

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

THURSDAY 4TH DECEMBER 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, R. E. Lambert, S. R. Peters, J. Robinson and J. D. Stanley

Officers: Mrs. R. Bamford, Mr. D. M. Birch, Mr. M. Howarth (Anthony Collins Solicitors) Mr. G. Nock (Jacobs, on behalf of Worcestershire County Council, Highways), Mr. B. Simm, Worcestershire County Council, Highways, Development Management and Control Manager, Ms. J. Chambers, Mrs. S. Hazlewood, Mr. J. Pavey-Smith and Mrs. P. Ross

Prior to the meeting commencing, the Chairman informed all those present that the running order of the agenda had been amended, as follows:-

- **Agenda Item No. 6 – Planning Application 25/00901/S73**
- **Agenda Item No. 5 – Planning Application 25/00768/S73**
- **Agenda Item No. 7 – Permission in Principal Application 25/01151/PIP**

51/25

APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was received from Councillor S. J. Baxter.

52/25

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor A. Bailes declared an Other Disclosable interest in relation to Agenda Item Number 6 (Minute No. 55//25) – 25/00901/S73 - Land at Whitford Road, Bromsgrove, in that he had represented residents at the public inquiry and appeal. Councillor A. Bailes left the meeting room for the duration of this agenda item and took no part in the Committee's consideration nor voting on this matter.

Councillor A. Bailes also declared a personal interest with regard to Agenda Item Number 7 (Minute No. 57//25) – 25/01151/PIP – Land off Withybed Lane, Alvechurch, in that his spouse, Councillor R. Bailes would be speaking as Ward Member on this application; under the Council's Public Speaking Rules. Councillor A. Bailes stated that it would not cloud any of his decisions and would consider the application objectively. Councillor A. Bailes stayed in the meeting room for the

duration of this agenda item and took part in the Committee's consideration and voting on this matter.

Councillor J. Clarke declared an Other Disclosable interest in relation to Agenda Item Number 6 (Minute No. 55//25) – 25/00901/S73 - Land at Whitford Road, Bromsgrove. Councillor J. Clarke left the meeting room for the duration of this agenda item and took no part in the Committee's consideration nor voting on this matter.

Councillor J. Robinson declared an Other Disclosable interest in relation to Agenda Item Number 6 (Minute No. 55//25) – 25/00901/S73 - Land at Whitford Road, Bromsgrove, in that he had previously made public comments on this application. Councillor J. Robinson left the meeting room for the duration of this agenda item and took no part in the Committee's consideration nor voting on this matter.

53/25

MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 9th October 2025 were submitted for Members' consideration.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 9th October 2025, be approved as a true and accurate record.

54/25

UPDATES TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS REPORTED AT THE MEETING

The Chairman announced that a Committee Update had been 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 had sufficient time to read the contents of the Committee Update and were happy to proceed.

55/25

25/00901/S73 - VARIATION OF CONDITION 25 OF PLANNING PERMISSION 24/00516/S73: FROM: NO PART OF THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE OCCUPIED UNTIL THE JUNCTION OF FOX LANE/ ROCK HILL HAS BEEN ALTERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SCHEME FOR A ROUNDABOUT SHOWN ON THE PLAN FOX LANE/ ROCK HILL SCHEMATIC REF 7033-SK-005 REVISION F TO: NO PART OF THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE OCCUPIED OTHER THAN NO MORE THAN 49 DWELLINGS (OF WHICH, NO MORE THAN 30 SHALL BE FOR PRIVATE SALE AND NO MORE THAN 19 SHALL BE FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING) UNTIL THE JUNCTION OF FOX LANE/ ROCK HILL HAS BEEN ALTERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TEMPORARY SCHEME SHOWN ON THE PLAN WSP DRAWING 7033-WSP-HGN-00-SK-C-0022-V2 REV P02. THEREAFTER, NO PART OF THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE OCCUPIED OTHER THAN NO MORE THAN 365 DWELLINGS (OF WHICH, NO MORE THAN 219 SHALL BE FOR PRIVATE SALE AND NO MORE THAN 146 SHALL BE FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING) UNTIL THE JUNCTION OF FOX LANE/ROCK

HILL HAS BEEN ALTERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SCHEME FOR A ROUNDABOUT SHOWN ON THE PLAN FOX LANE / ROCK HILL SCHEMATIC SCHEME REF 7033-SK-005 REVISION G AND ANCILLARY DRAWINGS 7033-S278-701 REV CO2, 2015804 AGE-ZZ-XX-DR-X-0002, 0003, 0004, 0005, 0006 REV CO2

At this stage in the meeting, Councillors A. Bailes, J. Clarke and J. Robinson left the meeting room.

Officers presented the report and in doing so highlighted that the application was for the variation of Condition 25 of planning permission 24/00516/S73 granted in December 2024, as follows:-

FROM: No part of the development shall be occupied until the junction of Fox Lane/ Rock Hill has been altered in accordance with the scheme for a roundabout shown on the plan Fox Lane/ Rock Hill schematic ref 7033-SK-005 revision F.

TO: No part of the development shall be occupied other than No more than 49 dwellings (of which, no more than 30 shall be for private sale and no more than 19 shall be for affordable housing) until the junction of Fox Lane/ Rock Hill has been altered in accordance with the temporary scheme shown on the plan WSP Drawing 7033-WSP-HGN-00-SK-C-0022-V2 Rev P02. Thereafter, no part of the development shall be occupied other than no more than 365 dwellings (of which, no more than 219 shall be for private sale and no more than 146 shall be for affordable housing) until the junction of Fox Lane/Rock Hill has been altered in accordance with the scheme for a roundabout shown on the plan Fox Lane/Rock Hill schematic scheme ref 7033- SK-005 revision G and ancillary drawings 7033-s278-701 rev C02, 2015804 AGE- ZZ1XX-DR-X-0002, 0003, 0004, 0005, 0006 REV C02.

Officers drew Members' attention to the presentation slides, as detailed on pages 61 to 67 of the main agenda pack.

Officers highlighted that the proposal before Members tonight did not remove the need for the proposed original roundabout. The roundabout was still proposed as part of the amended condition.

Officers referred to page 3 of the Committee Update which detailed additional comments from The Bromsgrove Society and the responses from the applicant, Worcestershire County Council (WCC), Highways and the Planning Assessment and Conclusion.

A copy of the Committee Update was provided to Members and published on the Council's website prior to the commencement of the meeting.

Members were informed that principally, the interim scheme involved widening Fox Lane to create an additional short lane. Each lane would be 3m wide. A pedestrian refuse facility would be provided with dropped

kerbs either side of Fox Lane. This had resulted in additional capacity. The technical approvals process had involved a detailed design review of the proposals supported by an independent Road Safety Audit Stage 1 / 2.

Worcestershire County Council (WCC), Highways and Mott MacDonald had been consulted, as detailed on pages 36 and 42 of the main agenda pack. WCC Highways had raised no objections.

The current Condition 25 required the roundabout scheme to be in place prior to the occupation of the 50th dwelling. The variation of condition application, before Members, now sought to vary the trigger for the improvement scheme and take a staged approach to enhancing the junction on a temporary basis, then ultimately delivering the roundabout scheme to allow further occupation at the site during this time period.

This principally would involve increasing the capacity of the junction by providing a left-turn lane on Fox Lane. The junction would remain as a priority T-Junction but with increased capacity.

Officers drew Members' attention to the Recommendation on page 35 and 51 of the main agenda report and suggested that if minded to grant the planning permission that the Recommendation be amended as follows:-

'b) That delegated powers be granted to the Assistant Director for Planning, Leisure and Culture Services to determine the application following the receipt and completion of a suitable and satisfactory legal mechanism, **if required** in relation to the following matters:'

At the invitation of the Chairman the following public speakers addressed the Committee:-

- Ms. J. Slade, Chairman of the Bromsgrove Society in objection to the application.
- Councillor N. Price, County Councillor Bromsgrove West, in support of the application.
- Mr. D. Dixon, Associate Director, WSO, on behalf of Bellway Homes, in support of their application.
- Mr. G. Anderson, Chief Executive, Bromsgrove District Housing Trust (via Microsoft Teams) in support of the application.
- Councillor D. Hopkins, Ward Councillor.

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

In response to a query raised by one of the public speakers with regard to the public consultation being flawed, Members sought clarity on this.

Officers confirmed that the correct consultation had been carried out with the correct time scales and the comments received within those

timescales had been included on the public access and further referred to in the Committee Update.

Members further referred to the comments made by public speakers on data from WCC, Highways, querying if the most up to date and appropriate data was used for this particular scheme.

Officers clarified that the data that had been utilised was in accordance with the guidance provided by the Department for Transport, in that the last 5 year period data could be utilised, so 2024 was a suitable year for the data used.

Members further questioned if the data were still suitable, taking into account a causation effect on the possible data and if Officers could expand on the mitigations with the lack of the roundabout now, how effective would the temporary scheme be in managing the extra traffic mentioned?

The WCC, Highways Officers stated that the new scheme provided betterment in terms of providing greater capacity at the junction by providing two lanes, compared to the existing junction arrangements. The interim scheme provided greater capacity was more manageable.

Mr. G. Nock, on behalf of WCC, Highways further added that in terms of data provenance, this would be the same data that was presented to Planning Committee Members in June 2025, with questions being raised, at that particular time, regarding the reliability of the data. The data being used was suitable and his position with regard to thus had not changed. WCC, Highways position regarding the data set was outlined in the Officers report and was a suitable data set for Members to make a decision.

With regard to the overall efficiency of the proposed interim scheme, the efficiency could probably best be described in terms of the interim scheme providing some additional capacity by virtue of the additional lane being provided on Fox Lane, with the positioning of vehicles simultaneously side by side on the minor arm. This allowed better use of gaps in the available traffic on the main road, Rock Hill to enter safely and efficiently. The traffic modelling in support of that had demonstrated that there would be reduced delays compared to the existing layout, and in his professional opinion having scrutinized this, was that this would be a localised improvement that would provide betterment in terms of capacity and operational efficiency.

Officers further responded to questions from Members with regard to the retaining wall and footpath.

Members raised further concerns with regard to the cumulative impact of the other development phases further to the north and other potential applications for the land area in between and the cumulative impact this would have. Members were concerned about the knock-on effect into

the surrounding areas and the road network and safety implications, further down the line if this interim solution ends up becoming the enduring solution. Members also expressed some concern that current occupants of the site and a further 365 dwellings being occupied were being asked to live their lives without the convenience of the retail unit that was originally promised to them. Would the provision of the retail unit help mitigate additional traffic?

Members further commented that given the information in the Officers report and the weight given by the questions answered by the WCC, Highways Officer and their representative, that this was being driven by networkwide constraints and the need for affordable homes.

Officers clarified that a convenience store was planned and not a major supermarket.

Further discussions took place on the wording of the Recommendation (b) and the amendment suggested by the Officer at the start of the meeting and as detailed in the preamble above; and the restriction of the occupation of the retail unit.

With the agreement of the Chairman, a brief adjournment took place in order for Members to consider the wording of an alternative recommendation.

Accordingly, the meeting stood adjourned from 18:50 hours to 19:10 hours.

Having reconvened, Members stated that having discussed the recommendation regarding the retail unit, Members had thought that on balance the volume of traffic generated by the retail unit would be less if the retail unit was provided. Members would like the residents at Whitford Heights to have the early benefit of a small convenience store rather than have to wait until the roundabout was completed. So Members were proposing the removal completely of recommendation (b), and that Members would be minded to grant full planning permission.

The Chairman took the opportunity to refer Members to pages 35 and 36 and pages 51 and 52 of the main agenda pack, which fully detailed the recommendations, as proposed by Officers.

With the agreement of the Chairman, the Council's Legal Advisor took the opportunity to ask the Committee to clarify what was being agreed with regard to the alternative recommendation. The Assistant Director for Planning, Leisure and Culture Services also sought clarification from the Committee.

Further discussions took place on the proposed recommendation and the proposed alternative recommendation.

Following further confirmation and clarification it was

RESOLVED that full planning permission be granted and

- (b) that delegated powers be granted to the Assistant Director for Planning, Leisure and Culture Services to agree the final scope and detailed wording and numbering of conditions, as set out in the report.

56/25

25/00768/S73 - VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 (APPROVED PLANS) OF APPLICATION 19/00592/FUL TO ALTER DETAILS OF THE CONVERSION OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, BLUE BIRD ADMINISTRATION, NEEDLERS WAY, HUNNINGTON. C/O R. SINGH

At this stage in the meeting, Councillors A. Bailes, J. Clarke and J. Robinson returned to the meeting room.

Officers presented the report and the presentation slides, as detailed on pages 30 to 34 of the main agenda pack.

Officers explained that the application was for a variation of Condition 2 (approved plans) of application 19/00592/FUL to alter details of the conversion of the administration building.

As detailed in the Officers report, the site formerly comprised of a factory complex largely constructed in the 1920s and 1930s for the Bluebird Toffee company. To the front of the site were the Administration and Welfare buildings which were Grade II listed buildings as well as the wall to the front boundary of the site.

Planning permission and Listed Building Consent had previously been granted for the re-development of the site for residential purposes comprising of the construction of new dwellings and conversion of the Welfare and Administration buildings.

This application specifically related to the works to the Administration building and sought changes to the approved conversion details. The majority of the changes related to internal reconfiguration to the proposed layout of the residential units. The fine details of these works would be dealt with under the associated Listed Building Consent application.

Members were informed that the external changes which were subject to this application related to:-

- The insertion of 4no. doorways in the front elevation of the building, associated steps and handrails.
- A brick skin external wall and the details associated with this to the rear elevation.
- Changes to the fenestration on the rear elevation of the building.

Officers referred to the 'Specific works proposed,' as detailed on pages 24 and 25 of the main agenda pack.

As detailed in the Officers report, the Conservation Officer had raised no objection to the principle of the proposed works in relation to the impact on the listed building; and as such it was considered that the proposal accorded with the historic environment policies and legislation as outlined in the report.

In conclusion Officers stated that all other conditions relating to the previous permission remained valid; and that in order ensure that the development was satisfactory in appearance an additional condition (Condition 3) had been included as follows:-

"Prior to installation on site, samples and trade descriptions of the materials to be used on the rear wall of the Administration Building 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."

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. C. Montez, the Applicant's Planning Agent addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Members then considered the application which officers had recommend be granted.

In response to questions from Committee Members, Officers explained that Listed Building Consent application 25/00762/LBC would be considered and determined by Officers.

Members who had attended the Site Visit commented that it was a wonderful building, but sadly in a very bad state of repair; and that it was good to see the building being renovated.

On being put to the vote it was

RESOLVED that Planning Permission be granted, subject to Conditions 1 to 11, as detailed on pages 25 to 27 of the main agenda pack.

57/25

25/01151/PIP - PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE FOR UP TO NO9 DWELLINGS. LAND OFF WITBYBED LANE, ALVECHURCH. MR. C. BRAIN

It was noted that the Application had been brought to the Planning Committee for consideration at the request of Councillor R. Bailes, Ward Councillor.

Officers presented the report and in doing so highlighted that the application was for Permission in Principle (PiP) for up to 9 dwellings at land off Withybed Lane, Alvechurch.

Officers referred to page 4 of the Committee Update which detailed two representatives received raising objections to the scheme. The objections were detailed in the Committee Update.

A copy of the Committee Update was provided to Members and published on the Council's website prior to the commencement of the meeting.

The site comprised of a field measuring just under 0.5 hectares and was located within the Green Belt. A railway line was situated beyond the site's eastern boundary, and the Worcester and Birmingham Canal formed the site's western boundary. The unclassified road Withybed Lane forms the northern boundary from which vehicular access was proposed.

The site contained a number of fairly modest buildings and relatively low fencing. The site was currently in equine use. The buildings were located in close proximity to the site boundaries adjacent to both the railway line and canal, leaving the majority of the site open and laid to grass. Having regard to the modest scale and location of the existing development, the site had a predominately open and rural character.

Officers explained that the PiP process was an alternative to the traditional outline planning application route and involved two stages:-

Stage 1. Permission in Principle (PiP) Stage - The local planning authority assesses the site's suitability based only on three core factors:

- Location
- Land use
- Amount of development (e.g., number of dwellings)

Stage 2: Technical Details Consent (TDC) Stage - The second stage where the detailed development proposals are assessed. The new process was introduced in June 2018 and was intended to speed up and simplify the planning process for small housing developments.

Stage 2 would include all the technical details of the application; appearance, the layout, the landscaping, the detailed access, full architectural plans as well as any additional surveys.

The application itself had received no objections from Worcestershire County Council (WCC), Highways, Worcestershire Regulatory Services and (WRS), Environmental Health concerning contamination and noise. There were no objections from Network Rail or the Canal Trust; and no objections from WCC Archaeology.

Officers referred to the objections received from nearby neighbours and Alvechurch Parish Council, with concerns raised on impact on the Green Belt and the impact on the highway network.

Officers drew Members' attention to pages 75 and 76, which detailed questions on Green Belt land and Grey Belt.

Members were asked to note the Appeal Decision dated 30th October 2023 (APP/P1805/W/23/3315385), as detailed on pages 82 to 85 of the main agenda pack, which stated that the site was in a sustainable location.

The application form sets out that the Agent considered the most appropriate exception to consider was 'Grey Belt' under paragraph 155 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), details of which were shown on page 74 of the main agenda pack.

Grey Belt was defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF, also detailed on page 74 of the main agenda pack.

Officers briefly referred to the Council's 5 Year Land Supply Position.

It was considered that the site was Grey Belt and would meet the requirements of Paragraph 155 of the NPPF and that 9 dwellings was acceptable.

Therefore, the application was recommended for approval.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Ms. A. Brown addressed the Committee in objection to the application.

Due to unforeseen circumstances, the representative from Alvechurch Parish Council was unable to attend the meeting. Therefore, the Council's Legal Advisor read out their statement in objection to the application.

Councillor R. Bailes, Ward Councillor also addressed the Committee in objection to the application.

Members then considered the application which Officers had recommended be granted.

Members highlighted that the Recommendation on pages 69 and 79 should read:-

'RECOMMENDATION: that Permission in Principle be **GRANTED.**'

Some Members commented that due to policy changes, that Green Belt would become Grey Belt all over the District.

Members queried as to why a landscape assessment was not required, because a district-wide landscape assessment was undertaken on behalf of the Council by consultants in February 2022. Some Members had referred to their report prior to the meeting commencing. The report had included an assessment of the whole of that strip along the canal

towpath and had concluded that a housing development there would have a high to medium impact. Why was this not referenced in the Officers report? Some Members also referred to encroachment and asked Officers to explain encroachment.

In response Officers explained that the reason why a landscape assessment was not required at this stage, was because the application was a PiP. A landscape assessment would be considered under Stage 2, technical stage, of the PiP process.

The Development Management Manager referred Members to page 75 of the main agenda pack, which covered encroachment.

Members commented that the application was very confusing, having being refused twice, both in 2021 and 2022, and further dismissed at appeal due to inappropriate development in Green Belt.

Members were aware of the recent changes to planning policies, which had changed quite considerably, but to build nine houses on what was still considered a green field for grazing was unacceptable and in Members opinion would have an impact.

In response Officers highlighted that the revised version of the NPPF was introduced in December 2024. There had been a shift in planning policy which Members needed to be mindful of and pay regard to when determining the application before the Committee. The Grey Belt was a concept that had been introduced by the NPPF change and that as highlighted in the report, was material and Members did need to take this into consideration as part of their decision making.

Some Members further commented that they were personally having great difficulty with PiPs, as they did not require detailed information, therefore the Committee were being asked to make very subjective views and that gave Members great cause for concern.

However, a decision had to be made and one of the core factors to be considered was location. This site was one of the call for sites which came forward in 2018; and was subsequently dismissed on high sensitivity landscaping ideas and it was not taken forward.

Hence Members having expressed their concerns that no detailed landscape assessment was being undertaken, since the location had a high landscape sensitivity, this site was not a suitable location for such a development. WCC Highways in their letter of 2022 had objected on two accounts, with the access layout being unacceptable and also on sustainability grounds. Unfortunately, highway access was not taken forward into a reason for refusal when the application went to appeal. If this had been taken into account, then the applicant would have had to submit an outline application, which Members could have looked at in detail.

Members reiterated that the site was in an area of high landscape sensitivity.

Members were concerned with the PiP process, in that they were being asked to make a decision on the PiP application with no conditions, and having to leave it to the technical document stage was dangerous. Particularly with conditions, as Members were mindful that other applications had been presented which varied conditions and Members were concerned that there was no guarantee that amended conditions would not be applied for.

In response the Council's Legal Advisor stated that Members needed to consider and determine the application before them.

A detailed discussion took place on the PiP application and the two stages of a PiP application.

Some Members continued to express concerns with regard to the core factors to be considered, one of which was the suitability of the site. The site was not suitable because it was in high landscape sensitivity area, the access was not suitable in this location; and 9 dwellings was not suitable in this location.

Councillor A. Bailes proposed an alternative recommendation to refuse Permission in Principle.

Members were reminded that, as detailed in the report, that there was a previous application for nine houses which was which was refused, but the sole reason for refusal was inappropriate development in the green belt. That was back in October 2023 and since then there had been a policy change which was obviously the Grey Belt. The land in question was now classed as Grey Belt and not Green Belt. The Planning Inspectorate did not raise any concerns with regard to landscaping or nine dwellings.

Some Members sought clarification that WCC, Highways would be consulted with at Stage 2: Technical Details Consent (TDC), which would be more detailed; and as such if they had a problem with the access that this would be raised as an objection? The road under the railway bridge was very narrow, and that gave some Members cause for concern.

With regard to Officers referring to the Council's 5 Year Land Supply Position, 9 houses was not going to make a huge difference.

Whilst Members understood the need to approve this application under Grey Belt, with the recent policy changes in the NPPF, some Members were still concerned for the reasons detailed in the preamble above.

Officers stated that a decision on this piece of land, was previously based on the Green Belt and Officers were trying to articulate this fact in the report, and that Members had to consider this.

Officers responded to questions on car parking spaces.

Further discussion took place on the reasons for refusal of the previous application, was it just for being in an unsustainable location and inappropriate development in the Green Belt, there were no highways reasons given?

Officers commented that that was correct for the outline application. A PiP application was similar to outline looking at the principal development for 9 dwellings, but access would be determined at Stage 2. The appeal decision did not have any highways issues raised by the Planning Inspectorate.

Members again encroachment and safeguarding the countryside, was it accepted that the spatial occupation of the site would clearly encroach into the countryside, as the site currently contained only a small number of modest buildings.

Members who had attended the Site Visit commented that having looked at the site, and having understand the Grey Belt definition, that the site did not fulfil purposes A, B, and D and that there was still a requirement to consider whether the development of the site would compromise the other purposes of the Green Belt, in particular, assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Some Members had also looked through some of the documents and had discovered the landscape sensitivity analysis carried out in February 2022, as referred to during the course of the meeting.

The analysis described the natural heritage of the area in terms of the hedgerow and grassland clearly supporting a lot of wild wildlife alongside the canal. The cultural heritage of the area sandwiched between the canal and the tow path and the railway with the crown pub on the corner. It also referred to the distinctiveness of the landscape because of the undulating fields and the banks that go up and down from the canal to the railway. So some Members were struggling to understand how, given the kind of obvious harm to the natural heritage, cultural heritage and the distinctiveness of the landscape, as identified in the assessment, would now allow dwellings to appear on this site, that hasn't or doesn't already have a built form, could be considered to be safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and contributing to the wider Green Belt purpose.

Officers reiterated that the reasons for the refusal of the previous application and that with regard to access and highways matters, this was not actually taken into account in the Planning Inspectorate's decision because they were simply regarding it as inappropriate development in the Green Belt. And as highlighted during the course of

the meeting, that this was now very different due to changes in the NPPF.

Stage 2 of the PiP process would provide more detailed information, in order for Committee Members to actually determine whether the development could proceed.

In response to a question from the Committee with regard to the application being 'Called In,' Officers confirmed that had the application not been 'Called In' then Officers would have determined the application under delegated powers.

Officers further clarified that Members were being asked to consider and determine Planning Permission in Principle, which was deciding purely on the location, the land use and the amount of development for nine dwellings.

With the agreement of the Chairman, a brief adjournment was agreed in order for Members to consider the alternative recommendation to refuse the application, as proposed during the course of the meeting.

Accordingly, the meeting stood adjourned from 20:20 hours to 20:24 hours.

Having reconvened, Councillor M. Marshall proposed an alternative recommendation to refuse Permission in Principle, on being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED that Permission in Principle be refused for the following reasons:-

- Severe harm to the cultural heritage, natural heritage and distinctiveness of the landscape and consequent encroachment on the countryside representing unacceptable development in the green belt, and no special circumstances existed to outweigh this harm.

58/25

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 on this occasion.

The meeting closed at 8.40 p.m.

Chairman