

**Bromsgrove District Council
Planning Committee**

**Committee Updates
5 November 2007**

Application Ref No	Update
B/2007/1032/HB	<p>2 more letters of objection received - no additional grounds of objection</p> <p>Objection received from Bromsgrove Society 18.10.07</p> <p>Similar concerns to previous approved scheme. Erection of perimeter fencing around footpath increase the 'fortress mentality'. This would impede the use of the open space and reduce its amenity benefit.</p> <p>Alternative footpath is 420m long there would be little advantage in time and effort and cost to use this. Would recommend this refused or condition be placed to review in 12 months once buildings are occupied.</p> <p>HLS - Head of Leisure Services. WMI - West Midlands Police.</p>
B/2007/0691/DI	<p>Additional letters received from the Agent on 17th October 2007 summarised as follows:</p> <p>The applicant will have the following equipment at his farm: 2x power harrow, 1x roller, 1x corn drill, 1x 5 furrow plough, 1x sub-soil chisel plough, 1x 135Hp Tractor, 1x 50Hp Tractor, 1 JCB farm special loadall, 1x 3.7 ton digger/ excavator, 1x livestock trailer, 1x horse trailer, 1x 5 ton tipper trailer, 1x quad bike, 2x flail toppler, 1x ballast roller, various livestock handling and feed implements.</p> <p>This is evidence that the applicant is a serious entrant into the farming industry.</p> <p>Given the time it takes to grow and harvest arable crops would take approximately 2.5 - 3 years and this should be the minimum temporary permission granted.</p>
B/2007/1092/D1	Belbroughton PC - Objection received on: 02/11/2007 - inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

B/2007/1094/DI

Belbroughton PC - Objection received on: 02/11/2007 - inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

The upgrading of an agricultural track would not necessarily require planning permission and such works maybe permissible providing that the works do not extend beyond the original track in any way, shape or form. The proposed upgrading works must follow the original line of the track. This retrospective track would not follow the line of the existing track and would therefore by definition constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. There is no 'fall-back' position for this application.

The Council received some aerial photographs claiming to show an original track but these have not been dated. These photographs merely show a rudimentary route which was not a formal agricultural access point and would not have been readily accessible for standard private vehicles. This would have solely been used for the farmer to access his field via a tractor or equivalent 4x4 vehicle.

The proposal before you is permanent and substantial in construction and is far superior to any rudimentary route that may have existed beforehand.

The laying of hard standing itself would not damage the openness of the Green Belt. It is not just the laying of the track and hard-standing that is harmful but it could also result in the facilitating of these areas to accommodate parked vehicles of unrestricted sizes and colours as well as the external storage of plant machinery that would all potentially harm the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt.

Despite the existence of limited screen planting, these do not form an impenetrable barrier. Further more green screening are not permanent and cannot undo the permanent impact of the track and surfacing, nor conceal the potential visual impact of parking and storage of vehicles, plant machinery and equipment.

The appellant also makes reference to other poor drainage on the site, indicating that this would be the best location for the proposal. This is not a 'very special circumstance' to outweigh the harm caused to the openness/ visual amenity of the Green Belt.

