

Appendix One

Tabulated Response to Deferral Reasons Arising From 31 October 2019 Planning Committee Meeting

(1) Whitford Vale Voice

(2) Worcestershire County Council (acting as Highway Authority)

	Topic / request	Raised by	WVV response	WCC response
<b>1. Transport, Highways and accessibility</b>				
<b>Rock Hill Roundabout and environs</b>				
1.1	Number of lanes approaching in all directions	Planning Committee Member	This matter was raised by Cllr Hession. It appears to WVV that this matter arises from a statement in the local press attributable to the applicant that "improvements are set to include a new roundabout with two lane entries on all approaches at the junction of Fox Lane and Rock Hill" when the applicant's indicative drawing 7033-SK-055F shows a single lane entry on the southbound Rock Hill approach.	Rock Hill (south) 2 lanes Rock Hill (north side) 1 lane Fox Lane 2 lanes  This is published in the TA which is in the public domain.  Approved General Attached
1.2	Technical Approval of roundabout	WVV	Drawing 7033-SK-055F that is described as being fully technically approved by the Local Highway Authority (LHA) is clearly labelled "to be treated as indicative", "for discussion purposes only" and "any designers who progress these proposals further will need to reconsider the proposals based upon the information which subsequently becomes available including potential site hazards". In addition to WVV, the indicative status of the roundabout design was raised by Cllr Hessian, Cllr Baxter referred to the plans for junctions being concepts and indicative and this being something she could not agree to, while Cllr Holtham was concerned about delegating powers to enable final approval of junction designs as being odd and something he had not come across before. Vehicle tracking diagrams have been provided for the concept design but these do not show how vehicles will access and egress from the driveway at number 5 Rock Hill or the parking spaces on both side of the shop. It appears to WVV that in the latter locations, following the loss of parking space for deliveries directly outside the shop, the proprietor may wish to use one or both of these parking spaces for delivery purposes. It appears to WVV that the junction has not been appropriately modelled and comment on the requirements for realistic modelling in Section 4.5 below. On 1st November 2019 Cllr Mallett made a Freedom of Information request to WCC for all correspondence and documents between WCC Officers, Contractors, Advisors and Developers in respect of the proposed roundabout, including all details of safety audits and technical approval, from Feb 2016 to the point at which the request is met. This request was not fulfilled within the required 20 working days' time limit and Cllr Mallett advises that as of 7th January 2020 the request had not yet been met.	Approval issued 21st August 2019  Approval Letter Attached
1.3	Road Safety Audit not provided contrary to NPPF	WVV	With regards to concept drawing 7033-SK-055F the minutes of the meeting state that it "has been through stage 1 and 2 safety audit". However a stage 2 audit has not been made available to Members. It is on the basis of the NPPF requiring Members to consider the safety of the roundabout that WVV consider that concept drawing 7033-SK055F should be advanced to a final 3D design with accompanying road safety audit	Not required in NPPF  Normal stakeholder consultation process undertaken  RSA has been undertaken as part of the early technical approval process. The document is owned by Catesby so could be released with their agreement.
1.4	Loss of parking space in front of shop	Planning Committee Member	Loss of parking spaces in front of the existing shop on Rock Hill was a matter on which an LHA Officer provided clarification. Cllr Mallett raised the matter of the potential economic impact arising from the loss of passing trade affect the viability of the shop and the social impact if it was forced to close. WVV assume that member clarification was sought in the context of potential loss of passing trade at the shop which could lead to the loss of a valued local amenity. Cllr Hessian expressed concern about the safety of deliveries to the shop. It is the expectation of WVV that this matter will be addressed when concept drawing 7033-SK-055F is advanced to a final 3D design with accompanying road safety audits.	Reduction of layby length of approximately 2 car spaces, this accounts for existing access location. Drawing are in the TA which is in the public domain. This reduction is acceptable to the highway authority.

1.5	Footpath outside shop very narrow	Planning Committee Member	<p>WVV note that Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP) Bromsgrove Package Scheme ID BR6 provides an expectation for Members that enhanced walking and cycling infrastructure will be provided in the Rock Hill / Worcester Rd corridor.</p> <p>Currently, in the vicinity of the Select &amp; Save shop in Rock Hill, it appears to WVV, that on the east side of Rock Hill the width of the footway is sub-optimal south of the shop, near to the pillar box and from the north of the gates at the entrance to 5 Rock Hill to the wall of St Peter's graveyard with the width severely constrained by the safety barrier adjacent to the footpath to Morris Walk. On the west side of Rock Hill it appears to WVV that the width of the footway is suboptimal in the vicinity of the bus shelter.</p> <p>The applicant's proposals in concept drawing 7033-SK-055F show improvement, in part, to the width of the footway in the vicinity of the shop with it still appearing to remaining sub-optimal in places. However north of the southbound stop line at the pedestrian crossing it appears that the width of the footway will remain sub-optimal and there is no proposal to improve the footway in the vicinity of the bus shelter.</p> <p>It appears to WVV that pedestrian safety is compromised through the risk of a collision arising from a vehicle reversing from the parking place at the side of the shop or the driveway of 5 Rock Hill directly on to the roundabout.</p> <p>It is the expectation of WVV that when concept drawing 7033-SK-055F is advanced to a final 3D design it will show footway widths to allow Members to make a fully informed judgement on the safety of the proposed highway scheme for all users.</p>	Not reduced by the proposal. Drawing are in the TA which is in the public domain.
1.6	Pedestrian crossing safety with cars accelerating away from roundabout	Planning Committee Member	It is the expectation of WVV that this is a matter that will be addressed when concept drawing 7033-SK-055F is advanced to a final 3D design with accompanying road safety audits.	Has been considered as part of design. Was reviewed by qualified safety auditor, chartered engineer and has been through a safety audit process. The document is owned by Catesby so could be released with their agreement.
<b>Western Distributor</b>				
1.7	Western Distributor required	WVV/BDC members	<p>It is the longstanding view of WVV, many BDC Members and the local community that a Western Distributor Road is necessary to alleviate congestion in and around the Town Centre and a prerequisite for the delivery of growth and regeneration in Bromsgrove. A link road between Kidderminster Road and Birmingham Road was a policy in the former Local Plan adopted in 2004 and the Stourbridge Rd / Barnsley Hall Rd roundabout was built in part to facilitate its delivery.</p> <p>The MM review exposed the deficiencies in the WCC feasibility study into a western distributor road including its limitation of considering growth up to 2023 only concluding that there is insufficient evidence to dismiss the case for a WDR.</p>	There is no policy requirement for such a scheme.
1.8	Route for distributor should be protected	WVV/BDC members	<p>LTP4 informs Members that "a longer term transport strategy is currently under development for Bromsgrove District" that will include "the case for a potential Western Bypass for Bromsgrove" which "will be comprehensively assessed" with the outcome "feeding into future versions of the Worcestershire Transport Plan and Bromsgrove Local Plan".</p> <p>On this basis it appears to WVV that it is essential that an appropriate and deliverable route for a Western Distributor Road is protected as failure to do so would be prejudicial to the development of the longer term strategy for transport in Bromsgrove, future version of the Local Transport Plan and future versions of the Bromsgrove District Plan.</p>	There is no policy requirement for such a scheme.
<b>Other Assessments / Road Safety Audits</b>				
1.9	Assessment of Catshill required	WVV / Cllr Mallet	<p>The impact of development on Catshill is also a matter raised in the representations from Catshill &amp; North Marlbrook Parish Council and The Bromsgrove Society.</p> <p>WVV consider that the decision to extend the original study area to include the Stourbridge Rd / Perryfields Rd and Stourbridge Rd / Barnsley Hall Rd junctions but not to include the Stourbridge Rd / Westfields / Meadow Rd (Crown Inn) junction when the applicant's vehicle trip assignment shows the same proportion of Whitford Rd and Perryfields development vehicle trips at each location is illogical. The decision seems perverse when it is considered that the Stourbridge Rd / Barnsley Hall Rd roundabout, built with foresight to a high standard to facilitate delivery of a western distributor road, has two entry lanes on each of its three arms but the Crown Inn mini-roundabout only has one entry lane on each of its four arms.</p> <p>Alternative routes for development vehicle trips become available at the Crown Inn mini-roundabout. Using the same rationale for the addition of the Rock Hill / Hanbury Rd / Worcester Rd junction to the original study area (proportion of Whitford Rd development vehicle trips forecast to route through this junction) there is a very strong case for assessing the impact of development at multiple junctions across Catshill. Especially so as the main route choice identified by the applicant demonstrates an expectation that drivers will deviate from the B4185 distributor road to rat run through Catshill Village Centre and residential areas.</p>	<p>This is not considered to be significant in the context of the route choices available.</p> <p>Estimated at 75 departures and 33 arrivals in AM peak on Perryfields Road, not all will travel into Catshill. Under a worst case scenario the 75 departures would be split onto 3 routes so 25 trips per hour extra per route. This is an extra vehicle on each route of 1 every 2 minutes 24 seconds on average. This is not considered to be severe. No further analysis is needed.</p>
1.1	Assessment of 'Parkside junction' required	WVV / Cllr Mallet	<p>The impact of development on the Parkside junction is also a matter raised in the objection from the Bromsgrove Society.</p> <p>Development vehicle trips through the Town Centre and the Parkside junction was of concern to a number of Members with a prolonged discussion during the meeting on the implementation of MOVA at Parkside.</p> <p>WVV consider that an assessment of the impact of development at the Whitford Rd / Greyhound Inn and Perryfields sites is required at the Parkside junction with the Whitford Road development vehicle flows based on the route options shown by MM in Table 7 of their WVV Technical Notes Response (Document Reference 378295/023/B Final).</p>	WSP Tech Note 5 shows 19 vehicle heading towards the junction and 8 away on St Johns Street in AM peak over the course of an hour, and 10 towards and 19 away in the PM peak. This level of impact to too small to warrant assessment.

1.11	What funding has been secured for Parkside junction and when does the funding expire	Cllr Mallet	Given the concerns raised at the meeting about the funding of proposed highway schemes to mitigate the impact of development it appears to WVV that Members also require an answer to these questions.	Funding has been secured through a legal agreement from, the Parkside Medical Centre and Norton Farm. 08/0685 - £50,000 - Available until 19/04/2027 12/0709 - £26,000 – Available until 26/03/2025  The congestion improvement proposals being promoting outside the planning application now have a preferred concept plan, but this is still being refined. Discussions will take place with effected stakeholders in the new year and it is anticipated to be delivered in the 2020/2021 financial year
1.12	Why have no Safety Audits been carried out on Albert Road	Planning Committee Member	Members require road safety audits, vehicle tracking diagrams, nonmotorised user audits and access design and compliance reports to make a judgement on if the proposed access from Albert Road to the Greyhound Inn site meets the NPPF requirement that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users.	Not required, and in context is a disproportionate reaction to the nature of the design.  Normal stakeholder consultation process undertaken
1.13	Why has the impact on All Saints Road and Victoria Road not been assessed	Cllr Mallet	Whitford Rd / Kidderminster Rd / Cotton Pool Rd / Cherry Orchard Dr / Willow Rd / Crabtree Ln / Broad St / Providence Rd / The Flats / Santridge Ln / All Saints Rd / Birmingham Rd form a rat run route through residential areas that will be attractive to residents of a future Whitford Rd estate wishing to reach the M42 as it avoids congestion hot spots in the town centre. LHA signage to the M5 and M42 on the All Saints Rd approach to its junction with Birmingham appears to encourage the use of All Saints Rd as a rat run.  Similarly the above route with the substitution of Victoria Rd for All Saints Rd will be attractive to future residents of a Whitford Rd development wishing to access retail and leisure destinations in Birmingham Rd.	Given the route choices available trip dispersal means that the small number of trips near this part of the network are insignificant to capacity.
1.14	Rat Running through Millfields	Cllr Mallet	Mr Bailes, speaking on behalf of WVV at the Committee meeting, mentioned Millfields 14 times. The impact of development on Millfields is also raised in the written objection from The Bromsgrove Society. Based solely on a subjective opinion on the future attractiveness of Millfields as a rat-running through route the applicant simply asks Members to accept that development will not lead to an increase in vehicular traffic in the Millfields residential area!	Not expected due to Fox Lane / Rock Hill improvements, although accepted some vehicles may travel this way as part of a linked trip including Millfields School.
1.15	How could members be confident that that previous inspectors concerns have been addressed.	Planning Committee Member	The Decision Letter for the Whitford Road Planning Inquiry states “I conclude that the inadequacy of the mitigation proposals for the Millfield area would be likely to result in the proposed development having a severe impact on traffic and highway safety there”. Given that; 1. The applicant’s assertion that “improvements to the Rock Hill / Fox Lane junction will reduce queuing and delay and therefore reduce the attractive of Millfields” is unsupported by any modelling to forecast future rat running through traffic and vehicle movements to destinations in Millfields; 2. The Applicant’s position appears to be that with development there will be no net change in the total number of traffic movements within Millfields; 3. If development increases traffic within Millfields then there is an adverse and unmitigated impact on the Millfields Residential Area; 4. If development reduces traffic within Millfields there are additional impacts on the Rock Hill / Fox Lane junction and Charford Road roundabout that the Applicant does not account for; and; 5. The WCC consultation response remains silent on the potential impact of development on the Millfields residential area; It appears to WVV that Members can have no confidence that the Inspector’s concerns have been addressed.	As per initial officer response.
1.16	Further detailed information and possible conditions for improvements to non-motorised movement namely: pedestrians, mobility scooters and cyclists	Cllr Douglas	Recommendation a(ii) for sustainable infrastructure contributions includes the sum of £560,000 for a cycleway between Whitford Rd and Kidderminster Rd via Sanders Park. Such a scheme is in the process of being delivered through the National Productivity Investment Fund. During discussion on this matter a LHA Officer suggested that this sum of money could be used to increase the width of the already built cycleway from 3.0m to 3.5m, provide lighting and address other desire lines. WVV note that the provision of lighting on this route is likely to be difficult due to the sensitive environmental nature of the route and find the suggestion of increasing the width of the cycleway as unconvincing and potentially poor value for money. It appears to WVV that Members require clear and fully costed proposals for the delivery of schemes using the £560,000 cycleway contribution.	Mitigation measures are proposed to address the needs of active travel users.  Committee must specifically identify what they consider to be absent from proposals.
1.17	further detail on how residents could access a sensible route in order to walk from the proposed development to the school in Perryfields	Cllr Douglas	For future residents of the proposed Whitford Road site the walking distance using the suggested Dawson Rd route to the proposed new First School at Perryfields will be in excess of the Institution of Highways and Transportation maximum walking distance of 2000m. WVV also have concerns about the proposed signalised crossing on Kidderminster Rd arising from visibility constraints and observations of HGV’s straddling the white line at this location. MM in their Technical Note 378295/007A dated 15th February 2018 requested “that consideration is given to options that prevent / discourage pedestrians from using the northern section of Whitford Road where no footways or street lighting are present. Any associated planning condition should reflect this” but that there is currently no such planning condition.  WVW draw to the attention of Members the opinion of the Planning Inspector who examined proposed modifications of the Bromsgrove Local Plan that Sanders Park could be extended into the land designated as strategic open space to the west of Whitford Rd “to provide additional recreation facilities and further opportunities for walking and cycling”. It appears to WVV that a westward extension of Sanders Park would provide scope for the delivery of a direct walking and cycling route between the proposed Whitford Rd and Perryfields Town Expansion sites.	Route has been identified by the Walking and Cycling Officer, mitigation measures are proposed to ensure this route is suitable.  The route map is attached, although has previously been provided

1.18	More info require on where and when other s106 contributions such as public transport money are to be spent.	Cllr Baxter	Cllr Baxter expressed her concerns about S106 contributions for bus services not being spent in past applications. A financial contribution is offered towards a new bus service but no route has been defined for the service nor has the frequency of service or the hours of operation been set. It appears to WVV that Members require a comprehensive bus service viability study in order to judge the likelihood of the delivery of an appropriate bus service for the Whitford Rd site.	This is already detailed in the consultation response. It is unclear what additional information the committee wishes to be provided with. Timescales cannot be confirmed at this stage, but legal agreement will be timebound.
1.19	Noise – was raised as issue to discuss but no specifics mentioned	Cllr Hotham	It appears WVV that concerns about noise arise from the M5 forming a boundary to the Whitford Rd site.	None provided by WCC - BCD planning officer response: No objection from WRS – noise info contained in Section 11 (page 45-46) of the published report BDC members should clarify specific concern
1.20	Air Quality was raised as issue to discuss but no specifics mentioned	Cllr Hotham	WVV note the comments from the Directorate of Public Health Worcestershire regarding the Whitford Rd site that “air pollution is a serious public health issue” and “the number of dwellings proposed at Whitford Road and the potential health impact of increased traffic, is proposed in an area that is in close proximity to Worcester Road and Kidderminster Road and borders the M5/M42, is a health concern, particularly as parts of Worcester and Kidderminster Roads are already in air quality management areas and the development is sited so close to the M5”.	None provided by WCC - BCD planning officer response: No objection from WRS – Air quality info contained in Section 10 (page 45) of the published report BDC members should clarify specific concern
<b>2</b>	<b>Healthcare Provision</b>			
2.1	Further review of S106 contributions, with the Committee questioning if a tripartite discussion was possible with regard to seeking funding for the Worcestershire Acute Hospital NHS Trust.	Cllr Hotham	The matter of the Acute Hospital Trust apparently being unable to receive a S106 contribution was also raised by Cllr Whittaker. WVV support Cllr Hotham’s suggestion that the possibility of a tripartite discussion to seek funding for the Worcestershire Acute Hospital NHS Trust be explored. Cllr Mallett commented in his speech that he had concerns about local health services. With regards to access to GP services. WVV note that the CCG consultation response dated 19th July 2019 provides a snapshot of spare capacity that does not take into account; new development occupied since the date of the CCG response (for example at the Norton Farm site), development that has been approved but not yet occupied and development at sites allocated in the Local Plan but not yet approved (for example the proposed Peryfields Town Expansion Site). On this basis it appears to WVV that to allow Members of the Planning Committee to judge if there is likely to be sufficient spare capacity at local GP surgeries it is necessary for the CCG to provide an up to date consultation response that also anticipates future demand from committed developments yet to be occupied and developments allocated in the Development Plan.	Legal opinion accepted – unless justification from NHS changes then any S106 secured on current justification potentially unlawful
<b>3</b>	<b>Site Specific issues / other issues</b>			
3.1	Access points more detail required of internal layout.	Cllr Baxter	Minutes of the Committee meeting state “approval was being sought for access (ingress and egress) to the proposed site on the ‘Indicative’ Masterplan; and that, as highlighted by the Development Management Manager, the Application had been submitted in outline with all matters except access reserved for future detailed applications”. Members expressed their concerns that drawings for the Whitford Road site access junctions have not been advanced beyond the concept design stage. Members require detailed site access drawings, road safety audits, vehicle tracking diagrams, non-motorised user audits and access design and compliance reports to determine if the proposed Whitford Rd access junctions meet the NPPF requirement that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users	Not required - BDC planning committee has granted outline approval on multiple large scheme where no internal layout was provided. Paragraph 9.1 states: Members will be aware that the application is submitted in outline, with internal access, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping reserved for subsequent approval. In this respect, the finished design of the development is not set at this outline stage. However, the application contains an Illustrative Master Plan and information on design principles, architectural style, materials and how the development would integrate within the character of the surrounding locality. Members at this stage are thus being requested to determine issues of principle, whilst paying regard to the parameters set out in the Illustrative Masterplan, the Design and Access Statements and the Planning Statement.
3.2	Comments by urban designer on site regrading		WVV note the comments in the Applicant’s Geology Technical Note dated 23rd December 2013 submitted for application 13/0479 that the site “lies at an elevation of between approximately 90m above Ordnance Datum (AOD) in the north and 120m AOD in the south/southwest generally sloping down towards the north-east. The site is also defined by a shallow valley trending north to south with small outcrops of bedrock on the valley sides in the south of the site”. WVV support the Urban Designer’s opinion that the applicant’s proposed cut and fill approach to regrade the site with a less pronounced topography is regrettable and that the distinctive existing topography “if approached with imagination in the placement of houses and the selection of house-types, is capable of contributing towards equally distinctive place making”.	N/a
3.3	40% affordable housing, what would the percentage be for - social housing and shared ownership?	Cllr McDonald	Cllr Hotham also noted that demand for social housing was much greater than for shared ownership. It appears to WVV that Members are concerned that the proportions of social housing and shared ownership properties within the 40% affordable housing allocation reflect demand.	N/a
3.4	How do the Council maintain that 40% affordable housing will be provided?	Cllr McDonald	It appears to WVV that the applicant or future end user of the Whitford Rd or Greyhound Inn sites may seek through a viability assessment a reduction in the proportion of affordable housing and / or exemptions from other planning obligations and that LPA’s are expressly permitted to refuse permission where the planning obligation which the applicant seeks to reduce is necessary to ensure the acceptability of the proposed development. It appears to WVV that Cllr McDonald is seeking clarification on this matter	N/a
3.5	Open Space Management – can the Council adopt the open space	Cllr King	WVV note that the University of Sheffield BRITICE glacial map and GIS database of glacial land forms of the last British-Irish Ice Sheet records the prominent ridgeline forming the western boundary of the Whitford Road site as being an esker. As such the ridgeline represents a significant fluvio-glacial landscape feature. The indicative masterplan for the Whitford Road site shows 7.3 ha of open space comprising a ridgeline amenity area, a central linear green corridor and an open area around the proposed sustainable urban drainage attenuation ponds with footpaths providing access. It appears to WVV that the proposed footpaths through open spaces require designation as rights of way to guarantee public right of access to all members of the wider local community.	N/a