

**Bromsgrove District Council
Planning Committee**

**Committee Updates
10 September 2007**

Application Ref No	Update
B/2007/0306/SW	<p>Addendum Under subtitle of Recommendation. Refusal reason one should read “do not outweigh”</p> <p>Catshill ADR should read BROM5E not BROME</p> <p>Members will note that the application report refers to an Article 3 direction. The matters requested in detail were scale, layout and appearance. The details received are not indicative but represent the proposed detailed scheme for consideration</p> <p>1 further e-mail neighbour objection received objecting to the scheme outlining concerns in respect to loss of habitat for birds and wildlife and loss of open countryside.</p>
B/2007/0482/LD	<p>WCC (HP) views received 06.09.07 Alvechurch PC views received 04.09.07: No objection</p> <p>The application was withdrawn on 10.09.07. Members are requested to pursue item B of the recommendation.</p>
B/2007/0495/DMB	<p>Page 45. Report should read: (f) The application does not include contributions towards the provision of highway improvement works contrary to Policy DS11 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan</p> <p>EA – views received 06.09.07:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following appraisal of the Flood Risk Assessment we have no objections to the proposed development as submitted. • The proposed site is located in Flood Zone 1 (low annual probability of flooding). The site area is greater than 1 hectare and therefore in line with paragraph E9 of PPS25: Development and Flood Risk (December 2006) a FRA has been submitted to support the application. • The FRA produced by Couch Consulting Engineers states that “surface water drainage will be via soakaway, dependent on Site Investigation infiltration tests, or to the nearest available outlet.” We support the adoption of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS)

as part of the development as this in accordance with the requirements of PPS25. The LPA may wish to impose a condition, if permission is granted to secure SUDS as part of the development.

On this basis, reason for refusal (e) detailed on your Report (page 44) is formally withdrawn.

Letter and attachments (appeal decision relating to land at Tittensor Road, Barlaston, Stoke on Trent, neighbourhood statistics for Alvechurch Parish and extract of the West Midlands Regional Housing Strategy) received from applicant's Agent 29.08.07:

- Reference to appeal decision at Barlaston, near Stoke on Trent and differences of characteristics of Bromsgrove District and the location of the appeal site
- Reiterate that a housing need is demonstrated for Hopwood firstly be the Parish Housing Needs Survey which was carried out by the Rural Housing Enabler using the same methodology as applied and accepted by housing and planning authorities across Herefordshire and Worcestershire and secondly by current housing waiting list data for Alvechurch including Hopwood.
- The Strategic Planning Manager has suggested that the latter merely indicates the "desire" of some in mobile homes in Hopwood to move to a house. However we strongly dispute that a mobile home is a decent home
- The definition of unsuitable housing in Government guidance, most notably practice guidance on Strategic Housing Market Assessments, includes housing with insecure tenure, lacking in amenities and in substandard condition, all or some of which are likely to apply to the mobile homes in question.

In response to this your Officer has consulted the Council's Housing Standards Officer. The Housing Officer has commented as follows:

- In order to determine whether a dwelling house (which includes mobile homes) are to a Decent Standard an assessment must be made under the new Housing Act 2004 and more specifically the Housing Health and Safety Rating System.
- Mobile Home sites also have the benefit of requiring Licensing and further monitoring of property standards as determined under the Caravan Sites & Control of Development Act 1960.
- I have checked both the license file and the site file on the public protection system, neither of which highlights

any concerns regarding insecure tenancy, lack of amenities or substandard conditions of the units.

- If the agent can prove the units are substandard then this information would be gratefully received as we are then potentially able to offer a series of grants to bring the properties up to a Decent Standard and/or take action against the Licensee to undertake works on site.

Additional letter received from applicant's Agent 07.09.07:

- Concern over determination process
- The application does meet an identified local need, meeting the requirements of Policy S16 of the Local Plan for rural exception housing and is exempt from the moratorium on new housing in relation to SPG10
- The site is located in a sustainable location
- The trees to be retained are of moderate quality and value and the scheme also seeks to retain trees of much poorer quality at the boundaries in order to screen the site
- The trees to be removed are of poor quality
- The hedgerow will be retained along much of Ash Lane and this will assist in providing an effective screen along the main frontage
- A Grampian condition could be attached in relation to tree retention
- Reasonable evidence has been provided that the site does not host protected species and further surveys will confirm this. A Condition could be imposed relating to further survey works prior to the commencement of works
- Flooding issues (**now resolved as detailed above**)
- A Section 106 agreement can resolve the monetary contribution issue

Additional memo received from Strategic Planning Manager received 30.08.07:

- This memo is in response to further information submitted by the applicants in relation to displaying a local need for 20 affordable units in Hopwood.
- The further information in my view does not satisfy a need for 20 affordable units in this location, simply providing a list of people on the waiting list does not demonstrate need.
- It is my understanding that anyone can apply to be on the housing waiting list, and therefore this list does not constitute a measure of housing need, but rather a measure of housing demand. Further to this the fact that the vast majority of those people on the waiting list are from Waterside orchard, a Caravan Park where many of the residents are automatically entered onto

	<p>the waiting list once taking up a property, does not demonstrate a genuine need for affordable properties in Hopwood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In my view a rural housing needs survey of Hopwood should have been carried out, or the Alvechurch survey designed in such a way that it was possible to ascertain exactly where the need arises from and whether or not that need is genuine. • As I have still not been provided with the methodology behind the current Alvechurch housing needs survey I cannot accept this as evidence of need for housing in the whole of Alvechurch, let alone evidence of housing need specifically in Hopwood. <p>1 letter received 31.08.07</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife issues (as detailed in report) <p>Alvechurch Parish Council – views received in relation to amended plans 04.09.07:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar to previous comments. • Alvechurch Parish Council are strongly in favour of building affordable dwellings in the Parish of Alvechurch. The site is one of those considered by the Parish Council and deemed suitable and sustainable. • It was noted that the planners have moved positioning of the houses to afford more privacy to existing homes. • The Housing Survey identified a need for 22 in Hopwood and this development meets the need, only a percentage of the site is Greenfield & some Brownfield Affordable Housing Development is one of the exceptions to Green Belt development. • It was suggested that the Clerk write to the Office of the Deputy Prime minister (cc Julie Kirkbride MP) and ask for the application to be called in 800 people are on the waiting list for Alvechurch, through Bromsgrove District Housing Trust.
B/2007/0594/SMC	<p>Councillor Dent has requested this application is determined by Planning Committee and not dealt with under delegated powers (verbal request 02.08.07)</p>
B/2007/0717/DI	<p>In response to the only two objections, the Agent has submitted the following information which has been summarised: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>The waste drainage</u> will continue to be discharged via the present system, which includes serving the neighbouring house at <u>no</u> expense to the immediate neighbouring occupier. 2. <u>As for the neighbour's natural light</u> to his windows; the proposal would make no difference, as the proposal would be <u>inset</u> from the common boundary where the

	<p>applicant replaced a dilapidated screen wall for mutual benefit.</p> <p>2.1 <u>In regard to sunlight</u> on the neighbour's garden, there are already conifers across it that far exceeds the height of the proposal.</p> <p>2.2 <u>In respect of height</u>, the proposal would not exceed the existing ridge, which you approved before.</p> <p>2.3 It is a fact that the applicant has improved the neighbour's privacy by reducing the ground level and preventing overlooking on that previously higher ground. The former boundary wall was about 1.8m higher, so the neighbour has been given considerable improvements. The applicant intends to continue this considerate approach.</p> <p>3. <u>The phases of construction</u> over the years are not a planning issue.</p> <p>4. <u>The landscaping</u> of the previous approval was implemented. As you can appreciate, the banks are difficult for plants to grow on, but a lot of shrubs have taken. The current proposal would be further landscaped to your approval, after taking specialist advice.</p> <p>5. <u>The lay-by provides 3 extra car spaces</u>, which is <u>off the carriageway</u>. Mr Butterworth similarly benefits in front of his house, on what is a very little used, wide stretch of road. You have the design and assessment whereby vehicles are shared, and no increase in car use is necessary.</p> <p>Additional information received 07.09.07 Further covering letter and 2 photos received labelled 1 and 2 which are available for Committee presentation. Photos show boundary with neighbouring property.</p>
B/2007/0759/VN	<p>Letter received from Barnt Green Parish Council via email 29.08.07</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Parish Council feels particularly strongly about this application. • If approved the application would have serious consequences for the future of a major part of the Conservation Area.
B/2007/0663/DI	<p>Councillor Lewis requested this application to be taken to Committee on: 12/08/2007.</p> <p>Members should note that this is a small agricultural holding which is served by a dwelling, orchard and agricultural buildings to the rear. It is proposed to turn this mixed agricultural smallholding to domestic house and garden. Member will also note that whilst a field access exists into the orchard there also appears to be a new driveway shown on the plans across the orchard area to serve the dwelling. However</p>

	<p>this drive has been excluded from within the red line of the application site.</p> <p>The areas presently on site include the house and small garden area to front and rear, the fenced orchard area and the yard to the rear containing the agricultural buildings. The application consolidates them into a domestic residential use. It is also proposed that the floor space area of the agricultural buildings would be used as a means of 'trading off' for a larger domestic floor space area on the proposed new domestic dwelling. Whilst buildings are proposed to be removed the large pole barn on the north west boundary appears to be retained as it is not being shown as demolished.</p>
<p>B/2007/0767/SMC</p>	<p>Councillor Dent has requested this application is determined by Planning Committee and not dealt with under delegated powers (verbal request 02.08.07)</p> <p>WMC – views received 04.09.07:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a representative of West Mercia Constabulary and having taken advice in relation to this application I submit a formal objection. • If this application were successful it would exempt persons from drinking alcohol in the High Street within the area of the application being prosecuted under The District Council of Bromsgrove Designation Order (Various Locations) 2007 (No 1) that came into force on 31/01/2007. This order was granted under The Local Authorities (Alcohol Consumption in Designated Public Places) Regulations 2001. • Our concern is that this will encourage disorderly behaviour and increase the fear of crime for those pedestrians in the High Street <p>Community Safety Officer – views received 05.09.07:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At a meeting of Police and Community Safety Joint Tasking Group today we discussed the above planning application. The group were very concerned that the application would affect what is currently a designated Alcohol Free Zone. Such a precedent, I am led to believe, would enable all the other pubs in the High Street to set out tables/chairs which would turn the High Street from an alcohol free zone into an area where outdoor drinking on a large scale occurs the whole length of the Street. • We feel sure this will have a significant impact on Fear of Crime for those residents/visitors who want to use the High Street for other than drinking. I would remind you that Section 17 of the 1998 Crime & Disorder Act puts a duty on a Local Authority to ensure any Planning decision must consider the impact on Crime &

	<p>Disorder.</p> <p>Economic Development Officer – views received 06.09.07: There is serious concern regarding this application and therefore I object to the scheme</p>
B/2007/0768/SMC	<p>Councillor Dent has requested this application is determined by Planning Committee and not dealt with under delegated powers (verbal request 02.08.07)</p>