. As part of the supporting statements, no assessment has been made of the cumulative impact of the

application site when considering it in conjunction with two other Battery Storage application sites) which fall within the Zones of Theoretical Visibility, identified in Fig 4 of the Landscape and Visual Appraisal. No assessment has been made regarding the cumulative impact of these schemes when considered holistically and how these developments collectively impact on the five main purposes of the Green Belt and its integrity. This cumulative impact also needs to be considered in respect of the Illey and Lapal Area of High Historic Landscape Value (AHHLV). All 3 sites are accessed directly off Illey Lane.

4. Highway Safety Implications

- As the proposed access point is immediately adjacent to Dudley MBC's Borough boundary, consultation has been undertaken with Dudley MBC Highway Engineers. On review of the submitted information the Highway Engineers share Worcestershire County Council's Highway Authorities view that the proposal should be refused on insufficient information.

In addition to the above, further comments have been raised regarding the following:

- Appropriate liaison should be undertaken around public rights of way (PROW) which runs through the application site, and an agreed solution would need to be secured to maintain accessibility over the PROW.
- The proposed access track should be of a sufficient width to allow two vehicles to pass and be of an appropriate construction.
- Details of the proposed junction onto Illey Lane should be provided, including details of gradients, radii and widths to allow for an informed assessment.
- Impact of the adjacent property and existing structures on visibility to the southeast of the access. This would need to be confirmed as part of any final access design.
- There are overhead wires within the vicinity of the access and associated track. This would need to be considered if development is to be supported.

Hunnington Parish Council

- Hunnington Parish Council have submitted two objections as part of the application. In their objections that raised a wide range of issues and concerns with the proposed development including cumulative impacts. These issues include comments on the following matters:
 1. Hunnington in Context (Green Belt Designation)
 2. The planning application and BESS sites
 3. Lowlands Farm and Illey Brook Farm BESS sites
 4. Cumulative Effects
 5. Green Belt Status - Appropriateness
 6. Harm to the Green Belt
 7. Bess Sites and Renewable Energy
 8. The Surrounding Countryside of Hunnington
 9. Register of Public Rights of Way
 10. The Quality of the Hunnington Countryside (Illey and Hunnington Environment and Landscape Analysis)
 11. Siting and Effects on Local Residences
 12. Wildlife Impact and the Nature Friendly Farming Initiative
 13. Noise pollution
 14. Battery Plant Safety - Fire and Toxic Risk
 15. Flood and Pollution Risk
 16. Cyber and Terrorist Threat
 17. Operational Impact

18. Forty Year Temporary Permission
19. Financial Status of Grenergy Renewables
20. Consultation With Residents (lack of support for development)

In conclusion that state the following:

- *“At the time of writing, two adjacent BESS sites have recently been approved and there is a potential for 3 significant BESS sites on the same tract of Green Belt land, and all within less than one mile of each other. The fact that two of these sites are within the Dudley Borough Council boundary is irrelevant, as Illey Brook Farm is less than half a mile from Goodrest Farm.*
- *We believe that this clearly demonstrates that the cumulative harm to the Green Belt significantly outweighs any benefits, of a third BESS site and that “very special circumstances” cannot be applied in these circumstances. Furthermore, HPC would argue that the current BESS commercial “free for all”, with lack of central control, is leading to decisions being made with absurd consequences.*
- *We believe that the close proximity to residential houses is the consequence the site selection process, and that Grenergy could not find any other suitable location. Furthermore, this presents a significant risk of harm to residents through fire and concomitant pollution. This is reiterated by HWFRS in their response, and we believe sets it apart from most other BESS Green Belt applications. This is further exacerbated by the lack of any detailed risk assessments by Grenergy or consultees, along with appropriate contingency plans should a serious fire or pollution incident occur.*
- *Hunnington is a semi-rural village within a widely recognised Green Belt area, popular with walkers and wildlife enthusiasts. To allow this to go ahead would lead to the spoliation of an historical and much-loved area.*
- *Grenergy state “This effect or harm (to the Green Belt) s however temporary given the limits of the lifetime of BESS developments (para 2.3.5). This temporary nature is 40 years, which is the lifetime of many residents.*
- *The Bluebird development alone is significant for a village of this size. This particular planning application represents the most serious issue to face the parish council and its residents since its formation and will trigger the demise of Hunnington as we know it. Hunnington Parish Council therefore strongly objects to this planning application”.*

Members also received a further objection from Hunnington Parish Council on Monday 16 June. This raised concern regarding the summary of the Parish Councils comments in the committee report in particular the consequences of downstream flooding from Illey Brook and The Operational Response statement from HWFRS. The Parish Council wanted to draw members attention to their objections, particularly sections 4, 14.5 and 15.

The Hunnington PC response is summarised in the committee report as well as their detailed comments being on public access for the application. Due to the 24 pages of comments submitted by the Parish Council, a summary has been provided.

Following this Hunntington PC a further objection dated 30 June 2025. The comments supplement the comments already received and can be summarised as follows:

- National and Regional Oversupply of Battery Storage Capacity
- Fire Safety Failures and Environmental Risk
- Battery Waste and Replacement Over the Project Lifecycle

- Stand-Alone BESS and Cumulative Infrastructure Impact at Kitwell
- Green Belt and Grey Belt
- Planning Balance and Conclusion

Following the July 2025 Planning Committee further objections have been submitted regarding Fire Safety dated 18th September 2025.

In this document Hunnington Parish Council asks that the application be Refused, or at minimum Deferred, unless and until the redesign and evidence in Section 11 are submitted and formally signed off by HWFRS. Section 11 outlined the following matters:

Required Redesign — Non-Negotiable Pre-Consent Deliverables

- Two independent highway accesses plus a full perimeter loop road with passing places/turning heads to ADB B5; submit swept-path drawings.
- Hydrants: tested performance with flow/pressure curves, undertaker certification, and relay routing to sustain $\geq 1,900$ L/min for ≥ 2 h.
- Dedicated engineered containment (tanks/bunds/valves) sized to worst case; impermeable linings; EA-agreed handling/disposal; segregated from SUDS/BNG features.
- Vendor fixed pre-consent; declare chemistry/form factor; supply product data sheets.
- UL 9540A full suite dossier (cells→modules→racks→installation), witnessed by an approved lab.
- Registered FPE report interpreting test data to govern spacing, venting, explosion control, gas handling, and standoff at this site.
- Separation: maintain ≥ 6 m unless FPE-endorsed, installation-specific evidence justifies any reduction.
- Detection/monitoring/suppression/venting: full specifications, schematics, alarm telemetry to FRS, vent discharge maps and exclusion zones.
- Plume dispersion & deflagration modelling: computational analysis under prevailing winds; receptor mapping, cordon plans, public warning triggers; feed into ERP and layout.
- Site-specific ERP: appliance staging, water logistics, road closures, comms, handover, post-incident decontamination.
- Formal HWFRS sign-off confirming the above before committee.

This was supplemented by further comments regarding the Lincomb Farm BESS (Wychavon DC) and the response from HWFRS.

Further comments regarding BNG/ecology material which can be summarised as follows:

The applicant's revised BNG submission (Sept 2025):

- Fails to resolve the four issues highlighted by the Council's consultant.
- Introduces new flaws, notably counting an impermeable firewater lagoon as habitat.

- Misapplies multipliers and assumes unrealistic delivery conditions. When corrected, shows only ~8.6% habitat gain, below the statutory 10% requirement.

The detailed responses from the Parish Council are all published in full on Public Access for the application and members are encouraged to read these documents.

2.0 Public comments

89 letters sent to neighbours 07.10.2024 (expired 31.10.2024)

Site notice displayed 12.10.2024 (expired 05.10.2024)

Press advert 04.10.2024 (expired 18.10.2024)

77 objections received

1 neutral comment received

Comments are summarised as follows:

Green Belt

- Harm to openness and visual amenity
- No very special circumstances
- No need for the proposed development
- Cumulative impact with other proposals

Highway matters

- Safety of access/egress onto the site in the context of prevailing traffic speed
- Restricted Emergency Access
- Safety issues given proximity of adjacent Public Right of Way
- Impact on Public Rights of Way

Design and appearance

- Development will be prominent in the context of surrounding views and will negatively impact upon those
- Mitigation measures, including planting, inadequate due to scale of development
- Unsightly appearance of proposal
- Impact upon character and setting of listed buildings

Other matters

- Battery fires, unsafe technology, decommissioning
- Infrastructure upgrade to facilitate development
- Impact on wildlife/biodiversity
- Loss of agricultural land
- Noise from BESS
- Construction noise
- Flooding/Drainage
- No strategy to future BESS facilities
- Proposed connection to Kitwell

Other issues which are not material planning considerations have been raised but are not reported here as they cannot be considered in the determination of this application.

3.0 **Relevant Policies**

Bromsgrove District Plan

BDP1 – Sustainable Development Principles
 BDP2 – Settlement Hierarchy
 BDP3 – Future Housing and Employment Growth
 BDP4 – Green Belt
 BDP12 – Sustainable Communities
 BDP16 – Sustainable Transport
 BDP19 – High Quality Design
 BDP20 – Managing the Historic Environment
 BDP22 – Climate Change
 BDP23 – Water Management
 BDP24 – Green Infrastructure
 BDP25 – Health and Well Being

Others

NPPF – National Planning Policy Framework 2024
 NPPG – Planning Practice Guidance
 High Quality Design SPD

National Government Policy regarding Energy

National Policy Statement EN-1 (Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy) January 2024
 National Policy Statement EN-3 (For Renewable Energy Infrastructure) January 2024

4.0 **Planning History**

None

5.0 **Nearby Planning History**

- 5.1 Within the vicinity of the application site two Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) have been allowed following planning appeals since September 2024. Details of these decisions are summarised below:

Land at Illeybrook Farm, Illey Lane

- 5.2 Erection of a battery energy storage system (BESS) together with associated infrastructure, site levelling works, access onto Illey Lane and ancillary development at Land at Illeybrook Farm, Illey Lane (Dudley P23/0940) allowed following a planning hearing (APP/C4615/W/24/3345744). The decision was in April 2025, following an earlier decision being superseded.
- 5.3 The Planning Inspector considered that the proposal would constitute inappropriate development in the green belt which should not be approved except in very special circumstances, which national policy advises will not exist unless the potential harm to the green belt and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In the green belt balance, the inspector decided the weight given to the contribution to mitigating climate change and to energy security, the

absence of alternative sites taking into account a grid connection offer, and to the potential for permanent BNG, clearly outweighed the temporary harm to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, overall, very special circumstances existed which justified the development and the appeal was allowed.

Land at Lowlands Farm, Illey Lane, Halesowen

- 5.4 Provision of battery energy storage, substation compound with associated infrastructure, fencing, access road, drainage and landscaping at Lowlands Farm, Illey Lane, Halesowen, B62 0HJ (Dudley P22/1733) allowed following a planning hearing (APP/C4615/W/24/3341383) 4th September 2024.
- 5.5 The development would involve the provision of plant and equipment including a series of battery units around three metres in height, associated infrastructure, compound buildings, palisade fencing, CCTV cameras as well as an access road. In the inspector's assessment, although the site was small in the context of the wider green belt, it made a strong contribution to the green belt and therefore the development would conflict with the purpose of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment as well as causing considerable harm to spatial and visual openness.
- 5.6 The field which comprised the site was visible from a number of locations, and from the motorway and a footbridge over it, the inspector identified, concluding that there would be additional harm to the character and appearance of an area of area of high historic landscape value but not to its heritage significance because ridge and furrow and old parish boundary hedgerows would be unaffected.
- 5.7 Under other consideration the Inspector recorded that the development would facilitate greater use of renewable energy sources, give more flexibility to the energy system, benefit energy security and help meet net zero targets key to addressing climate change. He noted that national energy policy EN-1 states that electricity storage has a key role to play in achieving these objectives, and that this was consistent with the draft NPPF policy (at that time) on low carbon development.
- 5.8 The Inspector concluded that these other considerations clearly outweighed the harms to the green belt and landscape. Therefore, very special circumstances existed which justified the development.

6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

- 6.1 The application was due to be considered at the Planning Committee on 23rd June 2025. However, this was deferred at the agenda following an application to the Secretary of State for a Screening Direction. In correspondence dated 2nd July 2025 the Secretary of State confirmed that based upon the evidence this did not indicate a need for the Secretary of State to exercise her power under regulation 5(6), and therefore the Secretary of State declined to issue a screening direction in response to the request.

- 6.2 The aim of the EIA Regulations is to ensure that major projects that are likely to have impacts on the environment are subject to an EIA so that these impacts are fully assessed and understood before planning permission is granted. Development proposals of varying types are categorised in the EIA Regs as either Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development, depending upon the nature and scale of the development. Development proposals within the former category must always be subject to an EIA, while those within the latter category must be subject to a determination as to whether the proposals are likely to have significant effects on the environment where one of the threshold criteria is exceeded. In addition, if development falls within Schedule 2 but is within a sensitive location, even if the minimum criteria is not met, a screening opinion is still required to decide whether the proposal is likely to have significant environmental impacts and therefore if an EIA would be required.
- 6.3 The Local Planning Authority issued its original screening opinion in March 2024, which confirmed that the development was not EIA development. Having regard to all material matters and the information provided by the applicant in support of the application and the consideration of the nearby approved schemes it is the local planning authority's view that the proposed development is not EIA development.

Assessment of Proposal

7.0 Site Description

- 7.1 The application site extends to approx. 3.8ha, lies to the south of Illey Lane and comprises agricultural land and encompasses several fields, with the proposed development situated towards the middle of the site area.
- 7.2 The site's immediate surrounding area is considered to be rural and agricultural, it is screened and surrounded by dense vegetation, tall trees and situated away from the primary residential areas located along Bromsgrove Road (approx. 120m from the western site boundary to the nearest dwelling). Site access will be taken via an existing private gate along Illey Lane.
- 7.3 The site is within Flood Zone 1 where the risk of flooding is at its lowest. Whilst the site does not lie within a Conservation Area and there are no listed buildings on the site, the nearest Grade II Listed Building (Oatenfields Farmhouse) is approximately 155m to the northwest of the site.

8.0 Proposal

- 8.1 Full planning permission is sought for the erection of Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) to provide energy balancing services to the National Grid. The application proposes the erection of storage containers, support infrastructure and security fencing along with landscaping and associated works.
- 8.2 The proposed development would comprise of the following equipment housed within a fenced compound:
- 60 no. Battery Units

- 20 no. Power Stations *which contain two inverters
 - 132kV Substation within a 52.7m by 28.9m compound
 - 2no Switchgear
 - Monitoring Room / Office 12.2m in length, 2.6m in height (2.75m on base) and 2.44m width
 - Auxiliary Transformer
 - DNO Control Room Building 7.5m in length, 5m in height and 6.7m width
 - CCTV Cameras
- 8.3 The battery units are laid out in 5 rows of 12 battery units, with 2 sets of power stations within each row. At the frontage of the battery storage facility has a substation, switchgear buildings and monitoring room/office. Of the 3.8ha application site the developable area of the site is around 1ha.
- 8.4 The compound surface would comprise primarily of type 1 aggregate surface, with the above equipment sitting on raised reinforced concrete foundations. Internal access tracks within the compound would consist of a tarmac/asphalt surfacing.
- 8.5 Access to the site will be taken via an existing access point located along Illey Lane and will be upgraded as required to provide suitable access. The compound would be surrounded by a fence, with an appropriate landscaping scheme around the perimeter and the BESS. Remaining spacing outside the fence line is to be utilised for new woodland, hedgerow and tree planting as well as rough/wildflower grassland.
- 8.6 The proposed development would be time-limited to 35 years, after which time all infrastructure would be removed from the site.
- 8.7 This type of facility operates by taking excess electricity from the grid at times of low demand when energy would otherwise be lost, storing it in batteries, and releasing it back to the Grid when demand is high. Energy storage facilities therefore improve the efficiency of existing energy production facilities, notably from renewables where production is intermittent and based on external conditions. BESS can also operate in several different modes to provide grid stability services, such as managing voltage and frequency imbalances as renewable generation dips up and down. A battery energy storage facility does not itself generate renewable energy but provides storage capacity.
- 8.8 The point of connection (PoC) for the facility would be into the Kitwell Substation which is located approximately 2km east of the application site on Kitwell Lane. The connection would be made using underground cabling from the application site to the substation. This is outlined within the Alternative Site Assessment (ASA) document. There are no overhead power lines/pylons proposed. The underground cabling does not form part of this application and would be subject to a future planning application.
- 8.9 In relation to the point of connection an application for the spare capacity is then made to National Grid Electricity Distribution (NGED) at a cost to the applicant. If the application is successful, the grid connection offer is made exclusively available only from the site that it is applied for, with connection to the PoC. At this

stage, and going forwards, the site cannot then be changed as this is the agreed and offered grid connection point.

- 8.10 The applicant is Grenergy Renewables UK Ltd they are an Independent Power Producer (IPP) that designs, develops, implements and operates renewable energy plants on a large-scale across the globe. Headquartered in Spain, Grenergy entered the international market in 2007 with the aim of producing clean, sustainable energy and are now present in 11 countries. As of 2020 Grenergy entered the UK market to support the Nation's shift to Net-Zero and protect the environment for future generations. To date, Grenergy has over 1.8 GW of renewable projects in operation or under construction across the globe through 80 connected plants, primarily in Spain and South America.

9.0 Principle of Development

- 9.1 Section 2 of the Framework states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development including the provision of homes, commercial development and supporting infrastructure in a sustainable manner. To achieve this the planning system has the three overarching objectives of economic, social, and environmental elements which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways.
- 9.2 At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development which for decision making means that development proposals that accord with the Development Plan should be approved without delay, but where the Development Plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, LPAs should grant permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination. Paragraph 11 of the Framework does include a caveat (footnote 7) stating the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where specific policies provide a strong reason for refusing the development, which includes development within Green Belt, designated heritage assets (and other heritage assets of archaeological interest referred to in footnote 75).
- 9.3 The application site is located on land outside of a settlement hierarchy outside of the settlement hierarchy outlined in Policy BDP2 Settlement Hierarchy.
- 9.4 The proposed development is intended to serve as infrastructure supporting the National Grid network and therefore, it is considered the relationship with National Grid infrastructure (in this case the Kitwell substation) is the determining factor in identifying an appropriate location for this type of development. It is acknowledged that the location of a battery storage site is unlikely to be accommodated within designated settlement areas where the availability of land is typically more constrained. However, the requirement to be near National Grid infrastructure does not completely discount the possibility of a settlement location or serve to demonstrate a countryside location is inherently essential.

- 9.5 Policy BDP22 focuses on how the Council will deliver viable low carbon climate resilient developments. Specifically, the policy goes on and states that the Council will support low carbon energy generation schemes when adverse impacts are addressed satisfactorily.
- 9.6 Section 11 of the Framework 'Making effective use of land' sets out that planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land including making as much use as possible of previously developed or brownfield land (paragraph 124). Also that policies and decisions should "give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, and supporting opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land" (Framework paragraph 125(c)). As set out elsewhere this site falls wholly within the Green Belt and as such there are no brownfield regeneration benefits arising from this proposal which can be given positive weight in the overall planning balance.
- 9.7 At national level, whilst there is no specific policy for BESS development in the Framework, there are policies for mitigating the impacts of climate change and specifically relating to the development of renewable energy projects. These are set out in the Framework in Chapter 14: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change with Paragraph 161 confirming that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. There is a strong strategic policy framework which supports renewable and low carbon development proposals. The Framework also confirms in paragraph 168 that applicants are not required "*to demonstrate the overall need for renewable or low carbon energy*".
- 9.8 It is of note that the Framework revisions in December 2024 highlighted a stronger focus on tackling climate change to align with the government's push for renewable energy in order to help achieve the net zero targets. These include:
- Paragraph 161 references the UK's legally binding target of achieving net zero by 2050;
 - Paragraph 168 sets out points which LPAs should consider when determining planning applications for renewable energy development and confirms significant weight should be given to the benefits associated with renewable and low carbon energy generation;
 - Paragraph 169 sets expectation that LPAs should identify areas for renewable development;
 - Amends footnote 65 which address agricultural land, and
 - Paragraph 155 introduces the concept of 'grey belt' land – this is discussed in detail in the Green Belt section below
- 9.9 The Planning Policy Guidance on Renewable and Low Carbon Energy provides further guidance on considering and determining developments for renewable energy. As established earlier the PPG carries the same weight in decision taking as the Framework.

- 9.10 The PPG contains a section specifically dealing with battery energy storage systems setting out that:
- 9.11 Electricity storage can enable us to use energy more flexibly and de-carbonise our energy system cost-effectively – for example, by helping to balance the system at lower cost, maximising the usable output from intermittent low carbon generation (e.g. solar and wind), and deferring or avoiding the need for costly network upgrades and new generation capacity.
- 9.12 The PPG does not provide any specific information on battery storage in terms of siting stating that there are no hard and fast rules on how authorities should identify suitable areas for renewable energy. It advises local authorities to consider potential impacts of developments on the local environment and the views of local communities.
- 9.13 Whilst developers and LPAs are encouraged in the PPG to consult their local fire and rescue service on planning applications for BESS schemes, it should be noted that fire and rescue services are not statutory consultees. Updates to the PPG refer to guidance on grid-scale BESS by the National Fire Chiefs Council and comments received from the Fire Service in relation to this application are covered under a separate heading in this report.
- 9.14 There are a number of Government documents that reference Climate Change and Energy requirements – the documents are noted below. The Clean Power 2030 Action Plan (Dec 2024) is the most recent Government document, which provides significant information on the unmet need for power in the UK.
- 9.15 In 2019 Bromsgrove District Council and many other Councils across the country declared a climate emergency. The Council made a commitment to reduce carbons emission by 50% by 2030 and achieve Net Zero by 2040¹. A Carbon Reduction Strategy and Action Plan has been produced by the Council with the latest version 6.1 being published in November 2024². Within this document one of the actions and measures is to: “Review Local Plan where there is particular reference to renewables /provision for renewables in the future or heat networks”.
- 9.16 National Grid’s Future Energy Scenarios Report (2024) - the report notes there is currently 4.7GW of operational battery storage in the UK, with an expected 36GW of energy storage requiring installation by 2050 in a best-case scenario attainment of net zero. Electricity storage capacity is required to increase in all scenarios to ensure that demand can be met reliably in peak times as an increasing proportion of the UK’s electricity is generated from renewables. National Grid expects battery storage to make up the largest portion of storage power capacity in all scenarios by 2050.
- 9.17 Energy White Paper: Powering our Net Zero Future - A key objective of this paper is the necessity to move towards a smarter electricity system, where electricity markets are required to adapt to the deployment of renewable energy generation

¹ <https://www.bromsgrove.gov.uk/council/policy/climate-emergency/>

² [Bromsgrove Carbon Reduction Strategy November 2024 10122024 Cabinet.pdf](#)

increases. The report states that electricity demand could double by 2050. Thus requiring an increased renewable energy output to accommodate for the shift in electric consumption.

- 9.18 Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 - This act introduced the UK's statutory target to reduce its carbon dioxide emission to below 80% of the country's 1990 levels by 2050. The main energy generation production in the UK is dependent on Coal, Oil and Gas. The need to comply with the legal requirement to become carbon neutral by 2050 places a statutory requirement on the planning system to deliver a greater number of renewable energy generation sources and associated infrastructure required to support the grid.
- 9.19 National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1 & EN-3) -EN1- The NPS states that substantial weight should be given to low carbon renewable energy projects when considering applications due to the urgent need for them and concludes that there is a critical national priority (CNP) for the provision of nationally significant low carbon infrastructure to meet national security and net zero aims. EN3 - states that The Committee for Climate Change (CCC) has identified a need to deploy 54GW of solar by 2035 to keep on track to deliver net zero by 2050 which equates to roughly 40GW of solar by 2030.
- 9.20 British Energy Security Strategy (April 2022) – notes long-term solutions to address the UK's underlying vulnerability to international oil and gas prices by reducing our dependence on imported energy. It highlights the necessity for a secure, home-grown, reliable flow of affordable energy. There is a need for domestic supply of clean and affordable electricity will require accelerating the connecting network infrastructure to support it. Within this decade two key features will be prioritised: anticipating need because planning ahead minimises cost and public disruption; and hyper-flexibility in matching supply and demand so that minimal energy is wasted. A more efficient, locally responsive system could bring down costs by up to £10 billion a year by 2050.
- 9.21 Net Zero Strategy: Build Back Greener – outlines a strategy for reducing emissions from each sector of the economy and sets a delivery pathway showing the reduction of emissions across sectors to meet targets by the sixth carbon budget (2033- 2037) to reach net zero emissions by 2050.
- 9.22 Clean Power 2030 Action Plan – to tackle three major challenges: the need for a secure and affordable energy supply, the creation of essential new energy industries, supported by skilled workers in their thousands, the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and limit our contribution to the damaging effects of climate change. It is estimated that electricity demand could rise by around 11% by 2030, and flexible capacity, including 23-27 GW of battery capacity and 4-6 GW of long-duration energy storage will be required by 2030. Currently, for energy storage, there is estimated to be around 5GW.
- 9.23 As noted, the Clean Power 2030 Action Plan is one of the key documents that is anticipated to be used by Developers, Businesses, Policy Makers, Councils etc to assist in the delivery of clean electricity power. The provision of clean electricity power is considered an urgent priority by the Government.

- 9.24 It is evident from all the above documents/guidance that there is a need to deliver improvements to energy efficiency and energy management. Managing the National Grid is of upmost importance, requiring the necessary infrastructure—such as this development—to provide essential support to the electricity grid. Although most of these documents are not explicitly planning policies (aside from the National Policy Statement for Energy), they are high-level strategic Government documents/frameworks with a clear intent, making them a material consideration in the planning decision-making process.
- 9.25 The proposal is considered to be fully in line with the principal policies in the District Plan, and with National Planning Policy and other National Policy. The National Planning Policy Framework explains that when dealing with planning applications, planning authorities should support the transition to a low carbon future, improve resilience and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. Consequently, these benefits, that support the provision of battery storage and assist in the delivery of renewable energy, are of substantial weight in favour of the scheme.

10. Potential of Cumulative Impact

- 10.1 The proposed scheme represents one of three similar developments in the surrounding area. Details of the other schemes are outlined in the Other Relevant Planning History section above,
- 10.2 The potential for all three battery storage sites to be delivered within the locality is acknowledged, however it is not considered this factor represents a justifiable basis as a reason for refusal for this application. For that to have any merit it would be important to capture what the impact might be from installing and operating all sites together. That said, it is important that every application is assessed on its own merits. Where it is possible to capture any in-combination effects such as the impact on the local road network or character and appearance of the area, this report assesses that impact in the relevant sections below.
- 10.3 As part of the consideration of this planning application, it is not considered appropriate to factor in the potential cumulative impacts of other BESS development (or any other development) that is not even subject of a planning application and even if a planning application was received, not granted or being built out.

11.0 Green Belt and Grey Belt

- 11.1 The application site is within the Green Belt. The main issue in establishing the principle of the development is firstly, whether or not the proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt for the purposes of BDP 4 Green Belt and the Framework. Secondly, if the development is inappropriate, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other identified harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

- 11.2 Paragraph 153 of the Framework states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 154 outlines a list of exceptions where development may be acceptable in the Green Belt, and these align with BDP4, it is noted that there are now further exemptions since the Framework was amended in December 2024 in paragraph 155 which are not reflected in BDP4.
- 11.3 There are further potential exceptions to development being treated as defined as inappropriate within the amended Framework, namely whether the site amounts to 'Grey Belt' as defined in the Framework and if so whether certain criteria are met. If met this means development is not inappropriate and there is no need to demonstrate very special circumstances.
- 11.4 In relation to BDP4, the proposed BESS facility would not fall within any exceptions listed within the policy criteria. In this regard the proposal is a departure from the development plan and on the basis that it would be considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
- 11.5 However, as explained the Framework is a significant material planning consideration, and its policies and guidance must be applied in decision making as a matter of law. The amended Framework published and adopted by the Government on 12 December 2024 introduced the concept of Grey Belt land as a further important material planning consideration when considering proposed development in the Green Belt. Policy BDP4 as it was adopted prior to the amended Framework does not address Grey Belt as a potential exception and to that extent it no longer fully aligns with the Framework.
- 11.6 In accordance with the guidance in the Framework and caselaw this affects the weight that should be given to the fact that the application does not meet BDP4 which is a key relevant policy. Consideration must be given therefore to whether the Grey Belt exemption applies as well as other relevant policies and guidance within the Framework.

Grey Belt

- 11.7 Development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the exceptions listed in paragraph 154 of the Framework applies. However, paragraph 155 indicates that:

The development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should also not be regarded as inappropriate where:

- a) the development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan,*
- b) there is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed,*
- c) the development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of this Framework, and*
- d) where applicable the development proposed meets the "Golden Rules" requirements set out in Framework paragraphs 156 and 157.*

- 11.8 The Glossary to the Framework defines Grey Belt as,
“...Grey Belt is defined as land in the GB comprising previously developed land (PDL) and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in NPPF paragraph 143. Grey Belt excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in Footnote 7 (other than GB) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development.”
- 11.9 Footnote 7 refers to Framework policies, rather than those in development plans, relating to: habitats sites, and those sites listed in paragraph 194, and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as GB, Local Green Space, a National Landscape, a National Park (or within the Broads Authority) or defined as Heritage Coast; irreplaceable habitats; designated heritage assets and other heritage assets of archaeological interest referred to in Footnote 75; and areas at risk of flooding or coastal change.
- 11.10 In this case, the site is not PDL, however, to determine whether the site falls to be considered as Grey Belt, the site has to pass the test of whether the land, does not strongly contribute to Purpose a - to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, Purpose b - to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another listed in Framework paragraph 143 and Purpose d - to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

Purpose a – Sprawl

- 11.11 The evidence base for the District Plan review, included a Green Belt Purposes Part One Assessment (2019) (GBPPOA), which assessed how land within the Green Belt contributes to the purposes of the Green Belt. The site is located within Parcel N5 named West of the M5, East of B4551 at Romsley. The assessment concluded that made a strong contribution to Purposes a, b and c and not applicable to purposes d and e. However, due to the size of the parcel this does not assist in assessing the effect of the development on Green Belt purposes. Whilst the Council acknowledge this work as an evidence base, it dates from 2019 and was commissioned for plan review purposes against the backdrop of a previous version of the NPPF. The Part 1 Assessment is the first stage in a wider process of Green Belt and site allocation work. This document does not, and is not intended to, justify the release of land from the Green Belt and it does not consider the development potential of land. It was purely intended to establish a baseline of how the Green Belt currently performs and was a starting point for more detailed site assessment and Green Belt assessment work to follow. The assessment was undertaken at strategic level. It is acknowledged that there will be differences in how the land parcels perform against the Green Belt Purposes at the strategic stage in Part 1 of the Purposes Assessment, versus how individual sites within those land parcels perform through detailed site assessment. Overall, the Council consider this document has no relevance in the specific assessments of individual sites as required under the 2024 NPPF and set out in the Grey Belt PPG.
- 11.12 The Framework does not contain a definition of what might constitute sprawl. Concluding on whether the development would conflict with Purpose a, depends on the relationship of the site with the large built-up area. The GBPPOA 2019

refers to Halesowen and describes the A456 as a “strong defensible boundary.” The proposed development is in open countryside some 2km away from the A456 and therefore in spatial terms, is separated from an existing built-up area and does not present an extension of Halesowen beyond its current boundary. It is also physically separated from the ribbon development along the B4551 Bromsgrove Road (Hunnington), in both instances it cannot be described as urban sprawl. As such, the development would be physically and visually discrete from the large built-up area. In this context, the site does not strongly contribute to Purpose a.

Purpose b – Merging

- 11.13 The proposal would result in physical development in the N5 parcel. Therefore, in the strict sense of this purpose, the proposal would not in itself lead to the merging of neighbouring towns. The countryside and open land between towns (in this case Halesowen and Birmingham) is always under pressure from development and it is rarely the case that a single development, on its own, would cause neighbouring towns to merge. However, such areas could be lost incrementally and, over time, lead to the merging of neighbouring towns.
- 11.14 In this case, albeit temporarily, there would be a loss of Green Belt land between the towns of Halesowen and Birmingham. This would result in a minor, temporary reduction, in the gap between these towns. Therefore, the proposal would not contribute to the possibility of these towns merging. However there is significant open land remaining between the site and these towns (even after taking into account the other approved schemes in the area). In both spatial and visual terms it is noted that the gap between Halesowen and Birmingham is made up of a combination of Parcel N5 and other adjoining parcels within the Green Belt which together prevent the merging of neighbouring settlements. The gap function of other parcels within the Green Belt will continue, regardless of the proposed development. There is very limited visibility of the site, and the BESS would have no material impact on the perception of the gap. In this context and given the proposal would be temporary and would not lead directly to the merging of neighbouring towns, the site does not strongly contribute to Purpose b.

Purpose D - To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- 11.15 This is not relevant.

Conclusion on Grey Belt Status

- 11.16 The proposal site does not strongly contribute to any of the three Green Belt purposes required to be considered in a Grey Belt assessment, this is clearly demonstrated above.
- 11.17 When considering the application of the policies in footnote 7 of the Framework (other than Green Belt) it is not considered that these provide a strong reason for refusing the development. There is an extensive discussion on heritage matters elsewhere in this report and it is concluded that whilst concerns have been raised by heritage advisors these do not provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting the development as set out in the application documentation.

- 11.18 On this basis, and in line with the definition of Grey Belt in the Framework (i.e.land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143.) that the site is considered Grey Belt land.

Paragraph 155 Grey Belt Criterion A

- 11.19 This criterion requires that the development proposed would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan (not just this application site). I take this to mean an assessment of the proposal against all 5 of the purposes of the Green Belt. Criteria a, b and d have already been assessed above however this leaves the other 2 criteria in paragraph 143 to be applied.
- 11.20 With regard to Green Belt purpose (c), namely, safeguarding from encroachment, it is accepted that the spatial occupation of the site would clearly encroach into the countryside. However, in relation to the wider parcel of Green Belt which forms the strategic function, within which the site lies, the comparatively small nature of the site itself is such that the harm resulting from encroachment would be negligible when tested against the contribution of the larger parcel to the Green Belt across the area of the Local Plan. Thus, the proposal would not undermine this purpose.
- 11.21 Regarding Green Belt purpose (e), namely, assisting urban regeneration by encouraging recycling of derelict and other urban land, reference should be made to an Alternative Site Assessment (ASA) submitted in support of this application. In the absence of an alternative site, there would be no conflict with Purpose e to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
- 11.22 Whilst there is no requirement in local or national policy for an ASA, as each application is assessed on its own merits, it can form a basis for demonstrating 'very special circumstances' to justify Green Belt development. This has been carried out by the applicant and submitted as part of this proposal.
- 11.23 Focus is given to deliverable and available sites, sites over 1ha in area to accommodate the development. A range of technical, environmental and economic factors were also utilised when assessing suitable sites for the proposed development. This included proximity to sensitive receptors, access and feasibility site size and shape, development plan policy, agricultural land quality, landscape and visual impact, nature conservation and potential for enhancement flood risk; land availability and ground conditions.
- 11.24 The starting point for this assessment is the connection point to the grid. In this case, the site is positioned adjacent to the substation, so requires minimal disturbance to connect to the grid. The ASA found that the sub-stations that are not in the Green Belt cannot support a BESS scheme. Furthermore, out of the Green Belt options, the application site is identified to be free from substantial connection constraints and would be capable of suitably sized BESS development

without the need for significant substation upgrades and reinforcement works. As such, this is a viable and suitable option.

- 11.25 When considering all the necessary requirements to facilitate the development of a BESS including proximity to a grid point of connection, commercial requirements, buildability considerations and planning restrictions, the selection of this site to accommodate the proposed development is a reasonable conclusion set against the criteria.
- 11.26 In these circumstances, the proposed development would not fundamentally undermine this purpose of Green Belt criterion (e) i.e. assisting in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
- 11.27 Drawing all the above matters together, it is concluded that the development would not fundamentally undermine, the purposes when taken together of the remaining GB in the plan area. Criterion A of paragraph 155 is met.

Paragraph 155 Grey Belt Criterion B

- 11.28 This criterion requires that there is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed. The consideration that a BESS project fulfils this requirement and has been substantiated through appeal case law, including in local decisions as outlined above.
- 11.29 A number of objection representations note that applications for BESS are being considered on an individual basis and that there is no clear strategy of where these BESS facilities should be located and how many of these BESS facilities are needed, if they are needed at all.
- 11.30 In the Clean Power 2030 Action Plan it is noted the amount of energy storage that is required by the Government, which is 23-27 additional GW of energy storage by 2030 to meet the Government targets, with it noted that only 1.7GW was installed in 2023. There is no clear strategy set out in any of these Government documents of how and where this will be achieved. The industry and developers are responding to the Governments targets by the submission of these BESS applications. At some point, there may be sufficient BESS connection, with the need for BESS waning, but currently the demand is high for such facilities and the unmet need is apparent in the UK.
- 11.31 There is a very clear steer from Government to promote renewable technology in order to meet net zero ambitions. A recent allowed appeal decision for a BESS Staffordshire Moorlands District Council (Appeal Ref: APP/B3438/W/24/3351328) sets out in paragraph 26 that *“The need to reduce carbon emissions from energy is of fundamental importance and well documented”* and furthermore in paragraph 28 that *“Storage is needed to reduce electricity system costs and increase reliability by storing surplus electricity in times of low demand to provide it when demand is higher.”*
- 11.32 There is substantial information within the National Government documents (referred to above) and within the applicants’ supporting statements that the need

is unmet. As a Council, we have not yet determined the Bromsgrove District requirements/contribution to this unmet need – this would normally be undertaken through the Local Plan process (which would also consider the allocation of sites/criteria for the unmet need). In the absence of an up-to-date Local Plan and/or any other evidence, the need for battery energy storage systems is considered to be unmet. Furthermore, whilst a material consideration, the Clean Power 2030 Action Plan does not override established policy on BESS. EN-1 states that “it is not the role of the planning system to deliver specific amounts or limit any form of infrastructure covered by the NPS” and “the Government does not consider it appropriate for planning policy to set limits on different technologies”.

- 11.33 Further detail is provided in Very Special Circumstances section below and concludes there is a demonstrable need for the type of development proposed (BESS).

Paragraph 155 Grey Belt Criterion C

- 11.34 This criterion requires that the development would be in a sustainable location through limiting the need to travel and that sustainable transport modes are prioritised. This is in relation to development that would generate significant level of vehicle movements, particularly by car. As discussed in the Highway section of this report, this level of traffic movement is not significant, nor would it have an unacceptable effect of highway capacity or safety.
- 11.35 The location of the BESS facility is limited by the factors addressed in the Alternative Site Assessment and, as above, it is accepted that the proposed development site is the only appropriate location. In the context of the development type, the location is considered sustainable and meets this criterion.

Paragraph 155 Grey Belt Criteria D

- 11.36 Criterion D refers to housing development and the ‘Golden Rule’ does not apply.

Conclusions on Grey Belt Exemption

- 11.37 The relevant criteria contained in Framework paragraph 155 are met and this development therefore does not fall to be considered as inappropriate development in the Green Belt. As the development is considered to be not inappropriate, it should not be regarded as harmful either to the openness of the Green Belt (or to the purposes of including land within it, as explained).
- 11.38 Having regard to all the above it is concluded that the application is considered to meet the exception in paragraph 155 of the Framework and is not considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Therefore, as a matter of principle, it does not conflict with Policy BDP4 or the Framework.
- 11.39 As the development is not considered to be inappropriate there is no need to assess openness or to demonstrate very special circumstances to justify the proposal.

- 11.40 However, for robustness and completeness, should Members disagree with the above assessment and conclude that the development does not fall within the Grey Belt exception and the development must therefore be treated as inappropriate development in the Green Belt, then the following assessments on impact on openness and landscape harm as well as whether very special circumstances can be demonstrated have been undertaken.

Impact on Openness

- 11.41 Paragraph 142 of the Framework states that, 'the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence'.
- 11.42 The proposed development would occupy an area of undeveloped land. While some land will be used for landscape and ecological enhancement, the development is highly functional and utilitarian. Most structures will be below 3m in height. Although the development is contained within existing and proposed planting, including reinforced landscaped boundaries, it would result in a loss of spatial openness due to its extent and spread.
- 11.43 In terms of the visual dimension of openness, existing mature planting, although helping to filter views into the site, does not presently effectively screen the site and the proposal would represent a contrast to the undeveloped agrarian landscape, including a few glimpsed views through trees on Illey Lane and from the public footpath to the west and south of the site. The localised visual effect would increase during the winter months although the existing strong mature planting and its reinforcement and enhancement by new landscaping would mean that the development would be viewed through several layers of planting. Notwithstanding, from close distances, including along existing public footpaths, the visual effects would be considerable as it would still result in a change from an agricultural landscape to a more industrialised and utilitarian landscape.
- 11.44 From further afield, the proposal would occupy a relatively small area of land in the overall landscape.
- 11.45 Due to a mix of topography and existing and proposed planting, the effects of the development when viewed from the north and east would be relatively imperceptible. There would be inevitable glimpsed views from longer vantage points but these would be at a distance, and would be filtered through topography, existing vegetation and the increasing establishment of new planting over time.
- 11.46 In this context, the development would remain visible from a number of viewpoints and although the mitigation would temper the effects, due to the scale of the proposed development and its intermittent visibility particularly at certain times of the year, there would be a considerable loss of openness in terms of the visual and spatial dimensions of the Green Belt. Nevertheless, the impact on the Green Belt would not be permanent. However, if the site was no longer needed during the 35 years or at the end, it would be relatively straightforward to remediate the land to its existing state. This would be included as a condition to ensure the

development would not become a permanent feature in the landscape if it no longer in use during the 35 years or at the end of the 35 years.

- 11.47 Overall, the proposal's effect on the openness of the Green Belt expressed in terms of its spatial and visual dimensions, despite the time limit of 35 years which in any event, would constitute a generational negative change, would amount to a considerable harm to loss of openness on a temporary but long-term basis. This would conflict with the Green Belt's purpose to safeguard the countryside from encroachment and conflict with policy BDP4.
- 11.48 As stated in paragraph 160 of the Framework, when located in the Green Belt, elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development. In such cases developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances if projects are to proceed. Such very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources.
- 11.49 The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. The development would also cause some harm to the openness of the Green Belt and by causing some degree of encroachment into the countryside would conflict with one of the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. In line with paragraph 153 of the Framework, the harm to the Green Belt from these matters results in substantial weight against the proposal. The proposal would not accord with BDP4 or the Framework outlined above.

Very Special Circumstances

- 11.50 It may be noted that the Framework at paragraph 160 notes that when located in the Green Belt, elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development. In such cases developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances if projects are to proceed. Such very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources.
- 11.51 Consideration has been given earlier in respect of whether there is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed in the context of meeting Green Belt criterion B.
- 11.52 The battery units would store surplus electricity, including that produced from renewable technologies. Surplus power would be released to the electricity grid for consumption during times of under-production from renewable energy technologies. By storing electricity and facilitating a decrease in the need to produce energy from fossil fuels sources during periods of under supply. The proposed battery storage facility would align with the principles of low carbon technology. There is a clear relationship between the amount of renewable energy generation and energy storage contributing to a faster transition to Net Zero.
- 11.53 This would support energy security and reduce exposure to volatile international fossil fuel prices, by harnessing abundant renewable and low carbon resources. The BESS facility would contribute to the UK's target to decarbonise the power

system supporting the aim in paragraph 161 of the Framework “The planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2005..... It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience”

11.54 Paragraph 168 of the Framework outlines that when determining planning applications for all forms of renewable and low carbon energy developments and their infrastructure, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) should:

- a) Not require applicants to demonstrate the overall need for renewable or low carbon energy, and give significant weight to the benefits associated with renewable and low carbon energy generation and the proposal’s contribution to a net zero future;
- b) recognise that small-scale and community-led projects provide a valuable contribution to cutting greenhouse gas emissions;
- c) in the case of applications for the repowering and life-extension of existing renewable sites, give significant weight to the benefits of utilising an established site.

11.55 The increasing dependence on renewable energy and in particular wind and solar energy has led to fluctuations in supply dependant on the weather, hence the increased need for storage facilities. These store excess energy at times of high renewable generation and provide somewhere to get energy from when demands are high, and generation output is low.

11.56 The provision of low carbon energy is central to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development set out in the Framework. There is strong national policy support, from the Government’s Energy White Paper (EWP) and National Policy Statement EN-1 (NPS), for the development of battery storage, which would aid in the storage of energy generated from renewable sources which by their nature, intermittently generate energy.

11.57 Within the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) the Government concludes Critical National priority (CNP) should be given to the provision of nationally significant low carbon infrastructure. For projects which qualify as CNP Infrastructure, paragraph 4.1.7 states *“it is likely that the need case will outweigh the residual effects in all but the most exceptional cases. This presumption, however, does not apply to residual impacts which present an unacceptable risk to, or interference with, human health and public safety, defence, irreplaceable habitats or unacceptable risk to the achievement of net zero”*.

11.58 Due to its isolated location the proposed BESS facility would not possess residual impacts with human health and public safety implication. Furthermore, the site has not been identified to contain irreplaceable habitats.

11.59 The provision of low carbon energy is central to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development set out in the Framework and the proposals do provide wider environmental benefits associated with

increased production of energy from renewable sources. Very substantial weight is given to this benefit.

- 11.60 Policy BDP22 focuses on how the Council will deliver viable low carbon climate resilient developments. Specifically, the policy goes on and states that the Council will support low carbon energy generation schemes when adverse impacts are addressed satisfactorily.
- 11.61 The application states that the battery storage would contribute to energy security by providing a storage, import and export capacity. The facility would provide a means of storing energy, to be released when need arises and so provides a vital element of infrastructure which supports the use of intermittent renewable energy, allowing renewable power to be utilised when it would otherwise be wasted i.e. when generation exceeds demand.
- 11.62 The proposed scheme would therefore make a valuable contribution to cutting greenhouse gas emissions, by increasing the opportunity to store energy. The national support for such schemes is caveated by the need for the impacts to be acceptable, or capable of being made so. Nevertheless, the energy benefits of proposal, both in terms of its contribution towards energy security and resilience and the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, must be accorded very substantial weight.
- 11.63 There are other benefits in terms of comprehensive landscaping scheme which has a beneficial impact in terms of vegetation cover and landscape character for the area. The urgent need for battery energy storage technology across the grid and the locational constraints associated with this type of technology, which mean that points of connection are a rarity.
- 11.64 The applicant has also ensured that the proposed development has provided at least 10% Biodiversity Net Gain onsite. The proposed development will result in a net gain of 5.33 habitat units (46.44%), 1.87 hedgerow units (25.59%) and 0.30 watercourse units (14.24%).
- 11.65 The economic benefits of the proposal include a significant financial investment into the local and wider economy with jobs (both direct jobs on-site and indirect/induced roles) being created during the construction period.

12.0 Impact upon Landscape Character

- 12.1 Paragraph 187 of the Framework states that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.
- 12.2 Policy BDP1 Sustainable Development Principles seeks the quality of the natural environment including any potential impact on biodiversity, water quality, geodiversity, landscape and the provision of/and links to green infrastructure (GI) networks. Policy BDP21 Natural Environment states that the Council will seek to achieve better management of Bromsgrove's natural environment by expecting developments to protect and enhance the distinctive landscape character of

Bromsgrove, as identified in the Worcestershire Landscape Character Assessment, and take account of the Worcestershire Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Guidance.

- 12.3 The site is situated in a single field between Goodrest Farm and Illey Lane, within a wider landscape east of Bromsgrove Road. The site is well-screened due to hedgerows, hedgerow trees, tree belts, and wooded streams. A dismantled railway forms a distinct sinuous feature, separating the site from residential properties on Bromsgrove Road and filtering direct views of the proposed development. Illey Lane, a minor road to the north and east, channels views due to roadside vegetation, with high hedges or tree belts restricting views towards the site. There are Public Rights of Way (PRoW) with potential visibility of the site throughout the wider area occur. Where these occur they are likely to be on higher ground, above, over or between intervening features in the landscape. At lower levels, including views from close and medium range, are often contained by boundary hedgerows restricting visibility to a single field or the next. The proposed development would introduce battery units and a substation enclosed by fencing and tree/hedgerow buffer to provide screening to mitigate the visual impact.
- 12.4 A Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) has been submitted. In terms of landscape effects on all the identified landscape receptors, these ranged between Negligible Adverse and Moderate Adverse. Moderate adverse effects are expected for the site and its immediate context during the construction and early operational phase of the proposed development in the short to medium term. The long-term landscape effect of the proposed development is assessed as no greater than Minor Adverse.
- 12.5 In relation to visual effects, for the construction phase these were assessed as Moderate Adverse, Minor Adverse in the early operational phase (with developing mitigation) and remaining at a Minor Adverse effect following mitigation. For medium and long-range receptors, the difference in effect between construction and operational phases would be less evident than close range receptors. For medium range receptors, long term effects were within the range of Minor to Negligible Adverse, for long range receptors would be no greater than Negligible Adverse.
- 12.6 All these matters have been assessed in detail in the LVA. The WCC Landscaping Adviser has reviewed the Landscape and Visual Appraisal and overall support the findings set out for landscape and visual impacts and consider the viewpoints selected for assessment to be appropriate. The Advisor does acknowledge the wider risk with this scheme and the potential for cumulative effects when it is considered in context with the similar developments along Illey Lane in short, there is a risk of the overall setting becoming urbanised. However, following the submission of further work regarding this matter (in the form of an Addendum to the LVA), given the scale and location of these approved developments the cumulative effects it is agreed that no cumulative landscape effects are expected between the proposed development other development nearby.
- 12.7 Overall, the proposed BESS would result in Moderate/Minor Adverse landscape and visual effects contrary to the objectives of development plan policy. These

effects would be temporary and with mitigation would, in the short term, be materially reduced. In the long term once the site had been restored, the mitigation planting would have beneficial landscape and visual effects.

13.0 Loss of Agricultural Land

- 13.1 Paragraph 187b of the Framework states that decisions should “recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland”.
- 13.2 Framework Paragraph 188 and associated footnote no.65 states that ‘plans should...distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites; allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. Whilst this paragraph relates specifically to allocating land for uses such as housing or employment as part of plan making, it is considered that it can equally apply to decision making, particularly for large developments. It is worthy of note that the latest version of the Framework against which decisions are to be made has removed the availability of agricultural land use for food production to be considered against other relevant policies both nationally and locally.
- 13.3 Best and Most Versatile (or BMV) land is defined within the Framework as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification. An Agricultural Land Classification and Soil Resources has been carried out by Reading Agricultural Consultants. This identifies that the site comprises 2.1ha (55%) of Grade 3a (good quality), 1.5ha (40%) of Grade 3b (moderate quality) land and 0.2ha (0.5%) as non-agricultural.
- 13.4 There is no definition of ‘significant development of agricultural land’ in planning guidance or legislation although it is noted that Natural England are only consulted where there would be a loss of more than 20ha of BMV land (DMPO 2015). The quantum of BMV within the site is 10.5% of the threshold which requires consultation with Natural England. It is therefore not considered to be significant development in that regard.
- 13.5 The development would therefore result in the temporary loss of 2.1ha of BMV. The site is agricultural fields in pastoral use and is not used for food production. There is no evidence that the land should be kept available for food production in Bromsgrove or the wider area.
- 13.6 Whilst there can be economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, in this case its loss would not cause harm to the overall supply or availability of land for food production and the proposed use is a form of rural land diversification that can complement or support farming of the wider area including the remaining fields within the applicants’ ownership.

- 13.7 It is considered that the proposed development, given that it is time limited and could be reversed in future, is unlikely to lead to significant permanent loss of BMV agricultural land as a resource for future generations. Although it is accepted that the development would prevent any food production taking place on this particular site for the lifetime of the development, it is not anticipated that the temporary loss of this land would compromise the District's overall farming ability.

14.0 Highways, Access and Parking

- 14.1 In line with paragraphs 111 and 112 of the Framework, the impact of development proposals on the highway network should be considered. Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
- 14.2 Policy BDP16 Sustainable Transport requires that 'Development should comply with the Worcestershire County Council's Transport policies, design guide and car parking standards, incorporate safe and convenient access and be well related to the wider transport network'.
- 14.3 A Transport Statement (TS) has been prepared by Local Transport Projects Ltd to assess the impact of the proposed development on the local and wider highway network and to assess the safety and suitability of site access arrangements.
- 14.4 Vehicular access to the site is to be provided via an existing field access connecting with Illey Lane on the north-eastern site boundary, which is expected to be widened as part of the development to accommodate large construction vehicle movements. The access is expected to be utilised during the construction, installation, and maintenance periods. Vehicle parking for site workers during all stages of construction and operation will be accommodated on-site with no vehicles allowed to park or wait on the adjoining highway network during any stage of the development
- 14.5 The delivery and construction/installation period of the proposed BESS is expected to take place over a nine-month period. During this period, there would be trips associated with the arrival and departure of construction staff and the delivery of parts and construction materials. A Construction Traffic Management Plan has been as part of the application. The BESS would operate, generally, on an unmanned basis, however it is understood the facility will generate between 10 and 20 trips per month to support site operations and maintenance activities. These trips will be made by car and/or light vans.
- 14.6 The Highway Authority does not object to the proposals subject to conditions that: the site access arrangement be provided in accordance with full construction details to be submitted to and approved, a highway dilapidation survey, the suitable drainage and surfacing of roads, and adherence to the submitted CTMP. It is considered reasonable and necessary that these conditions should be attached to any permission

- 14.7 On the basis, it is considered that there would be an acceptable impact on highway safety subject to conditions, it is considered that there would not be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network.

15.0 Neighbouring Amenity and Public Health

- 15.1 Policy BDP19 seeks to protect the amenity of nearby residents and requires that developments likely to generate noise are directed to appropriate locations away from noise sensitive areas. Paragraph 180 of the Framework states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by (amongst others) preventing new development from contributing to unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution.
- 15.2 Framework Paragraph 198 states that, *'Planning policies and decisions should... a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life' and 'b), identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason...'*
- 15.3 The application is supported by a noise assessment by e3P. This has been reviewed by WRS Noise. The output from the modelling indicates that daytime rated levels should not significantly impact on (Noise Sensitive Receptors) surrounding the development and that nighttime similarly should not be significant. As the predictions are based on assumed input levels, it is necessary to ensure that when constructed, that the actual noise levels are not higher than this. It is therefore suggested by WRS Noise that this be controlled by condition including the post installation verification of noise levels and amelioration measures if that is the case. As such, the distance of the nearby properties is considered sufficient to avoid any detrimental noise impacts arising from the proposal.
- 15.4 The application includes a Contaminated Land Report to provide advice regarding the nature and potential significance of contaminated land hazards which may be present at the study site. WRS Contamination have reviewed this and have no adverse comments to make.
- 15.5 In relation to battery waste, the disposal of battery units is governed by the 'Waste Batteries and Accumulators Regulation 2009 (amended)'. This establishes a framework for the separate collection, treatment and recycling of waste industrial, automotive and portable batteries. As part of this, it is:
- Compulsory to collect/take back and recycle batteries and accumulators.
 - A requirement to prevent batteries and accumulators from being incinerated or dumped in landfill.
- 15.6 In summary, any batteries which reach their end of life will be sent to regulated waste recycling facilities which hold environmental permits with the Environment Agency. At these facilities, they will be recycled in accordance with the above

Regulations. In this respect, there is not a scenario in which old batteries would be stored inappropriately or put the local environment at risk.

- 15.7 A decommissioning condition was proposed originally as part of condition 3. However on further consideration a dedicated condition has now been included as condition 4, this is proposed to ensure that decommissioning issues are considered early into the 35 year operation of the site.

16.0 Ecology and Biodiversity

- 16.1 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is legislation that was put forward by Government. BNG is an approach to development. It makes sure that habitats for wildlife are left in a measurably better state than they were before the development. In England, BNG is mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021). Developers must deliver a BNG of 10%. This means a development will result in more or better-quality natural habitat than there was before development. This should ideally be provided onsite however a developer is able to purchase offsite credits for BNG elsewhere should it not be possible to provide onsite.
- 16.2 Habitats are assigned a value based on their intrinsic biodiversity value or 'distinctiveness', which is predefined for each habitat within the metric. This value is then multiplied based on the size, condition and geographical location of the habitat in order to ascertain its absolute value in 'biodiversity units'. Separate calculations are used within the metric for area, based habitats, linear habitats (such as hedgerows) and watercourses (including ditches and streams). These units are non-transferable and must therefore be considered individually for each project or development. Collectively, they are referred to as 'biodiversity units'.
- 16.3 The Biodiversity Metric Report has been updated to reflect the changes to the proposal. This indicates that BNG will be delivered wholly on site for this application, and the resultant expected gains that the proposed development a total gain of 4.44 habitat units (40.34%), 1.87 hedgerow units (25.59%) and 0.30 watercourse units (14.24%). Comments have been received regarding whether it is appropriate to include the SUDS as part of the BNG calculations. It's considered primary use is a Sustainable Urban Drainage System, in the unlikely event of a fire, which could result in an impact on the on site habitats, this would be addressed as part of the ongoing habitat monitoring required under BNG. The developer must maintain significant on-site habitats that they create or enhance for a minimum of 30 years. These habitats will be subject to a monitoring schedule that ensures they achieve the target condition and distinctiveness that was stated in the Biodiversity Metric.
- 16.4 A Preliminary Ecological Assessment identified the ecological constraints of the site and recommended mitigation. A GCN eDNA survey also confirms that pond WB1 tested negative for the presence of great crested newts.
- 16.5 Implementation of these mitigation measures will ensure that there are no adverse ecological impacts from the proposed development.

- 16.6 The Council's Ecologist is satisfied with the assessment of impacts relating to protected species and designated wildlife sites. It is also considered that the biodiversity net gain can be achieved on site and constitutes a significant gain in relation to the baseline habitats. The Ecologist agrees with the measures detailed in the habitat management plan and would seek to secure the implementation of this plan. The Ecologist has also outlined relevant conditions relating to a species enhancement plan, the biodiversity net gain habitat management and monitoring plan, compliance with the CEMP and ensuring no lighting is erected without permission. Subject to the inclusion of these conditions, appropriate material planning weight must be given to this uplift in biodiversity within the planning balance.
- 16.7 Subject to implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, the proposed development would comply with Policy BDP21 and BDP24.
- 16.8 The views of the Council's appointed Ecological Consultant and no objection from Natural England are noted and the reports and accompanying plans are considered well-presented and give a clear explanation of likely impacts on ecological features and of proposed mitigation measures.

17.0 Flood Risk and Drainage

- 17.1 The application site lies within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore at the lowest flood risk of flooding; the Environment Agency have not commented on the application.
- 17.2 The drainage strategy for the site indicates that the site will be constructed with permeable materials to allow rainwater to infiltrate into the underlying makeup where it will be intercepted by perforated pipework and feed into a SUDS pond located to the north of the site.
- 17.3 North Worcestershire Water Management (NWWM) have raised no objections to the scheme. However, they have recommended the imposition of a pre-commencement planning conditions stipulating the provision of a detailed surface water drainage scheme and Construction Surface Water Management Plan. NWWM also recommended conditions regarding at least 5m Buffer strip should be maintained alongside any watercourse and a permeable access track.
- 17.4 Concerns have been raised by members of the public in relation to flooding, some in connection with leakage of chemicals from the facility. However, in the event of fire, water used to treat this will be fully contained in that surface water will drain, through the internal drainage basin into the attenuation basin on site. This basin will be lined to stop any water leaching into the ground and is also sealed by a firewater isolation valve.
- 17.5 Therefore it is considered that the proposal would not unacceptably increase levels of flood risk on site. The application is therefore deemed to comply with the Framework and Policy BDP23 Water Management.

18.0 Trees

- 18.1 The Council's arboricultural Officer has commented on the application and has no objection. The Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA) identifies that there are a number of category A arboricultural features, which are high quality and would be required to be retained, subject to adhering with the submitted Arboricultural Method Statement. The proposed does not require or intend the loss of any existing tree on site as detailed in the report and the development has been sympathetically designed with the existing tree stock in mind. The submitted landscaping scheme and proposed planting is welcomed and does well to include native mixes for thicket areas as well as the more formal hedging that surrounds the development
- 18.2 It is considered that the necessary protection methods, mitigation, and enhancement can be secured via conditions to ensure that the proposals are acceptable in relation to trees.

19.0 Heritage and Archaeology

- 19.1 The application site is in close proximity to a number of heritage assets, including the Grade I Listed Sy Mar's Abbey Ruins and the associated SM of the Halesowen Abbey and associated water control features, lying some 600m to the north-east; the Grade II listed Oatenfields Farmhouse, lying some 150m to the west, with additional historic barns which may be considered as being curtilage listed; Illey Mill (non-designated heritage asset NDHA) lying adjacent to the proposed site entrance; and Goodrest Farm (NDHA), lying to the south of the site, which dates at least to 1831, being evident on the First Edition of the OS Mapping.
- 19.2 In accordance with section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA), special regard has been paid to the desirability of preserving listed structures or their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they may possess. Paragraph 200 of the Framework states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should take into account the significance of heritage assets and how they may be affected by proposals. Policy BDP20 managing the Historic Environment is relevant in that it sets out a presumption in favour of "development proposals which sustain and enhance the significance of Heritage Assets including their setting."
- 19.3 The application is supported by a Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment (HEDA) the Council's Conservation Officer has assessed the proposal and HEDA and concurs that there will be a degree of less than substantial harm to the significance and setting of the Grade II Oatenfields Farmhouse through the proposed development, resulting from both the alteration of the agricultural nature of the site, as well as the visual prominence of elements of the scheme, including the scale and size of elements such as the transformer and the high level disconnectors, and that this would be at the lower end of the scale of less than substantial harm.
- 19.4 The officer also agrees that there would be some limited harm to the setting and significance (insofar as the former contributes to the latter) of the Goodrest Farm

complex, again resulting in the need for a balanced judgement to the given to the scale of harm against the significance of the asset

- 19.5 However, the officer disagrees that there would be no harm to the setting, insofar as this contributes to significance, of Illey Mill, as part of the rural character of this setting, which does contribute to its significance, would be altered. It is considered that this would be a low level of harm to significance, where a balanced judgement has to be given to the scale of harm and the significance of the asset.
- 19.6 In relation to other matters raised and in particular to the consultation response by Dudley MBC, the following comments are made.
- 19.7 It is acknowledged that the Illey and Lapal Area of High Historic Landscape Value (AHHLV19) is a non-designated asset. However, it is incorrect to state that this was not assessed as part of the supporting information submitted.
- 19.8 As outlined in the desk-based assessment, the application site falls outside of the AHHLV19 and it does not contribute to its significance due to the modern landscape character exhibited by the site's field amalgamations. Within the Dudley Borough-Wide Urban Historic Landscape Characterisation Study (March 2016), it makes specific reference to AHHLV19 being subdivided into three areas, topography east and west of Lapal Lane South and north of Illey Lane, falling to the west to Illey Brook and then rising to the south to Illey Lane. Farmland south of Illey Lane is described as having a pattern of small, irregularly shaped, hedged fields in a mix of arable and pastoral agriculture, which is evidently different in character from the application site. Furthermore, the application site is well screened from the area of the designation and change within the site is unlikely to impact upon its significance.
- 19.9 The desk-based assessment was submitted prior to the appeal decision at Land at Illeybrook Farm, Illey Lane. In this case, the proposed BESS was within the AHHLV19 but the Inspector concluded in paragraph 34 "...that the appeal development would harm the character and appearance of the immediate area in the short term but would not harm the significance of the NDHA which would be preserved" and that "There would be no conflict with BCCS policy ENV2 that seeks to ensure that the historic character of the Black Country is protected or with DBDS policy S13, which seeks to protect the historic integrity of the AHHLV."
- 19.20 This is a recent decision and supports the position that the application site, which is outside of AHHLV, does not contribute to the significance of the AHHLV and does not harm the significance of the NDHA.
- 19.21 As part of Dudley's objection reference is also made to other designated heritage assets that they do not consider to have been fully assessed as part of the application process.
- 19.22 A number of designated and NDHA were assessed as part of the Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment. Leasowes Registered Park and Garden (Grade I listed) is outside of the 1 km study area used for the desk-based assessment and not within the zone of theoretical visibility. Therefore, the

development would not be anticipated to have any visual impact upon the experience of this designated heritage asset. The development would not have any visual impact upon the experience of the designated heritage assets. As such, it is not anticipated that the proposed development will result in any harm to the heritage significance of the Leasowes Registered Park and Garden.

- 19.23 Halesowen Abbey (Grade I listed and a Scheduled Monument) is within the 1km study area and has been fully assessed. Section 4.2.1 of the desk based assessment outlines that:

“There were no possible views towards the Site from these assets due to distance and topography, with the sloping sides of the small valley formed by the Illey Brook to the south screening any views in the direction of the Site (Photo 12). Given the lack of visibility between the assets and the Site, and the lack of strong historical connection between the land within the Site and the assets, there would be no anticipated impacts to these designated heritage assets. The assets’ setting would be unaffected by development within the site.”

- 19.24 Due to the distance between the site and designated heritage assets identified within Dudley’s comments, as well as the limited ability to appreciate any visual or historic link between them, the development would not be anticipated to result in any harm to these assets.

- 19.25 The Council has assessed the impact of the proposed development on Halesowen Abbey and has not identified any harm to the heritage significance of the Grade I Listed St Mary’s Abbey Ruins, Manor Farm or the Scheduled Halesowen Abbey and associated water control features through changes to their setting. Overall, there is no objection to the development.

- 19.26 In terms of Archaeology matters through analysis of the historical baseline, it is identified that the following archaeological remains may survive within the site:

- Potential palaeolithic head deposits (MWR49433)/unknown prehistoric remains;
- Medieval and Post-medieval agricultural remains
- Remains relating to the anomalies identified through geophysical survey; and
- Other unknown archaeological remains.

- 19.27 If extant within the site, these remains have been identified as likely holding low to medium archaeological interest. As such, none of the remains have been identified as having the potential to be heritage assets of the highest significance and would be unlikely to require preservation *in situ* or otherwise preclude development within the site.

- 19.28 The impact of the proposed development upon the significance of these archaeological remains has been assessed. Truncation or total removal of underlying archaeological remains as a result of groundworks relating to the construction of the BESS within the site has been identified as a potential impact, which would reduce the significance of the remains. Any harm to such remains ought to be weighed in the balance, as per paragraph 216 of the Framework. If remains are present, a proportionate programme of evaluation and mitigation (i.e.

trenching and strip, map and sample) may be an appropriate method of offsetting some of the harm, through preservation by record.

- 19.29 The County Archaeologist has reviewed the HEDBA, including geophysical survey is a comprehensive piece of work and I can see that the current proposed development area (PDA) has been informed by the assessment in so much as it avoids areas of possible archaeology as indicated in the geophysics. County have made a suggestion that further archaeological investigation is undertaken pre-determination, to identify the presence or absence of archaeological remains their character and significance, within the area of the current red line boundary, which may not have been picked up by geophysical survey due to their more subtle, discrete nature.
- 19.30 It is the applicant's position that a proportionate and informed understanding of the nature of the proposed development and any likely archaeological impact has taken place. Any remains that have been identified are likely holding low to medium archaeological interest. As such, none of the remains have been identified as having the potential to be heritage assets of the highest significance and would be unlikely to require preservation *in situ* or otherwise preclude development within the site. The Framework iterates that when determining planning applications for renewable and low-carbon development, local planning authorities should approve the application if its impacts are (or can be made) acceptable (Paragraph 163). It would be disproportionate to require intrusive pre-determination trenching, which would have the potential to cause unnecessary harm to such remains and would be contrary to Paragraph 217. An appropriate scheme of localised trial trenching (e.g., of areas of greater anticipated impact) could be appropriately secured by planning condition in this instance.
- 19.31 Overall, the County Archaeologist have not objected to the proposal and outlined that should the LPA be minded to grant planning permission for this scheme, without further archaeological investigation pre-determination, a programme of archaeological works should be secured and implemented by means of a suitably worded condition attached to any grant of planning permission. This would take the form of evaluation by trial trench initially. This could be followed by further mitigation should the results of the evaluation find evidence to justify further stages.
- 19.32 The Heritage balance is undertaken further into this assessment.

20.0 Fire Risk and Fire Water Management

- 20.1 It is noted that a significant number of representations have raised concern with respect to the potential fire risk and resulting impact on the safety of the area. This includes concerns of the batteries catching fire, causing a thermal runaway and the effects of water to manage any fire, resulting in off-site water contamination from fire water. As a result, questions have been posed as to the proposed fire suppression systems and the site's access for emergency vehicles. An overriding concern expressed is that the BESS would represent an unacceptable safety risk to those living near the site. On this matter, National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) states applicants are encouraged to engage with the relevant local fire

and rescue service. This is so matters relating to the siting and location of battery energy storage systems, in particular in the event of an incident, prevention of the impact of thermal runaway and emergency services access can be considered before an application is made. This is to ensure that the fire and rescue service are given the opportunity to provide their views on the application, to identify the potential mitigations which could be put in place in the event of an incident, and so these views can be considered when determining the application.

- 20.2 Applicants are also encouraged to consider guidance produced by the National Fire Chiefs Council. In Summer 2024, the National Fire Chief's Council undertook consultation on a draft update to their Guidance. As this has not been formally adopted by the NFCC, having taken into account the consultation responses, it has not yet superseded version 1 at the time of writing and should only carry limited weight as a material consideration.
- 20.3 It is important to note that fire safety is covered by separate fire safety requirements and health and safety law. The government maintain that BESS developments are covered by a robust regulatory framework. The House of Commons published a Research Briefing on BESS developments (23 June 2025)³ that, amongst other things, addresses safety concerns. This outlines that there are two documented incidents in the UK, one at a facility in Liverpool in 2020 and one at a facility under construction in Essex earlier this year. It is noted the facility under construction was quickly contained and handed back to site management within a day.
- 20.4 The National Fire Chief's Council Guidance for Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage Systems (October 2023) provides planning guidance to aid the development sector. This document identifies 12 key principles to minimise fire risk and provide suitable emergency measures that include the identification and management of hazards, consideration of the effect on surrounding communities, and enabling safe access for emergency responders in the event of a fire. In terms of safe access, this requires at least two separate points of access into the site to account for wind direction. It also recommends that bespoke Emergency Plans, including both a Risk Management Plan and an Emergency Response Plan, should be prepared in coordination with the Fire and Rescue Service. While they are not a statutory consultee, following deferral at the 29 July 2025 Committee meeting, the Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service has reviewed the updated information. For completeness, their consultation response dated 1 October 2025 has been outlined in full in the consultation section.
- 20.5 In HWFS comments of 29 July they sought further information and clarification on a number of the following matters. The updated comments from HWFS dated 1 October 2025 are included in italics below.

Water Supply and Fire Suppression

³ [Battery energy storage systems \(BESS\) - House of Commons Library](#)

20.6 The updated Firewater Management Plan (FWMP-001 Rev 02) submitted is based on the management and full containment of almost 12 hours of storage at a rate of 1900 l/minute for a total volume of 1,342 m³ without intervention. This exceeds the minimum requirement for water supply of 2 hours at 1900 l/minute noted in the NFCC Guidance. This would be controlled in conjunction with Hereford and Worcester Fire Rescue Service via planning condition 25.

20.7 *We believe this issue has now been resolved, with the applicant agreeing to provide relevant hydrants with the required flowrate. However, we would request that the following condition wording be agreed as part of any approval.*

Site Access and Roadways

20.8 The layout plan has been amended. This now has a secondary access route around the western section of the site around the battery compound. There are now also three separate access points into the battery compound, further passing points have been incorporated into its design. This would be controlled in conjunction with Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service via planning condition 26.

20.9 *We note that the applicant has revised the site layout providing an additional access to the north-east corner of the compound, a perimeter road around the complete BESS facility, which now provides access at three points. We do note the NFCC Guidance states two separate access points to the site, which can be interpreted as the 'whole site' rather than the facility or compound area. We have reviewed the layout and again and are satisfied with the additional laybys provided, and access to the facility in the north, east and south locations.*

Container Separation Distances

20.10 The spacing between BESS units the guidance suggests a minimum of 6m. If distances are to be reduced then clear evidence why should be provided.

20.11 The NFCC guidance in relation to spacing between battery units is based on a 2017 Issue of the FM Global Loss and Prevention Datasheet 5-33 which has since been revised with the FM Global, Property Loss Prevention Data Sheets 5-33. Lithium-Ion Battery Energy Storage Systems, Interim Revision January 2024. The site layout plan showing the BESS, where they are back to back, accord with the minimum distance of 0.915m (3ft) as per guidance within Grid scale electrical energy storage systems: health and safety, published by the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero⁴. The applicants position is that they have demonstrated that the separation distances between units adhere to current guidance based on installation-level testing and current industry standards and have provided the requested information on the BESS units to be installed on site and what safety systems are installed, to ensure they mitigate the risks that this installation could pose.

⁴ [Health and Safety Guidance for Grid Scale Electrical Energy Storage Systems](#)

- 20.12 *Concerning this point we have reviewed the detail provided, and proposed container layout with regard to any proposed operational response, boundary container cooling etc. in the event of an incident. At this point we have no further comments.*

Vapour Cloud, Explosion & Deflagration Risk

- 20.13 The applicant does not consider this is required given the distance from any receptor.
- 20.14 *Following further consultation with the local planning authority and applicant we have reviewed the proposals with regard to the proximity to boundaries and taken account of the compound access points now provided, so make no further comment.*

Operation Response

- 20.15 A planning condition was previously proposed to address this point. This condition has now been updated in conjunction with HWFS and is now condition 26.
- 20.16 *Following further engagement, we do understand that a full response plan is not normally considered at this stage of planning. However, we believe that an extensive, site specific response plan should be agreed prior to any operation on-site, and therefore would request that the following proposed condition be included in any subsequent approval by the local authority.*

Water contamination (further consideration of this matter is outlined in Section

- 20.17 The National Fire Chief Council guidance states that; "Suitable environmental protection measures should be provided. This should include systems for containing and managing water runoff. System capability/capacity should be based on anticipated water application rates, including the impact of water based fixed suppression systems."
- 20.18 *We have reviewed the scheme proposals for water run-off and environmental impact, and note the containment proposals detailed. We make no comment with reference to environmental impact but would propose the following condition be included in any approval by the local authority.*

Testing & Design Evidence

- 20.19 The applicant has submitted a Risk Management Plan. Details of detection and suppression systems are covered under sections 2.6.1.4 (Battery Management Systems)& 2.6.1.5 (Fire Detection, Alerting & Suppression). Condition 24 for the Battery Infrastructure / Technology Proposed addresses this matter.
- 20.20 *This has been discussed with the applicant, and whilst we understand that this detail is often not known at the planning application stage, we would therefore request that the following condition wording be agreed as part of any approval.*

- 20.21 The concerns of the public regarding a fire incident are significant and understandable. However, the proposal has been assessed by the relevant authority (HWFR) in terms of its likely impact on the public and environment. The proposal is sited over 150m from the nearest residential property, well beyond the minimum distance of 25–30 meters outlined in NFCC guidance. The are considered sufficient to mitigate the risk of a serious fire incident, and to mitigate any major risks that might occur from a fire (or other incident) to people, the environment, ecology, ground, air and water.
- 20.22 In conclusion there is no compelling evidence to demonstrate that the facility would be hazardous or incompatible with its location within the open countryside. Moreover, it is guidance from the NFCC it is clear that HWFS have taken this into account and then deployed their site specific and local area knowledge in providing their detailed response in October 2025. In the unlikely event of a fire, the facility would be readily accessible by a fire tender and HWFS has raised no concerns in this regard subject to relevant conditions. As such, there is no clear reason within the submitted evidence that illustrates why the facility would be especially vulnerable to the risk of fire.

21 Heritage Balance

- 21.1 On heritage matters, the Framework requires that before carrying out a Planning Balance or the Green Belt Balance, a Heritage Balancing exercise is to be undertaken. Framework paragraph 212 advises that when considering the impact of a development on the significance of a designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to its conservation and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Framework paragraph 215 indicates that where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage assets (HA), this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
- 21.2 Great weight is accorded to the potential harm to the identified heritage assets. Balanced against this, the contribution the BESS would make to the acknowledged need for battery storage to assist in mitigating the effects of climate change and maintaining energy security attracts great weight. The absence of alternative sites, BNG and landscape enhancements attract significant weight and the economic benefits attract limited weight. Given their scale and nature, these public benefits outweigh the low level of less than substantial harm to HAs. The less that substantial harm to the HAs does not provide a clear reason for refusing the BESS.

22 Planning Balance

Conclusion in a scenario where the development accords with Framework paragraph 155.

- 22.1 This proposal would utilise Grey Belt land and having regard to the provisions of Framework paragraph 155, the development would not comprise inappropriate

development in the GB. The great weight attached to the contribution to mitigating climate change and to energy security, albeit temporary, the significant weight to the absence of alternative sites, the potential for permanent BNG and landscape enhancements and the limited weight the economic benefits generated by the proposal outweighs the temporary Moderate/Minor adverse landscape and visual effects, the less than substantial harm to heritage assets. Subject to the imposition of conditions, the proposal would not conflict with the development plan when read as a whole or the Framework.

Conclusion in the scenario where the development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt

- 22.2 Framework paragraph 153 requires the decision maker to give substantial weight to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
- 22.3 The great weight attached to the contribution to mitigating climate change and to energy security, albeit temporary, the significant weight to the absence of alternative sites, the potential for permanent BNG and landscape enhancements and the limited weight the economic benefits generated by the proposal outweighs the temporary Moderate/Minor adverse landscape and visual effects, the less than substantial harm to HAs. Accordingly, taking the case as a whole, very special circumstances exist which justify the development.
- 22.4 I conclude that the benefits of this proposal, clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and the other harms identified such that very special circumstances exist to justify this proposal. Subject to the imposition of conditions, the proposal would not conflict with the development plan when read as a whole or the Framework.

23 Conclusion

- 23.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 sets out that in considering planning applications the determination must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This is re-iterated within paragraphs 12 and 48 of the Framework. Having regard to all the above, the proposed development has been found to comprise Grey Belt land and is therefore considered to be acceptable in principle. It will provide renewable energy infrastructure and BNG enhancements on site while the moderate/minor adverse landscape impact is identified and the less than substantial harm to heritage assets.
- 23.2 There are considered to be no technical reasons to withhold planning permission. In weighing together all relevant factors, the proposal is considered to constitute sustainable development as defined within the Framework and is considered to be

acceptable when assessed against the aforementioned national planning guidance and local planning policy.

- 23.3 As such, it is recommended that committee endorse the recommendation to grant planning permission subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be **GRANTED**

Conditions:

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of the grant of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following documentation, plans and drawings:

01 Site Location Plan
02 Existing Site Layout Plan
03 Proposed Site Layout Plan REV 1
04 Fire Strategy Plan REV 1
05 Section Plan
06 Contextual Site Elevations
GRE002-SD-01_rev01 -132kV Substation (Plan)
GRE002-SD-02_rev01 -132kV Substation (Section)
GRE002-SD-03_rev01 -2.4m Palisade Fence and Security Gate
GRE002-SD-04_rev01 - 40ft Welfare Office
GRE002-SD-05_rev01 - DNO Control Room
GRE002-SD-06_rev01 - CCTV Camera and Pole
GRE002-SD-07_rev01 - Access Track
GRE002-SD-08_rev01 - Aux Transformer
GRE002-SD-09_rev02 - Battery Unit
GRE002-SD-10_rev01 - Twin Skid (TX)
GRE002-SD-11_rev01 - PCSK Inverter
GRE002-SD-12_rev01 - Battery Interface Cabinet
Outline Mitigation Plan 0755-01 Rev 09
Visibility Splays: LTP/5804/P2/01.01 Rev O
Tracking: LTP/5804/P2/01.02 Rev O
Vertical Alignment: LTP/5804/P2/03.01 Rev O

Reason: To provide certainty to the extent of the development hereby approved in the interests of proper planning/

3. The development hereby granted shall be limited to a period of 35 years from the date when electricity is first exported from the approved BESS to the electricity network.

Written confirmation of the first export date shall be given to local planning authority within 14 days of the first export date.

Within 35 years following the first export date of the development hereby permitted, the batteries, transformer units, inverters, all associated structures and fencing approved shall be dismantled and removed from the site. The developer shall notify the Local Planning Authority in writing no later than twenty-eight working days following cessation of power production. In the event of a cessation of operations of the electricity storage facility for a period of 6 months, the scheme approved under condition 4 shall be fully implemented and all plant, machinery and structures associated with the development (including the internal haul roads) shall be removed from site. The electricity storage facility shall not be re-created under the terms of this planning permission.

Reason: To provide for the completion of operations and restoration of the site at the earliest opportunity within the project timescale, in the interests of amenity, minimising the duration of any adverse impacts.

4. Within 12 months of operational use of the site hereby approved, a Decommissioning Method Statement including a scheme of restoration for the removal of the Battery Energy Storage Facility, subject of this planning permission, and any associated equipment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The restoration scheme shall be in accordance with this approved plan, the approved decommission general arrangement plan and the site restored in accordance with the decommission soft landscaping plan.

Reason: To ensure that the site is restored and reclaimed to minimise the duration of adverse impacts and the protection of the Green Belt.

5. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced (with the exception of site clearance and groundworks), full details of the facing colours of all the following structures: fencing, battery units, buildings, tanks and CCTV poles, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the development would integrate, respect and complement the character of the area and wider landscape.

6. A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and approved by the LPA prior to commencement of the works. The CEMP shall be designed to mitigate potential construction phase impacts on ecological features, including but not limited to designated sites, notable habitats, great crested newts and other amphibians, bats, birds, badgers, otters, hedgehogs, brown hare and reptiles.

Reason: To minimise negative impacts on ecological receptors during construction.

7. A sensitive lighting plan covering both the construction and operation phases of the development shall be produced and be approved by the LPA prior to commencement of works.

Reason: To avoid light spill onto retained trees, hedgerows and watercourses, during both construction and operation of the site, thereby minimising potential negative impacts of lighting on bats, birds, badgers, otters and other species that are active at night.

8. The development shall not commence until a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (the HMMP), has been prepared in accordance Biodiversity Metric Report ref 81-381 (E3P, September 2025) and approved by the LPA. The HMMP must include:

- A non-technical summary;
- The roles and responsibilities of the people or organisation(s) delivering the HMMP;
- The planned habitat creation and enhancement works to create or improve habitat to achieve the biodiversity net gain in accordance with the Biodiversity Gain Plan;
- The management measures to maintain habitat in accordance with the Biodiversity Gain Plan for a period of 30 years from the completion of development; and
- The monitoring methodology and frequency of reporting in respect of the created or enhanced habitat to be submitted to the LPA has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

Once approved, the created and/or enhanced habitat specified in the approved HMMP shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved HMMP for a period of 30 years from completion of development.

Reason: To secure the delivery of ecological enhancement.

9. Notice of the following elements, set out in the HMMP, shall be given in writing to the LPA within 14 days of such completion:

- Completion of habitat creation and enhancement works;
- Monitoring reports, in accordance with the methodology and frequency specified in the approved HMMP; and
- Verification of achieving targeted habitat condition of each habitat type, once target condition is achieved.

Reason: To secure the delivery of ecological enhancement

10. No development shall take place until the tree protection measures as set out in the Arboricultural Method Statement have been implemented. The tree protection fencing shall be erected in accordance with BS 5837: 2012 and retained throughout the construction phase until completion of the development. Should any pruning to retained trees be necessary to facilitate the development, they are to be done in accordance with BS3998:2010.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to protecting the trees which are to be retained on the site during construction works in the interest of the visual amenities of the area.

11. Prior to the installation of any approved battery units, transformers, structures and fencing, a schedule of landscape implementation and maintenance for a minimum period of 10 years shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning

Authority. The schedule shall include details of the arrangements for the phasing of the implementation and ongoing maintenance during that period in accordance with appropriate British Standards or other recognised codes of practise, including the identification of parties responsible for delivery and management. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule. Any trees or planting that are removed, die or become, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective within this period, shall be replaced before the end of the current or first available planting season following the failure, removal or damage of the planting.

Reason: To enable the development to respect, complement and positively integrate into the character of the area.

12. No development shall take place until a programme of archaeological work including a Written Scheme of Investigation, has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

- a) The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording.
- b) The programme for post investigation assessment.
- c) Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording.
- d) Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
- e) Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
- f) Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of paragraph 218 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

13. The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (12) and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of paragraph 218 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

14. Prior to first operation of the site equipment a noise impact assessment detailing the actual plant noise emissions, shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval. This shall include proposals for verification testing the noise levels within 3 months of first operating the equipment. The noise emissions shall not exceed at the façade of residential premises 40 dBLAr for day and night periods. Rating levels shall be freefield from direct measurement and extrapolation and in accordance with BS 4142:2014+A1:2019: or its successor. Where levels are shown to exceed these levels, further mitigation measures shall be submitted and approved by the local planning authority and installed within an agreed timescale.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the locality to ensure compliance with policy BDP19.

15. No works in connection with site drainage shall commence until a surface water drainage scheme for the proposed development has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of surface water drainage measures, including for hardstanding areas, and shall conform with the national standards for SuDS (Defra, 2025) and the Flood risk and drainage assessment submitted with the application (Gondolin, September 2025). The scheme shall include an assessment to demonstrate that the proposed scheme provides sufficient treatment prior to the attenuated discharge from the site. Discharge rates shall be limited to 5.3l/s for events up to the 1 in 100 year (1% annual probability) event plus 40% climate change allowance. The scheme shall include proposals for the containment of firewater on the site. The approved surface water drainage scheme shall be implemented prior to the first use of the development and thereafter maintained in accordance with the agreed scheme.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to protect water quality and to ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage assets in accordance with policy BDP23 Water Management.

16. No works or development shall take place until a construction surface water management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include how surface water will be managed during the construction phase, including site clearance and soil stripping. The plan shall include drawings of any temporary drainage systems, a timeline of construction and measures to mitigate the risk of pollution (including silt) of the water environment and offsite flood risk. The plan shall detail how the approved permanent surface water drainage system shall be remediated during the construction phase. The approved construction surface water management plan shall be implemented as soon as works start on site thereafter maintained during the full duration of the construction phase.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to protect water quality in accordance with policy BDP23 Water Management.

17. No works, other than the planting detailed in the submitted Outline Mitigation Plan (Stephenson Halliday, Drawing 0755-01, Rev 09), shall be undertaken within 5 meters of any watercourse.

Reason: To protect the water environment and riparian zone in accordance with policies BDP23 Water Management and BDP24 Green Infrastructure.

18. The access track hereby approved shall be laid with a permeable material unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. If a non permeable material is proposed, prior to its construction the access track shall be accompanied by a revised drainage strategy, adhering to the principles agreed for the surface water drainage scheme agreed under condition 15 (Surface water drainage scheme condition). The approved surface water drainage scheme shall be implemented prior to the first use of the development and thereafter maintained in accordance with the agreed scheme. The access track shall be maintained in good order for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding in accordance with policy BDP23 Water Management.

19. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the first 15 metres of the access into the development (or the length of the largest vehicle to use the access), measured from the edge of the carriageway, has been surfaced in a bound material.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

20. Before development commences, a detailed schedule of works, design for the site access and signing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. No works in association with the proposal shall commence until the site access works and signing, has been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with Worcestershire County Council Highways, and has been implemented in full.

Reason: In the interests of achieving safe and suitable highway access for all users.

21. The development hereby approved shall not commence until the vehicular access has been provided as shown on drawings.

- Visibility Splays: LTP/5804/P2/01.01 Rev O
- Tracking: LTP/5804/P2/01.02 Rev O
- Vertical Alignment: LTP/5804/P2/03.01 Rev O
- 03 Proposed Site Layout Plan REV 1

Reason: To ensure conformity with submitted details and highway safety.

22. The development hereby approved shall not commence / be brought into use until the visibility splays 2.4m x 215m (left) & 98.7m (right) shown on drawing LTP/5804/P2/01.01 Rev O have been provided. The splays shall at all times be maintained free of level obstruction exceeding a height of 0.6m above adjacent carriageway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

23. The development hereby approved shall not commence until a pre-construction highway condition survey has been undertaken to the satisfaction and approval of the Local Highway Authority. The extent of the survey shall be agreed and approved in writing. A copy of the survey shall be issued to the Local Highway Authority, as an approved record. Upon completion of the development construction phase, a follow-up condition survey shall be undertaken to the satisfaction of the Local Highway Authority.

Reason: To ensure integrity of the local highway network is maintained, in the interests of highway safety.

24. Notwithstanding the submitted information, no development shall commence on site until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include but not be limited to the following:

- a. Measures to ensure that vehicles leaving the site do not deposit mud or other detritus on the public highway.
- b. Details of site operative parking areas, material storage areas and the location of site operatives facilities (offices, toilets etc).
- c. The hours that delivery vehicles will be permitted to arrive and depart, and arrangements for unloading and manoeuvring.
- d. Details of any temporary construction accesses and their reinstatement.
- e. Details of the proposed routes for the Abnormal Loads and HGV's

The measures set out in the approved Plan shall be carried out and complied with in full during the construction of the development hereby approved. Site operatives' parking, material storage and the positioning of operatives' facilities shall only take place on the site in locations approved by in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the provision of adequate on-site facilities and in the interests of highway safety and public amenity.

25. No development shall take place until a scheme to dispose of surface water and any contaminated drainage from fire suppression has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service).

A construction phase Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) should also be submitted and agreed to ensure that surface water run-off and contamination is temporarily intercepted, stored, treated, and discharged from the site during construction of the scheme.

A management and maintenance plan shall be submitted to ensure surface water drainage systems are maintained and managed for the lifetime of development, including the name and contact details of the body(-ies) responsible.

The scheme shall include:

- a) details of any fire prevention systems;
- b) evidence of agreement with the Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service to confirm the expected volume and nature of contaminated water which would need to be managed in the event of a fire on the site (subject to an approved fire incident response plan being agreed);
- c) details of the nature of any contaminants which could be present from a failure and leak from the batteries and/or transformer(s) on site;
- d) details of fire water containment systems and how these will be designed to prevent infiltration and/or isolated to prevent direct discharges of contaminants to surface water outfalls;
- e) details of SUDS features and how these will be constructed to prevent the infiltration of contaminated water to ground (e.g. the proposed permeable hardcore will need to be lined to prevent infiltration);

- f) details of how the drainage system will be designed such that it is resistant to damage and corrosion that may occur during a fire incident;
- g) a management and maintenance plan to ensure that all drainage features, including penstock valves are maintained and functional throughout the life of the development. This should include plans for replacement and repair of elements that may be damaged as a result of a fire incident;
- h) evidence that a plan is in place, including the name and contact details of the body(-ies) responsible, to remove and safely dispose of any contaminated water stored on site in the event of an incident, including fire.

Reason: To ensure potential hazards and details of mitigation measures reduce environmental hazards to an acceptable level as required by BDP19.

26. No battery unit or associated electrical equipment shall be brought on the site until details of an overarching Fire Safety Precaution Statement for the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (following consultation with Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service). This statement shall be guided by the applicant's submitted Fire Safety Strategy and the "Grid scale battery energy storage system planning - Guidance for Fire and Rescue Services" published by the National Fire Chiefs Council (or any subsequent update and references). Thereafter, the development shall operate in accordance with the measures outlined in the approved Fire Safety Precaution Statement.

Reason: To ensure potential hazards and details of mitigation measures reduce environmental hazards to an acceptable level as required by BDP19.

27. Prior to the commencement of any above ground works pursuant to the development permitted, a detail site layout plan shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Authority and Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service. The approved scheme will require two access points, with appropriate turning and passing laybys, adjacent to site fire hydrants.

The scheme will include as a minimum two fire hydrants capable of delivering 1,900 litres per minute at the site (unless an alternative is agreed in writing with Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service). The two fire hydrant locations shall be agreed and detailed on the site layout plan, and included in the Emergency Response Plan.

Reason: To ensure potential hazards and details of mitigation measures reduce environmental hazards to an acceptable level as required by BDP19.

28. Prior to the commencement of any above ground works pursuant to the development permitted, a detail and site specific Emergency Response Plan shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Authority and Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service. The Emergency Response Plan shall be developed using best practice guidance as detailed and required in the published Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning - Guidance for FRS published by the National Fire Chiefs Council. The development shall be carried out and thereafter operated only in accordance with the approved site specific Emergency Response Plan.

The site specific Emergency Response Plan should cover as a minimum;

- a) Hazard Information;
- b) Response Procedures;
- c) Environmental Impact Mitigation;
- d) Post Incident Operations;
- e) Communication and Notification;
- f) Command & Control;
- g) Training & Exercising Responsibilities;
- h) All relevant site specific information.

Reason: To ensure potential hazards and details of mitigation measures reduce environmental hazards to an acceptable level as required by BDP19.

Case Officer: Mr Paul Lester Tel: 01527 881323
Email: paul.lester@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank


24/00960/FUL

Land Off Illey Lane, Hunnington, Halesowen


Proposed Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) and
associated infrastructure

Recommendation: GRANT planning permission subject
to conditions


Site Location Plan



Site Context Plan



Aerial View



Existing Layout



Proposed Layout

SECURITY GATE

DNO BUILDING

SUBSTATION

AUXILIARY TRANSFORMER

CCTV CAMERA

FIRE HYDRANT

EXISTING VEGETATION

Page 92



APPLICATION BOUNDARY

INTERNAL ROAD

PERIMETER FENCELINE

SITE ACCESS

SUDS POND

POWER STATION

20 ft BESS CONTAINER









SWITCHGEAR BUILDING

MONITORING ROOM/OFFICE


Agenda Item 5

Landscaping Plan




PROPOSED FEATURES

	Proposed Wildflower Meadow Seeding 4,341 m ²
	Proposed Modified Grassland Seeding 5,418 m ²
	Proposed Attenuation Basin Basin shall be lined with a layer of subsoil above and a meadow seed mixture applied.
	Proposed Native Thicket 5,025 m ²
	Proposed Native Hedgerow 291 m
	Proposed Native Tree 33 no.
	Proposed Hardstanding
	Proposed Fence

Page 93



RETAINED FEATURES

	Groups of Trees and Trees to be retained
	Existing Hedgerow to be retained
	Existing Grassland to be retained

Agenda Item 5




Fire Safety Plan


Evacuation Route




Battery Storage Spacing








Fire Safety – Firewater Management



Proposed Access Plan








Proposed Battery Unit



NOTES:-
CONTAINERS OVER 4 CONCRETE CUBES IN EACH OF THE CORNERS
Dimensions: 0.50 x 0.50 x 0.80 cm

Proposed Inverter



PLAN VIEW





SIDE VIEW

SIDE VIEW


END VIEW

END VIEW


Proposed DNO Control Room




Proposed Monitoring Room/Office




PLAN VIEW




END VIEW



REAR VIEW




END VIEW




FRONT VIEW


Proposed 132kV Substation



Existing and Photowireline View from PROW Goodrest




Existing and Photowireline View from PROW



Existing and Photowireline View from PROW Telepole near Illey Mill




Page 105



Agenda Item 5

Other Approved Schemes

Page 106




- 1 Land at Illeybrook Farm, Illey Lane
- 2 Land at Lowlands Farm, Illey Lane, Halesowen
- Proposed connection at Kitwell Substation

Agenda Item 5

Other Approved Schemes Proposed Layouts

1. Land at Illeybrook Farm, Illev Lane



2. Land at Lowlands Farm, Illey Lane, Halesowen



Name of Applicant	Proposal	Expiry Date	Plan Ref.
Chapel Hill Homes Ltd	Outline planning permission for two dwellings (landscaping reserved) 39 Parish Hill, Bournheath, B61 9JH	10.10.2025	25/00055/OUT

Councillor May has requested that this application be considered by Planning Committee rather than being determined under Delegated Powers

RECOMMENDATION: That outline planning permission be **GRANTED**

Consultations

Worcestershire Highways - Bromsgrove

- No objection subject to conditions.

North Worcestershire Water Management

- The site falls within flood zone 1. No objection on flood risk or drainage grounds, subject to conditions.

Bournheath Parish Council

Object to the outline application for residential development of two dwellings based upon the following four material planning considerations.

- Inappropriate development of the Green Belt
- Traffic generation and road safety
- Flood risk
- Sustainability

Publicity

14 neighbour letters sent 26 March 2025 (expired 19 April 2025)

Site notice displayed 4 April 2025 (expired 28 April 2025)

7 objections submitted. Summarised as follows:

- Outside the settlement boundary – detrimental to Green Belt. Not infill development.
- Elevations of the properties should be restricted to ensure the impact of openness on the Green Belt is minimised.
- Object to the layout/scale of the houses.
- Object to the modern design of the houses in this semi-rural setting
- Dwellings proposed in a prominent elevated location with two identical dwellings would look alien in the local setting. Out of character. No account has been made of the low in height 'cottage style' dwellings that are near the site.
- Double garages look horrible in front of the houses.
- Concerns of overlooking.
- Concerns in respect to speeding vehicles using the road particularly on the bend and close to the road junction of Parish Hill. Farm traffic use the road and concern that construction traffic will add to traffic issues.

- No pavements outside of the site. Concern about children and young people using the road.
- Concern about car parking arrangements.
- Limited services close by, reliance on vehicle to get to services.
- Impact on wildlife.
- Flooding issues in the area because of the culverted watercourse to the south of the application site.
- Concerns in respect to noise and air quality.

Councillor May

- Wish to call this application into Planning Committee as residents are concerned about the impact of this development on neighbouring properties; particularly flood risk that already exists. This call in is on the grounds of public interest.

Relevant Policies

Bromsgrove District Plan

BDP1 Sustainable Development Principles

BDP2 Settlement Hierarchy

BDP4 Green Belt

BDP7 Housing Mix and Density

BDP19 High Quality Design

BDP21 Natural Environment

BDP23 Water Management

Others

Bromsgrove High Quality Design SPD

National Planning Policy Framework (2024)

National Planning Practice Guidance

Relevant Planning History

23/00977/PIP	Residential development of up to 2 dwellings.	Refused	05.10.2023
		Allowed at appeal	26.09.2024
21/01866/FUL	Retrospective application for a rear two storey extension	Refused	09.06.2022
19/01468/CPL	Rear two-storey extension	Approved	23.12.2019
19/01420/FUL	Front porch and lounge extension	Approved	06.01.2020
B/5674/1979	The use of land for parking of a commercial vehicle.	Refused	19.03.1979

Assessment of Proposal

Site Description

The application site is an open, undeveloped field which has an existing gated access onto Parish Hill. The site lies within the Green Belt and is positioned directly to the north-west edge of the settlement boundary of Bournheath. The gradient of the land declines towards the east and south of the site. The field is enclosed with a mature hedgerow that fronts the road.

Proposal

The proposal is for the construction of two detached dwellings on the site. The dwellings would have 4 bedrooms and a detached double garage would be positioned in the front garden area of each dwelling. The properties would front Parish Hill. The house plots are generous and evenly spaced within the site. The hedgerow is proposed to be maintained as part of the development with the removal of some hedgerow to provide access arrangements for each plot.

This application seeks outline planning permission for 2 dwellings on the same site that has the benefit of a PIP approval (application reference 23/00977/PIP and appeal reference APP/P1805/W/23/3332459). Matters of access, appearance, layout, and scale are for consideration under this application with landscaping to be considered under a future Reserved Matters application.

The application site boundary for the outline application is smaller than the PIP application as detailed below. The site layout is very similar to that submitted under the PIP application.

Relevant Planning History

Members may be aware that a PIP (Permission in Principle) application is relevant to this site (planning ref: 23/00977/PIP). Permission in Principle (PIP) is an alternative route of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development. This process separates the issues concerning the principle of the proposed development, from the technical details of the proposal.

The Permission in Principle process has two stages - Permission in Principle (PIP), which establishes whether a site is suitable in principle; and the second stage - Technical Details Consent, where the detailed development proposals are assessed. When assessing applications for Permission in Principle (PIP), the scope for assessment is limited to location; land use; and amount of development.

The PIP application (23/00977/PIP) which included a site layout of two dwellings and double garages, was refused permission primarily on the basis that the proposal would comprise inappropriate development within the Green Belt, as the proposed development would not be limited infill in a village. The applicant appealed the decision.

Whilst the Planning Inspector for the appeal acknowledged that the site lies outside of any settlement boundary defined in the Bromsgrove District Plan, the Inspector considered that “on the ground”, having regard to the local pattern of development, the appeal site formed part of the Village of Bournheath.

Furthermore, as there is no definition of “limited infilling” within policy, the Inspector considered this as a matter of planning judgement, having regard to the nature and size of the development, its location, and relationship of the site to existing nearby development.

Based on these considerations, the Inspector concluded that the proposal would be limited infill and therefore Permission in Principle was allowed on appeal.

The appeal decision was allowed on 26 September 2024 and is an extant permission. The next stage of Permission in Principle would be for the applicant to apply for a Technical Details Consent when the detailed development proposals would be assessed.

Outline Application

The site layout plan shows two detached double fronted dwellings and double garages with access off Parish Hill. The dwellings and garages would have a hipped roof the dwellings would be finished in render with a central brick gable feature on the front elevation. Each dwelling would provide 4 bedrooms and be positioned within a generous plot.

The site is within the Green Belt and Policy BDP 4 of the Bromsgrove District Plan would apply. Development within the Green Belt is considered inappropriate unless it falls under a limited number of exceptions. Policy BDP4(f) of the BDP lists one of these exceptions to be limited infilling in Green Belt Settlements. This reflects paragraph 154 of the NPPF which states that limited infilling within villages may not be inappropriate within the Green Belt. Definitions for “limited infilling” and “settlements/villages” are absent from the NPPF.

The PIP appeal that was allowed on 26 September 2024 for two dwellings on this site is an extant permission that could still be implemented, and as such provides a strong fallback position for the applicant, making it an important material consideration for this application. The Planning Inspector made a planning judgement in respect to the PIP proposal and concluded that it would be limited infill development in the Green Belt, and as such would be in accordance with Policy BDP4 of the Bromsgrove District Plan, and paragraph 154(e) of the NPPF.

The NPPF indicates that openness is an essential characteristic of the Green Belt. Openness in terms of the Green Belt has a spatial aspect as well as a visual aspect. When considering a planning application, substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

The dwellings are proposed on a hillside location and would have a modest adverse effect on openness in terms of spatial aspect as well as visual aspect due to the elevated location, and long-distance views of the site. However, very special circumstances do apply to this outline application given that the PIP appeal included a site layout that showed the footprint of two dwellings and detached garages in similar locations to that now proposed for this outline application. It is considered that the Planning Inspector

would have taken into consideration the impact of openness on the Green Belt when they concluded that the proposal was an infill development and considered it to be acceptable.

However, to ensure that impact on openness is minimised, the dwellings are shown to be positioned within the contours of the site. In addition, the scheme has been amended from the original submission to reduce the bulk of the development by changing the roof design of the dwellings from a dual pitch roof to a hipped roof. The roof pitch has also been amended to a shallower roof pitch which has reduced the overall height of the dwellings from 8.5m to 7.9m. Taking into consideration these factors, the scale of impact on the openness of the Green Belt has been further reduced and is considered acceptable.

Access

Access to the property would be via Parish Hill with individual access points cutting into the existing hedgerow to serve each plot. Worcestershire County Highways note that the site is a semi-rural location off an unclassified road with a speed limit of 30mph.

Three car parking spaces are proposed for each dwelling in accordance with County Council's car parking requirements set out in the Worcestershire County's Streetscapes Design Guide. County Highways have no objection to the proposal subject to conditions.

Appearance, Layout, Scale

The appearance of the dwellings is acceptable; there is a mix of material finishes to properties on Parish Hill comprising brickwork and render. Therefore, the proposed development would be in keeping with the surrounding properties in Parish Hill.

The properties would be set back from the road. The gradient of the land declines to the east and south of the site. The properties would be positioned at least 16.8 metres away from the road. As such the dwellings would sit within the contours of the site and would be at a lower level in relation to the neighbouring property 39 Parish Hill. In addition, the existing hedgerow that fronts the site would also be maintained.

Public comments submitted in respect to the proposal refer to the size and design of the dwellings, particularly how they would relate to existing properties that exist on Parish Hill. Whilst it is noted that Parish Hill does comprise of several smaller cottage style properties, there is a varied mix of housing with some properties of a slightly larger scale. Following comments from neighbouring occupiers, there has been a revision to the elevations to reduce the scale of the dwellings as detailed above. In addition, longitudinal plans have been submitted to clarify the positioning of the properties in relation to the contours of the site and neighbouring properties, to demonstrate that the impact of these proposals would not cause harm to the streetscene. The proposal in terms of the design of the dwellings and layout of the proposal would be in accordance with Policy BDP19 of the Bromsgrove District Plan. In addition, the proposal would also be in general accordance with the spacing requirements set out in the Council's SPD on High Quality Design.

Highway Matters

Worcestershire County Highways have been made aware of resident's concerns regarding highway safety in this location, and a speed survey was conducted by the Authority between 9 June 2025 – 17 June 2025, which confirmed the 85th%tile speeds to

be 32mph southbound and 30mph northbound. The survey also confirms that the average speeds are shown to be lower than 32mph value, with the majority being below 30mph.

The speed survey was located north of the proposed development site in the vicinity of No. 20 Parish Hill which is a straight stretch of road, if the speed survey had been carried out in the vicinity of the proposed site, the speeds would have been lower due to the location of the bend and junction. In accordance with the 85th%tile speeds the recommended visibility splays are 2.4m x 52m southbound and 43m northbound and these can be achieved to standards set out the Streetscape Design Guide.

Based on the analysis of the information submitted, the Highway Authority concludes that there would not be an unacceptable impact and therefore there are no justifiable grounds on which an objection could be maintained.

Neighbours have expressed concerns regarding highway speeds, and size of vehicles that use the road, with some residents actively involved in community speed checks as a result. Concerns have also been raised in respect to construction traffic to and from the site. County Highways have noted the concerns from residents and have recommended that a Construction Management Plan condition be imposed with other highway conditions. This would enable County Highways to consider the logistics of potential construction traffic whilst the site is under construction.

It is considered that the conditions recommended by County Highways fully address the concerns raised residents in respect to highway matters.

Drainage Matters

Neighbours have also expressed concerns regarding a culverted watercourse that is causing local drainage issues in the vicinity of the site.

North Worcestershire Water Management (NWWM) have confirmed that the site falls within flood zone 1 (low risk of fluvial flooding) and is not shown to be susceptible to surface water flooding.

NWWM also confirm that the culverted watercourse, a tributary of the Elmbridge Brook, flows via a culvert along the southern boundary hedge, which is located outside of the application red-line boundary of the site. Along its length, the culvert changes diameter frequently, which has led to flooding of the highway and properties in the vicinity. This culvert currently takes no land drainage from this parcel of land. For this reason, it is of vital importance that no surface water from the site is disposed into the culvert, as this is likely to result in an increase in flood risk. A minimum of 5m easement along the length of the culvert should be provided, to ensure no damage to the culvert during construction, and to retain access for future maintenance.

NWWM have reviewed the drainage technical note and are satisfied that site investigations carried out confirm the soils underlying the site can allow for infiltration drainage. These tests were conducted in October and December 2024; Autumn 2024 was wetter than average for the Midlands region, therefore these tests will have been conducted during suitable conditions, and as such NWWM accept the results submitted.

With ground conditions allowing for infiltration, the applicant is proposing a combination of porous paving for the car parking area (with an under-drained area also providing the drainage for the garages) and modular soakaway units. These soakaways will be designed to accommodate the 1:100 year rainfall event, plus an appropriate allowance for future climate change. Therefore, all new impermeable areas will be drained within the site boundary, with no water leaving the site up to a 1:100 return period event. As such, NWWM are content that the proposed development will not result in an increase in flood risk off-site.

Based on the above information NWWM have no objection on flood risk or drainage grounds. Suitable conditions are recommended.

Ecology and Biodiversity

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) of 10% for developments is a mandatory requirement subject to some limited exceptions. This means a development will result in more or better-quality natural habitat than there was before development. This should ideally be provided on site however, a developer is able to purchase off site credits for BNG elsewhere should it not be possible to provide onsite.

Unless exempt, every planning permission granted pursuant to an application submitted after 12 February 2024 is deemed to have been granted subject to a pre-commencement condition requiring a Biodiversity Gain Plan to be submitted and approved by the local planning authority prior to commencement of the development. It has been found that the proposal triggers the need to provide a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG).

A small sites metric has been submitted which shows a baseline of habitat units for the site. The headline results page is showing a net loss in habitat units and therefore no 10% gain is being secured on site. Off-site credits will therefore need to be purchased to comply with the requirements. The planning permission would be granted subject to a pre-commencement condition for a Biodiversity Gain Plan to be submitted, this would set out how the 10% would be achieved and evidence submitted to demonstrate that off-site credits have been secured. On this basis, the application is considered acceptable.

The submitted Biodiversity Impact Assessment raises no concerns in respect of protected species. A planning condition can be secured for a general enhancement of bat and bird boxes.

5 Year Housing Land Supply

The Council acknowledges that it cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply.

In view of this and having regard to the presumption in favour outlined in paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the lack of a 5 year housing land supply would mean that the policies that are most important for determining the application are out of date (paragraph 11(d) and footnote 8), and that planning permission should be granted unless:-

(i) The application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development. (Footnote 7 clarifies that includes policies relating to Green Belt) Or,

(ii) Any adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

In view of limb (i) the proposal has been found to comprise appropriate development in the Green Belt and therefore there is no clear reason to refuse outline planning permission on this basis.

In respect of limb (ii) the proposal would result in 2 No. additional dwellings to the housing supply, which would provide a limited contribution. There would be limited economic benefits during the construction phase and further limited economic and social benefits arising from the future occupiers using the local public houses, for example. There are no technical concerns with the proposal that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal as a whole. The proposal should therefore be granted outline planning permission subject to the necessary conditions.

RECOMMENDATION: That outline planning permission be **GRANTED:-**

Conditions:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of one year from the date of approval of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

Reason:- In accordance with the requirements of Section 92 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 An application for approval of the reserved matters specified in Condition 3 below, must be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of two years from the date of this permission.

Reason:- In accordance with the requirements of Section 92 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 3 No development hereby permitted shall commence until details of the following matters (in respect of which approval is expressly reserved) have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority: (a) The landscaping of the site. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:- In accordance with the requirements of Section 92 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 4 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the plans/documents:-

Location plan Dwg. No. SL-1-01A

Proposed site layout SL-2-01A

House type A floorplans Dwg. No. 2-101

Housetype A elevations Dwg. No. 2-201 Rev. A
Garage details Dwg. No. 2-202
Longitudinal site section Dwg. No. 55-1-2
Streetscene Dwg. No. SS-1-1 A
Proposed Drainage Strategy Dwg. No. MCC-C-D-501 Revision A02

Reason: To provide certainty to the extent of the development hereby approved in the interests of proper planning.

- 5 Prior to their first installation, details of the form, colour and finish of the materials to be used externally on the walls and roofs shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development is satisfactory in appearance, to safeguard the visual amenities of the area.

- 6 The Development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the first 5 metres of the access into the development, measured from the edge of the carriageway, has been surfaced in a bound material.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

- 7 The Development hereby approved shall not be occupied until an area has been laid out within the curtilage of the dwelling for the parking of 3 cars (per dwelling) at a gradient not exceeding 1 in 8. This area shall thereafter be retained for the purpose of parking a vehicle only.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure the free flow of traffic using the adjoining highway.

- 8 The Development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until sheltered, safe, secure and accessible cycle parking to comply with the Council's adopted highway design guide has been provided in accordance with details which shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the approved cycle parking shall be kept available for the parking of bicycles only.

Reason: To comply with the Council's parking standards.

- 9 The Development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the access, parking and turning facilities have been provided as shown on drawing SL-2-01A.

Reason: To ensure conformity with submitted details.

- 10 Development shall not begin until visibility splays are provided from a point of 1.05m above carriageway level at the centre of the access to the application site and 2.4 metres back from the near side edge of the adjoining carriageway, (measured perpendicularly), for a distance of 52m southbound and 43m northbound measured along the nearside edge of the adjoining carriageway, to a vertical offset distance of 0.6m from the edge of the carriageway. Nothing shall be

planted, erected and/or allowed to grow on the triangular area of land so formed which would obstruct the visibility described above.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

- 11 The Development shall not commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include but not be limited to the following:-

- Measures to ensure that vehicles leaving the site do not deposit mud or other detritus on the public highway;
- Details of site operative parking areas, material storage areas and the location of site operatives' facilities as required;
- The hours that delivery vehicles will be permitted to arrive and depart, and arrangements for unloading and manoeuvring;
- The size of the construction vehicles, number of construction vehicles and the frequency of these vehicles.
- Tracking of the largest vehicle in/out of the site entrance.
- Applicant to confirm any traffic management measures proposed for construction vehicles on Parish Hill, also to include any temporary signage / use of a banksman to oversee all vehicular manoeuvres, construction vehicles to avoid peak pedestrian times.
- Any temporary traffic management measures such as signage and / or cones in the highway will require a permit. Applications can be made via www.worcestershire.gov.uk
- Measures to demonstrate that those immediately affected by the construction works will be kept informed and due consideration and courtesy will be shown to the local community.

The measures set out in the approved Plan shall be carried out and complied with in full during the construction of the development hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure the provision of adequate on-site facilities and in the interests of highway safety.

- 12 Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report carried out by a qualified, independent drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the LPA to demonstrate that the surface water drainage system has been constructed as per the approved plans.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory drainage for the lifetime of the development which does not increase flood risk off site.

- 13 The permeable paving areas shall be maintained to facilitate the optimal functionality and performance of the surface water drainage scheme. Permeable surfaces shall not be replaced by impermeable surfaces without prior written approval from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory drainage for the lifetime of the development which does not increase flood risk off site.

- 14 Prior to first occupation, in order to provide a net gain in biodiversity for protected species, two schwegler bat and/or bird boxes or equivalent per dwelling shall be placed on site in suitable locations at least 3 metres above ground level facing to the south or east and kept thereafter in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure the provision of enhanced biodiversity facilities within the site.

Case Officer: Sharron Williams Tel: 01527 534061 Ext 3372
Email: sharron.williams@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

25/00055/OUT

39 Parish Hill, Bournheath, Bromsgrove

**Outline planning permission for two dwellings
(landscaping reserved)**

Recommendation: That outline planning permission be GRANTED

Site Location Plan

Page 122



Agenda Item 6

The Site



Site Layout Plan



Elevations



Front Elevation
1 : 100



Side Elevation
1 : 100



Rear Elevation
1 : 100



Side Elevation
1 : 100

Floor Plans




Ground Floor
1 : 100




First Floor
1 : 100


Garage Details




Front Elevation
1 : 100




Side Elevation
1 : 100




Rear Elevation
1 : 100



Side Elevation
1 : 100




Ground Floor
1 : 100




Roof Plan
1 : 100

Site Section




A-A PROPOSED LONGITUDINAL SITE SECTION



LOCATION PLAN - NTS

Streetscene



PROPOSED STREETSCENE LOOKING EAST ALONG PARISH HILL

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Performance Information Quarter One (1 April 2025 – 30 June 2025)

Responsible Portfolio Holder	Councillor Kit Taylor
Responsible Assistant Director	Ruth Bamford

1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To receive an item of information in relation to planning performance and the outcomes of recent planning appeal decisions and planning appeal cost awards. Officers will answer any related questions at the meeting as necessary.

2.0 Recommendation

- 2.1 The Committee is asked to **RESOLVE** that this item of information is noted.

3.0 Report

- 3.1 This report provides details on the determination timescales for planning applications and planning appeals at Bromsgrove District Council when tested against the Government set timescales. This paper seeks to provide Members with a quarterly breakdown where applicable. Appendix One to this report contains a list of planning appeals determined in the relevant quarter. Appendix Two to this report contains a list of recent cost award outcomes relating to planning appeals.

4.0 Planning Statistics

- 4.1 On a quarterly basis, Local Planning Authorities supply information to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) on planning application type, volume, the speed of determination and other matters such as the number of planning Enforcement Notices, Breach of Condition Notices, Certificates of Lawfulness and Notification applications. The Government then use this information to publish planning performance data for each Local Authority that assesses the speed of decision making and the quality of decision making for major and non-major applications.
- 4.2 The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government publishes the document 'Improving Planning Performance'. This sets out that a local planning authorities' performance is based on two measures, that of the speed and the quality of their decisions on planning applications for major and non-major development. The document sets out the relevant performance targets and the concept of being designated if targets are not met.

5.0 Speed of Decision-Making

- 5.1 Planning performance is based on a one-year rolling assessment period and measures the speed of decision-making.
 - 5.2 Speed of decision-making is measured by the proportion of applications that are decided within the statutory determination period (8 weeks for non-major applications and 13 weeks for major applications), or an agreed extended period of time.
 - 5.3 The Government requires a minimum of **60%** of major and **70%** of non-major applications to be determined in time, or within an agreed extension of time.
 - 5.4 Underperformance for speed of decision-making is when a Local Planning Authority determines a lesser proportion of applications in time compared to the required threshold.
-

6.0 Bromsgrove District Council Speed of Decision-Making Figures

- Speed of decision-making for major applications over the rolling one-year period = **92.8%**
- Speed of decision-making for non-major applications over the rolling one-year period = **87.7%**

NB: The Government requires a minimum of **60%** of major applications and **70%** of non-major applications to be determined in time, or within an agreed extension of time.

Source: These are internal Officer level calculations.

7.0 Quality of Decision-Making

- 7.1 The information on the quality of decision making looks at the Local Planning Authority's performance over a two-year period. The performance data looks at the number of major and non-major applications determined by the District Council, how many have been refused, how many decisions have been appealed and how many appeals have been allowed. It then expresses the result of a percentage of the total applications in those categories.
- 7.2 Quality of decision-making is measured by the proportion of total decisions, or non-determinations, that are allowed at appeal. Fundamentally the performance measure is assessing how many applications the Authority has refused that have gone to appeal and the decision has been overturned by the Planning Inspectorate. The Government have set the maximum threshold that no Authority should exceed **10%** of decisions overturned at appeal.
- 7.3 The data is intentionally nine months behind the date of publication to allow a time lag for appeals in the pipeline to be determined.

- 7.4 Underperformance for quality of decision-making (represented by the proportion of applications that are subsequently overturned at appeal) is when an Authority achieves a higher proportion of applications overturned at appeal compared to the required threshold.
-

8.0 Bromsgrove District Council Quality of Decision-Making Figures

- Quality of decision-making for major applications for the most recent period available (October 2022 – September 2024) = **5.7%**
- Quality of decision-making for non-major applications for the most recent period available (October 2022 – September 2024) = **2.5%**

NB: The Government requires that no Local Planning Authority should exceed 10% of decisions overturned at appeal.

Source: Table 152a and 154 [Live tables on planning application statistics - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/live-tables-on-planning-application-statistics)

9.0 Further Statistical Information

- 9.1 Members can access further information relating specifically to applications received and determined, application types, outcomes and those relating to a particular geographical area of the District, by using the Public Access advanced search and completing the relevant drop-down options. Guidance on how to use the advanced search function of Public Access can be found in the Public Access User Guide.
- 9.2 Planning Application statistics for all Local Planning Authorities across England are also published on a quarterly basis by MHCLG. Information on planning application statistical performance is available on the GOV.UK live tables. The tables can be accessed here: [Live tables on planning application statistics - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/live-tables-on-planning-application-statistics).
- 9.3 The Planning Inspectorate also publishes statistics in relation to their timeliness with planning appeals, which can be accessed here: [Statistics at The Planning Inspectorate - Planning Inspectorate - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/statistics-at-the-planning-inspectorate)
- 9.4 The Government is also promoting the 'Planning Performance Dashboard' [Planning Performance Dashboard Table Final.xlsx](#) which shows the proportion of decisions made by a local planning authority with, and without, the use of Extension of Time agreements. The Government considers providing this level of information enhances the transparency of planning performance data.
-

10.0 Bromsgrove District Council Appeal Decisions

- Number of major appeals allowed in Quarter 1 and dismissed in Quarter 1:

Allowed = 0
Dismissed = 0

- Number of non-major appeals allowed in Quarter 1 and dismissed in Quarter 1:

Allowed = 6
Dismissed = 8

- 10.1 A list of appeal decisions received in Quarter 1 are provided in Appendix One attached to this report.
-

11.0 Planning Appeal Cost Awards

- 11.1 A list of cost award outcomes relating to recent planning appeals is provided in Appendix Two attached to this report.
- 11.2 For the reference of Members, a cost award is akin to a civil debt, for which the limitation period to claim is six years from the date of the cost award decision.
-

12.0 Financial, Legal, Policy and Risk Implications

- 12.1 It is important to manage and monitor the speed of decision-making, the quality of decision-making and cost awards.
-

13.0 Consultation

- 13.1 There has been no consultation other than with relevant District Council Officers.
-

14.0 Author of Report

- 14.1 The author of this report is Dale Birch (Development Management Manager) who can be contacted on 01527 881341 or d.birch@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk for more information.

14.2 Date of Report

30 September 2025

15.0 Appendices

- 15.1 Appendix One
Appeal Decisions: Quarter One

15.2 Appendix Two Recent Cost Award Outcomes

Appendix One Appeal Decisions: Quarter One

Non-Major Appeal Decisions Quarter 1 (14)

Application Reference	24/00399/CPE
Decision Status	Delegated
Appeal Reference	APP/P1805/X/24/3348680
Site	Sugarbrook Nurseries, Sugarbrook Lane, Stoke Pound
Proposal	Certificate of lawfulness for business storage, equestrian, residential amenity and agricultural land
Inspectorate Decision	Dismissed
Date of Decision	7 April 2025

Application Reference	24/00605/HHPRIO
Decision Status	Delegated
Appeal Reference	APP/P1805/D/24/3352930
Site	Sandhills Farm, Sandhills Green, Barnt Green
Proposal	Side/rear single storey extension
Inspectorate Decision	Allowed
Date of Decision	8 April 2025

Application Reference	24/00097/FUL
Decision Status	Delegated
Appeal Reference	APP/P1805/W/24/3352451
Site	Berries View, Banks Green, Upper Bentley
Proposal	convert a brick-built garage/workshop into a 2-bedroom dwelling. Change of use from outbuilding to residential unit
Inspectorate Decision	Dismissed
Date of Decision	11 April 2025

Application Reference	23/00898/FUL
Decision Status	Delegated
Appeal Reference	APP/P1805/W/24/3350913
Site	Land to the east of Appletrees, Hanbury Road, Stoke Prior, Bromsgrove
Proposal	2 No. detached dwellings
Inspectorate Decision	Dismissed
Date of Decision	25 April 2025

Application Reference	24/00451/PIP
Decision Status	Delegated

Appeal Reference	APP/P1805/W/24/3354450
Site	Land at 17 Alexander Close, Catshill
Proposal	Permission in Principle for the erection of one bungalow
Inspectorate Decision	Dismissed
Date of Decision	30 April 2025

Application Reference	24/00474/PIP
Decision Status	Delegated
Appeal Reference	APP/P1805/W/24/3354657
Site	2 Kenyon Close, Bromsgrove
Proposal	Permission in Principle for the erection of a single dwelling
Inspectorate Decision	Dismissed
Date of Decision	30 April 2025

Application Reference	24/01165/S73
Decision Status	Delegated
Appeal Reference	APP/P1805/W/25/3359681
Site	Farley Farm, Farley Lane, Romsley
Proposal	Application for the removal of conditions 3 and 4 attached to Planning Application ref B/2004/0605 which currently restrict permitted development rights
Inspectorate Decision	Dismissed
Date of Decision	8 May 2025

Application Reference	23/01245/OUT
Decision Status	Delegated
Appeal Reference	APP/P1805/W/24/3356588
Site	Land adjacent 54 Rock Hill, Bromsgrove
Proposal	Outline application for the development of 8 x 1 bedroom flats, cycle and bin stores and other associated works. All matters to be determined with the exception of landscaping.
Inspectorate Decision	Dismissed
Date of Decision	8 May 2025

Application Reference	24/01023/FUL
Decision Status	Delegated
Appeal Reference	APP/P1805/D/25/3359551
Site	63 Summervale Road, Hagley
Proposal	Single storey extension to rear, with double storey above existing garage and loft conversion with rear dormer, including raised patio to rear (retrospective)
Inspectorate Decision	Allowed
Date of Decision	27 May 2025

Application Reference	24/00630/S73
Decision Status	Delegated
Appeal Reference	APP/P1805/W/25/3359974
Site	Grey Cottage, Redditch Road, Alvechurch
Proposal	Removal of Condition 3 attached to planning permission reference B/2002/1294 to re-instate permitted development rights under Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A to E and Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A of the GPDO
Inspectorate Decision	Allowed
Date of Decision	30 May 2025

Application Reference	23/01375/FUL
Decision Status	Delegated
Appeal Reference	APP/P1805/W/24/3355790
Site	Land at Backlane Farm, St Kenelm's Road, Romsley
Proposal	Retention of boundary fence.
Inspectorate Decision	Allowed
Date of Decision	29 May 2025

Application Reference	23/01347/FUL
Decision Status	Delegated
Appeal Reference	APP/P1805/W/24/3355806
Site	The Firs Farm, Hanbury Road, Stoke Prior
Proposal	Building operations comprising external alterations of a building necessary to facilitate the change of use under Class R (Prior Approval Reference 23/00580/NOT)
Inspectorate Decision	Allowed with costs
Date of Decision	10 June 2025

Application Reference	23/00324/FUL
Decision Status	Committee
Appeal Reference	APP/P1805/W/24/3354949
Site	Alvechurch Sports and Social Club, Radford Road, Alvechurch
Proposal	Refurbishment of the existing building and extension to accommodate new bed and breakfast accommodation (Use Class <i>Sui Generis</i>)
Inspectorate Decision	Allowed
Date of Decision	19 June 2025

Application Reference	24/00855/AGR
Decision Status	Delegated
Appeal Reference	APP/P1805/W/24/3354513
Site	Flourishing Fields Farm, Stonehouse Lane, Hopwood
Proposal	General purpose agricultural storage building
Inspectorate Decision	Dismissed
Date of Decision	26 June 2025

Appendix Two Recent Cost Award Outcomes

Application Reference	23/01245/OUT
Decision Status	Delegated
Appeal Reference	APP/P1805/W/24/3356588
Site	54 Rock Hill, Bromsgrove
Proposal	Outline application for the development of 8 x 1bedroom flats, cycle and bin stores and other associated works. All matters to be determined with the exception of landscaping.
Inspectorate Decision	Dismissed
Date of Appeal Decision	8 May 2025
Date of Cost Decision	8 May 2025
Cost Decision Type	Refused
Application Reference	23/01347/FUL
Decision Status	Delegated
Appeal Reference	APP/P1805/W/24/3355806
Site	The Firs Farm, Hanbury Road, Stoke Prior
Proposal	Building operations comprising external alterations of a building necessary to facilitate the change of use under Class R (Prior Approval Reference 23/00580/NOT)
Inspectorate Decision	Allowed
Date of Appeal Decision	10 June 2025
Date of Cost Decision	10 June 2025
Cost Decision Type	Full
Date Cost Award Lodged	18 September 2025
Date Cost Award Agreed	22 September 2025
Cost Award Settlement	£3000:00
Application Reference	24/00855/AGR
Decision Status	Delegated
Appeal Reference	APP/P1805/W/24/3354513
Site	Flourishing Fields Farm, Stonehouse Lane, Hopwood
Proposal	General purpose agricultural storage building
Inspectorate Decision	Dismissed
Date of Appeal Decision	26 June 2025
Date of Cost Decision	26 June 2025
Cost Decision Type	Refused