

**Bromsgrove District Council
Planning Committee**

**Committee Update 1
13 February 2020**

Application Number: 16/1132

Site Address: Land at Whitford Road/Albert Road, Bromsgrove

Further Representations

14 additional representations received objecting to the scheme

- No new matters or issues raised above those contained in the published report.
-

Whitford Vale Voice

Letter received 9 February 2020

- This letter of objection replaces that submitted on 12th October 2019. Whitford Vale Voice (WVV) has undertaken a comprehensive review of the following:
- The applicant's transportation and highways submissions in support of planning application 16/1132
- The transportation submissions for Planning Application 16/0335 (Land at Perryfields) in so much as they impact upon the Whitford Road/Greyhound Inn cumulative impact assessment and school sensitivity test
- Submissions from Worcestershire County Council (WCC) in their role as Local Highway Authority (LHA)
- Submissions from Mott MacDonald (MM) acting in their transport and highway advisory role to Bromsgrove District Council (BDC)
- The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 31 October 2019
- The WVV notes made during the Planning Committee meeting held on 31 October 2019

In respect of planning application 16/1132, WVV have submitted to the Local Planning Authority (LPA), Bromsgrove District Council (BDC) the following:

- A series of 49 detailed Technical Notes outlining key aspects of our concerns regarding the Whitford Road / Greyhound Inn application on transportation grounds; and;
- In response to the decision made at the Planning Committee meeting on 31 October 2019 to seek further detailed information to address the concerns raised

by the Committee during the course of the meeting, a carefully considered written response that identifies what appear to WVV to be the deficiencies in the information provided to Members when considering the application on that date.

- Following the resolution by the Planning Committee on 31 October 2019 to defer making a decision on the application, as stated in the minutes, “in order for further discussions to take place between Council and Worcestershire County Council Highways Officers, Mott McDonald, the Applicants and other third parties as necessary; in order to seek further detailed information to address the concerns raised by the Committee during the course of the meeting” WVV have taken the following actions:
 1. In an attempt to expedite the process of identifying the additional detailed information that from WVV’s perspective the Committee appeared to be seeking, and prior to the publication of the minutes of the Committee’s 31 October 2019 meeting, WVV proactively submitted to the LPA on 18 November a document identifying what was in the opinion of WVV the deficiencies in the information provided to Members when the application was first considered
 2. At a meeting with the BDC Head of Planning and Regeneration on 10 December 2019, WVV expressed emphatically our willingness to meet with all parties, including the appellant, for the purpose recorded in the Committee minutes, to address the concerns raised by the Committee. For the avoidance of doubt WVV have NOT refused to meet with any party.
 3. Having given further consideration to the matter a revised version of the document identified in point 1 above was submitted by WVV to the LPA on 18 December 2019
 4. On 19 December, WVV submitted to the LPA a document which cross-references the above document to the WVV Technical Notes, the presentation made to the 31 October 2019 Planning Committee meeting by Mr Bailes on behalf of WVV and written representations made by Councillor Mallett; and;
 5. On 20 December 2019 WVV received a request from the LPA to comment on their perception of the additional information requested by Members. The WVV response to this request was submitted to the LPA on 7 January 2020.
- With regards to Point 2 above and the responses from WVV and other parties to the LPA request to comment on their perception of the additional information requested by Members (Point 5), WVV note that the Officer’s report for the forthcoming Special Planning Committee on 13 February 2020 states “the intention was that all parties would meet to discuss the content of these documents.
- Following the Committee meeting, it became clear that all parties were not willing to do so”. WVV wish to make it absolutely clear to Members of the Planning Committee that they are and will remain a party that is willing to meet with BDC Officers and their advisors, Worcestershire Highways Officers and the Applicant

to discuss the contents of the above documents and other matters pertaining to planning application 16/1132

- This letter provides a summary of the key reasons why WVV consider that the Whitford Road /Greyhound Inn application should be refused, namely:
 1. Whitford Road site access
 2. Greyhound Inn site access
 3. Journeys through the Town Centre to the M42 and the M5 at Lydiate Ash
 4. Ignoring pupil escort trips by car
 5. Ignoring vehicle trips to the south0-eEast Bromsgrove and Stoke Prior employment areas
 6. Assessment scenarios and ignoring vehicle trips
 7. Traffic survey concerns
 8. Accounting for committed developments and Local Plan allocations
 9. Suppressing vehicle trips generated by development at Perryfields
 10. Proposed Rock Hill/Fox Lane roundabout
 11. Charford Road roundabout
 12. Millfields
 13. Perryfields crossroads
 14. Bromsgrove Town Centre
 15. Stourbridge Road/Perryfields Road junction
 16. Catshill
 17. A38 improvement scheme
 18. Whitford Road bus service
 19. Western distributor road
 20. Sustainable infrastructure
 21. Access to GP services
 22. Access to acute NHS hospital services
 23. Access to school places
 24. Public health
 25. Section 106 contributions
- Based upon the above, it is the considered opinion of WVV that insufficient information has been provided to convince ourselves, the local community, and decision makers that the impact of development at the Whitford Road and Greyhound Inn sites on highway safety, ease of movement and congestion will not be severe, a test specified in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- In respect of transport and highways WVV consider that the proposed development at Site A (Land off Whitford Road) and Site B (Land off Albert Road) does not comply with Government Planning or Local Policy.
- NPPF does not support development proposals that cannot be shown to mitigate to an acceptable degree the impacts from development on the local highway network in terms of capacity and congestion, or on highway safety. Nor does the

NPPF support development proposals that cannot be shown to provide safe and suitable access for all users.

With regards to Site A (Land off Whitford Road);

1. The applicant's proposals do not show that the NPPF Paragraph 108(b) requirements to ensure that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users can be met;
2. Development fails to meet the requirements of Policy BDP5A.7(d) for the guaranteed provision of appropriate bus services; and;
3. The applicant's proposals do not show that the residual cumulative impact on the highway network, especially through the Millfields Residential Area, in Catshill and in the Town Centre will not be severe as required by NPPF Paragraph 109.

With regards to Site B (Land off Albert Road otherwise known as the Greyhound Inn) the Applicant's proposals;

1. Do not show that the NPPF Paragraph 108(b) requirements to ensure that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users can be met;
2. Do not meet the minimum onsite parking requirements specified in the WCC Streetscape Design Guide; and;
3. Do not satisfy the requirements of the BDC High Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document in terms of adequate amenity levels for future occupiers. Consequently development at the proposed Greyhound Inn development is likely to result in increased competition for the existing on-street parking amenity and a detrimental impact on ease of movement and highway safety.

With regards to Site A and Site B in combination:

1. The applicant fails to consider the totality of the likely impact of the development proposals on the local highway network as required by NPPF Paragraph 111; and;
2. It cannot be shown that the impact of development on ease of movement, congestion and highway safety can be acceptably mitigated as required by NPPF Paragraph 108 (c) and NPPF Paragraph 109:
 - At the Rock Hill/Fox Lane Junction;
 - In the Millfields Residential Area;
 - At the Whitford Road/Kidderminster Road/Perryfields Road junction;
 - At the Rock Hill/Worcester Road/Charford Road junction;
 - At the Kidderminster Road/St John Street/Hanover Street (Waitrose) junction;
 - At the St John Street/Market Street junction;
 - At the Market Street/Stourbridge Road/Birmingham Road/The Strand – Stratford Road (Parkside) junction;
 - At the Perryfields Road/Stourbridge Road junction;
 - At the Stourbridge Road/Meadow Road/Westfields (Crown Inn) junction;
 - At other junctions in the Parish of Catshill and North Marlbrook.
- The loss of parking spaces in the Rock Hill layby is likely to lead to a loss of trade at the Select and Save convenience store and the potential loss for an important

local amenity with an overall economic cost to the area contrary to WCC'S Open for Business vision and objectives.

- It is also the considered opinion of WW that insufficient information has been provided to convince ourselves, the local community and decision makers that the impact of development at the Whitford Road and Greyhound Inn sites will not have a detrimental impact on:
 1. Access to GP Services;
 2. Access to acute NHS hospital services;
 3. Health and wellbeing; and;
 4. Access to school places;
- As a consequence. WVV rightly consider that this planning application for 490 dwellings and a class A1 retail outlet at Site A and 15 dwellings and provision of a roundabout at Site B; should be refused.

A full version of this document is available on the District Council website under the document tab relating to the application (16/1132):

<https://publicaccess.bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk/online-applications/>

Councillor Luke Mallett

Emails received 9 February 2020

I would like to submit these documents provided by Worcestershire County Council - they illustrate the departure from standards that would be required to deliver a roundabout solution at Fox Lane / Rock Hill:

- Rock Hill – Crossfall Comments
- Rock Hill – Departure from Standards – WSP Technical Note
- Rock Hill – Departures from Standards
- Rock Hill – Design H&S Risk Register
- Rock Hill – Design Risk Management Schedule
- Rock Hill – Designers Response to RSA Stage 1
- Rock Hill – Discussion on Number of Entry Lanes
- Rock Hill – Discussion on Retaining Wall Liability
- Rock Hill – Roundabout – Drawing – Contours
- Rock Hill – Roundabout – Drawing – General Arrangements
- Rock Hill – Roundabout – Drawing – Puffin Crossing
- Rock Hill – Roundabout – Drawing – Surfacing and Kerbs
- Rock Hill – RSA Stage 2
- Rock Hill – Section 278 Approval – Minutes of Meeting 14 August 2018
- Rock Hill – Section 278 Comments
- Rock Hill – Section 278 – First Check
- Rock Hill Shop – WSP Statement re: Loss of Roundabout from Departures from Standards

- Rock Hill – Swept Path – Shop North Side and Number 5 Rock Hill
- Rock Hill – Swept Path – South Side – Box Van and Light Van
- Rock Hill – WSP Technical Note 22 July 2016

Full versions of these documents are available on the District Council website under the document tab relating to the application (16/1132):

<https://publicaccess.bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk/online-applications/>
