

Name of Applicant	Proposal	Expiry Date	Plan Ref.
Mr. Mitchell Ferris	<p>Redevelopment and change of use to a large portion of an existing mixed use commercial site known as Cur Lane Farm, involving the demolition of existing storage buildings, and the erection of 7 new homes, set out around two new courtyards, accessed from a new roadway ingress off Cur Lane. Two of the existing storage barns will remain to the northern end of the site.</p> <p>Cur Lane Farm, Cur Lane, Upper Bentley, Worcestershire,</p>	28.02.2022	20/01568/FUL

This application is being reported to members because it is a major planning application in relation to the creation of new floor space.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be **Refused**

Consultations

Highways - Bromsgrove

Unable to support the proposed redevelopment development due to its unsustainable location. Recommend refusal.

Waste Management

No objection.

WRS - Contaminated Land

The current use of the site is described as a mixed use commercial site consisting of light industrial and commercial functions namely storage and small workshop activities. There is the potential for contamination from various sources, therefore a suitable land contamination condition is recommended.

WRS – Noise

Have no adverse comments to make subject to the confirmation of the use of the existing storage buildings. The storage barns are close to this proposal and could have a detrimental effect to amenity to the proposed. It is recommended that a construction management plan is submitted and approved prior to commencement of this proposed development.

WRS - Air Quality

No objections.

Housing Strategy

2 rented affordable units required.

Education Authority

The proposal as submitted is below the threshold for which a planning obligation would be sought as the impact on education infrastructure is deemed to be low.

NHS/Medical Infrastructure Consultations

The development would give rise to a need for improvements to capacity of existing premises. The development falls within the boundary of a practice which is a member of Kingfisher Primary Care Network (PCN) and Nightingales PCN. Request a contribution of £2,760 to secure the funding for Kingfisher PCN or Nightingales PCN to provide additional infrastructure/extension/reconfigure existing premises to improve overall access.

NHS Acute Hospitals Worcestershire

Given the scale of the development, no contributions are sought.

Leisure Services

Views awaited.

Bentley & Pauncefoot Parish Council

Objects to the proposals.

Development would result in the loss of employment land for non-employment uses. Proposal will reduce the quality and quantity of employment land.

The proposal will not provide amenity.

The applicant provides no evidence that they have marketed the site for employment uses, could be allocated for employment in relation to the Foxlydiate development.

Development off a narrow lane, and the allocation of 2 parking spaces per residential unit will only add to our parish's existing traffic problems. Policy BDP22.1c states that the Council will deliver viable low carbon climate resilient developments through ensuring developments are in locations well-served by public/ sustainable transport, existing local facilities and infrastructure. This location has none of these.

Proposal conflicts with Section 5 of the Bromsgrove District Plan Strategic Objectives:

- This location is isolated out in the Green Belt 2 miles from the edge of Bromsgrove and 0.75 miles from the edge of Webheath without public transport connections and is therefore not sustainable.
- A range of housing types are needed in the parish so that local people can afford homes and so that our village does not become a dormitory one, damaging our community.
- Removes sources of economic growth and rural diversification.
- Proposal does not respond to local character; the design of the development shows expansive glazing in anthracite powder coated aluminium window frames dominating the facades and comparatively shallow pitched roofs that bear no resemblance to any vernacular elements.

These proposals do not fulfil the NPPF's sustainable development objectives.

- This location requires employment land, not housing, and it lacks infrastructure.
- The range of housing is extremely limited and no investigation has been carried out by the applicant to assess the needs of the community.
- The proposals do not make effective use of this land and the architecture makes no reference to low carbon design.

Given this site is in the green belt, this application throws up questions regarding land use. Curr Lane Farm is dominated by its livery facility and yet the proposals will result in the erasure of the buildings necessary for this to continue.

This development will necessitate further erosion of the Green Belt given no access is shown to the two existing single storey timber buildings on the north of the site. A road will have to be built in the adjoining countryside.

North Worcestershire Water Management

Recommend drainage condition.

Arboricultural Officer

No objection.

Red Kite Network Nat Healy (Ecology)

No objection.

Public Consultation

Site notice erected 16.3.21 expiry 15.4.21

Press notice published 12.3.21 expiry 29.3.21

Neighbour letters posted 5.3.21 expiry 29.3.21

No comments received

Relevant Policies

Bromsgrove District Plan

BDP1 Sustainable Development Principles

BDP2 Settlement Hierarchy

BDP3 Future Housing and Employment Development

BDP6 Infrastructure Contributions

BDP7 Housing Mix and Density

BDP8 Affordable Housing

BDP12 Sustainable Communities

BDP16 Sustainable Transport

BDP19 High Quality Design

BDP21 Natural Environment

BDP24 Green Infrastructure

Others

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

NPPG National Planning Practice Guidance

Bromsgrove High Quality Design SPD

National Design Guide

Relevant Planning History

B/2005/0889 Formation of new pond to facilitate land drainage.	05.12.200
--	-----------

B/1992/0624 Operation of agricultural contracting business	Refused	11.01.1993
--	---------	------------

B/10374/1982	Cattle and dry sow house, (address amended by letter dated 16.12.82).	Approved	24.01.1983
B/8246/1980	Filling of hole with inert material	Approved	26.01.1981
B/5856/1979	Erection of cattle store. (Lane House Farm).	Approved	21.05.1979
B/5855/1979	Erection of pig and cattle shelter	Approved	21.05.1979
B/3242/1977	Erection of barn.	Approved	23.05.1977

Proposal Description

Full Planning permission is sought for the demolition of various commercial buildings at Cur Lane Farm and the erection of 7 dwellings in the form of single and two storey buildings. The dwellings would be finished in brickwork and timber cladding and include pitched roofs of varying heights. 3 No. 3 bedroom units, 2 No. 4 bedroom units, and 2 No. 5 bedroom units would be provided.

Two existing agricultural buildings to the north of the site will be retained as part of the development and share the same vehicular access as the residential development.

Assessment of Proposal

Planning permission is sought to redevelop the site of various commercial buildings for residential use. All the existing buildings on site are lawful following the grant of planning permission on appeal for the site as a mixed use following an appeal decision Ref: APP/P1805/C/16/3160015 dated 28 April 2017. Two single storey buildings to the north of the site (units 3 and 4) which were approved for agricultural storage use are excluded from the redevelopment as they do not fall within the definition of previously developed land under Annex 2 of the NPPF and therefore, will be retained for storage agricultural equipment.

The existing buildings are used for the following uses (as defined in the appeal decision):-

Unit 1	Residential storage
Unit 2a	Commercial storage
Unit 2b	Steelwork manufacturing
Unit 3	Agricultural storage
Unit 4	Agricultural storage
Unit 5	Manufacturing of exhibition stands
Unit 6	Indoor equine facility
Unit 7	Commercial livery and stables
Unit 8	Manufacturing of exhibition stands
Unit 9	Commercial storage
Unit 10	Ancillary toilet block

Five Year Housing Land Supply

Paragraph 74 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires local planning authorities to identify and update a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against their housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies, or against their local housing need where the strategic policies

are more than five years old. In addition, there must be a buffer of between 5% and 20%, depending on the circumstances of the LPA.

The Council has identified that (inclusive of the 5% buffer required by the NPPF) it can currently demonstrate a housing land supply of 4.6 years. Therefore, despite progress which has been made in identifying sites and granting planning permissions the Council still considers that it cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply. Where a Local Planning Authority cannot demonstrate a five year housing supply, Paragraph 11 (d) of the NPPF is engaged. Paragraph 11 requires that decisions on planning applications apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. 11 (d) goes on to state that where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless:

"i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for restricting the development proposed; or
ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole."

Footnote 8 to the NPPF states that this includes (for applications involving the provision of housing) situations where the LPA cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites with the appropriate buffer, as set out in paragraph 74. Footnote 7 states these policies include land designated as Green Belts.

Green Belt

The site lies within the Green Belt where there is a presumption against new development save for a number of exceptions outlined at Paragraphs 149 and 150 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

One of these exceptions, at paragraph 149 g) is: "the limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development". This is aligned with policy BDP 4(g) of the Bromsgrove District Plan (BDP).

The definition provided in Annex 2: Glossary of the NPPF for previously developed land is as follows:

'Land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. This excludes land that is or was last occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill, where provision for restoration has been made through development management procedures; land in built-up areas such as residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that was previously developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape.'

In this case the site comprises of buildings that have been used for storage and industrial uses over time and now have the benefit of an established use via the above appeal

decision. Due to the characteristics of the site, it is considered that most of the site (excluding the two agricultural buildings to the north of the site) fall within the definition of previously developed land as outlined in Annex 2 of the NPPF.

With respect to the development proposed a total of approximately 2,258.61 square metres of existing building will be removed from the site to be replaced with approximately 1,294 square metres of built form (including garages). The two existing agricultural buildings to the north of the site totalling approximately 353.3 square metres will be retained as part of the development. The proposed development is contained within the site in a courtyard layout in the approximate locations of the existing buildings on site. Whilst the proposed development will contrast in its form with that existing on site, it can be seen to have a benefit to the openness of the Green Belt by breaking up the large block forms of the existing development on site with a mixture of single and two storey dwellings of varying roof heights from 4.4 to 7.4m. The heights of the existing buildings vary from 3.10 to 7.6m.

The NPPF indicates that openness is an essential characteristic of the Green Belt. Openness in terms of the Green Belt has a spatial aspect as well as a visual aspect. The new buildings would be of a reduced floorarea and height compared to existing. As such, the proposal would have less impact on the openness of the Green Belt in spatial terms than the existing circumstances. Taking all these matters into account it is considered that the development proposed would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development, complying with paragraph 149 g) of the NPPF and BDP 4g) of the BDP, and as such would not comprise of inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

There is therefore a presumption in favour of the development in terms of Green Belt policy.

Sustainable location

Policy BDP2 of the District Plan defines four main facets to the delivery of housing to meet the needs of Bromsgrove District consisting of the following:-

- a) Development of previously developed land or buildings within existing settlement boundaries which are not in the designated Green Belt;
- b) Expansion Sites around Bromsgrove Town (as identified in BDP 5A);
- c) Development Sites in or adjacent to large settlements (as identified in BDP 5B);
- d) Exceptionally, affordable housing will be allowed in or on the edge of settlements in the Green Belt where a proven local need has been established through a comprehensive and recent survey and where the choice of site meets relevant planning criteria. Where viability is a concern the inclusion of other tenures within a scheme may be acceptable where full justification is provided. Where a proposed site is within the boundaries of a settlement, which is not in the Green Belt, a local need for housing would not need to be justified.

Although the site is previously developed land, it is within the Green Belt and is outside any existing settlement. The site is not identified as one of the expansion sites around Bromsgrove Town, and it is not in or adjacent to the large settlements identified in BDP 5B. However, it is adjacent to the Foxlydiate mixed use urban extension site identified under Policy RCBD1, the Redditch Cross Boundary Development area. Members will be

aware that permission has recently been issued for hybrid application 16/0263 comprising:-

1) Outline Application (with all matters reserved with the exception of vehicular points of access and principal routes within the site) for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of : Up to 2,560 dwellings (Class C3); Local centre including retail floorspace up to 900 sq metres (Classes A1, A2, A3) health and community facilities of up to 900 sq metres (Class D1) ; A 3FE first school (Class D1) (up to 2.8Ha site area) including associated playing area and parking and all associated enabling and ancillary works.

2) Detailed application for the creation of a means of access off Birchfield Road, Cur Lane, Foxlydiat Lane and emergency, pedestrian and cycle access to Pumphouse Lane. The creation of a primary access road, including associated cut and fill works and other associated earthworks, landscaping, lighting, drainage and utilities, crossings and surface water attenuation/drainage measures.

Whilst the principle of the Foxlydiat development has been approved, the scheme and associated infrastructure/facilities/services proposed for the mixed use development are yet to be implemented on site. Whilst it is noted that the application site is adjacent to this cross boundary site, one of the main issues is whether the proposed development would provide a suitable site for housing, having regard to proximity to services and job opportunities and reliance on motor vehicles.

The Highways Engineer has recommended refusal of the application on the grounds that it is a rural unsustainable location. The site at present benefits from an existing vehicular access with visibility which is impeded by overgrown vegetation. Cur Lane does not benefit from footpaths or street lighting and no parking restrictions are in force. The site is not located within walking distance of amenities, bus route or bus stops. The matter as to whether the site lies in a sustainable location has been noted by the Highway Authority and an objection is raised to the proposal on this basis.

The applicant has submitted several supporting statements to address sustainability concerns. A summary of the arguments put forward are as follows:-

- Reference to the Enforcement Appeal decision and that the site was considered a sustainable location at the time of the appeal.
- Reference is made to the existing vehicle movements associated with the site and that these could increase in the future, however, a small scale residential development is likely to have fewer traffic movements. 7 houses would generate 54 movements per day. That is a reduction of nearly 160 vehicle movements per day with the current development.
- The following sustainability accessibility measures would be provided for each residential unit:-
 1. Two electric bicycles, housed in an easily accessible weatherproof and secure cycle store adjacent to each house, complete with charge points;
 2. An electrical charge point for an electric vehicle;
 3. A travel pack containing:

- Maps and a guide clearly indicating the site's access to cycle routes, notably access to the nearby National Cycle Route 5 and the wider cycle route network that this links into (see diagram below);
 - Maps and a guide clearly indicating the site's access to local bus routes;
 - Maps and a guide clearly indicating the site's proximity and access to local amenities such as schools, medical services, food retail and leisure services;
 - Maps and a guide clearly indicating the local public footpath network, indicating routes to be taken to reach various amenities, alongside suggested circular routes of varying distance and rigour for the purposes of walking and jogging to enhance better health and well-being;
4. Fast Broadband provision, to enable and support working from home.
- The existing buildings have poor thermal insulation properties and are inefficient to heat. By contrast, the construction methods employed in the new dwellings will deliver highly energy efficient homes, whose carbon footprint will represent a significant betterment to the existing development which this will replace.
 - The existing site sits on the edge of agricultural land and green open space. The new development will replace a voluminous collection of unsightly commercial and agricultural storage buildings with well designed new homes built in brick and hardwood finishes more in keeping with this setting.
 - The continued use of this site for commercial purposes, whilst controlled by a range of measures, will inevitably bring about more 'polluting' activity to this site than the proposed dwellings. The proposal will improve existing noise pollution;

The Highway Authority acknowledge that there will be a reduction in the number of trips between the current uses of the site and the proposed use. However, it should be noted that the uses are not a like for like comparison (employment and residential). As the proposal is now for a residential development, the residents should be able to reach the amenities and public transport routes safely and by sustainable modes which would not be the case in this instance.

Paragraph 110 of the NPPF states that in assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:

- a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location;
- b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;
- c) the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code 46; and
- d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.

Paragraph 112 of the NPPF requires that within this context, applications for development should:

- a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high

quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use;

- b) address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport;
- c) create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards;
- d) allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles; and
- e) be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.

BDP16.8 of the District Plan requires the use of travel plans where applicable to secure the provision of sustainable travel choices, both to new developments and to extensions of existing sites, regardless of use. The reasoned justification in the policy 'encourages a modal shift away from the car to move towards more environmental and sustainable travel, public transport needs to provide a convenient and efficient alternative to the private car that will encourage more people to use it'. Whilst it is acknowledged that if the site remains in employment use, employees will still access the site generally by car. It should be noted that the provision of sustainable travel choices is required for this new development and would not be achieved due to the distance of current local facilities and services.

The Highway Authority consider the proposed development to be remote in respect accessing even day to day services and facilities for the intended future occupiers who would have a high reliance on a private motor vehicle. For those that would not have access to such a vehicle, the nearest services and facilities would not be accessible.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the site is not physically isolated or remote with the dwelling known as Twin Oaks and another neighbour opposite, as well as The Retreat, and the existing settlement of Webheath; the site is not considered to be located within a sustainable location due to the reliance of the car to reach all amenities and public transport.

Once the building of the development for up to 2,560 homes at Foxlydiate has taken place new transport links especially bus services will be created, and local services will be provided further reducing the need to travel. Given that the infrastructure and services have not been provided for Foxlydiate at present, officers can only take into account the existing infrastructure in respect to considering the sustainability of the proposal in this location.

The thresholds below for a site to be sustainable cannot be met. The following are the acceptable maximum thresholds via suitable infrastructure being in place:

- o Walking - 2k
- o Cycling - 5k
- o Bus stop - 400m

The location is 1.3 miles from the nearest bus stop and impacted by the lack of a safe walking route therefore this location cannot be considered sustainable from a transport perspective as there is no realistic alternative to the use of the car. The lack of street

lighting will deter journeys on foot particularly in times of darkness and adverse weather conditions. The site is located off a classified narrow fast flowing road close to a bend. Since the amenities and public transport stops are not located within walking distance it is unlikely to encourage residents to walk or cycle. There would be an unacceptable reliance on motor vehicles to access services and job opportunities.

The applicant relies on the fact that the adjacent land (Foxlydiate) is allocated for mixed use development and considers the application should be assessed on the aspiration for the adjacent allocation site, noting that once fully developed and occupied, it would be necessary for transport infrastructure to be introduced. However, a planning application must be assessed on the existing context at the time of the application. Whilst it is appreciated the adjacent land is designated for future housing, as highlighted in policy RCBD1 point 1.4III, only once the associated infrastructure has been constructed would the site become sustainable. Furthermore, the timescale for such a large scale development to be delivered on the ground is some way off. Until such a time, the site remains unsustainable.

Due to the above factors the trips would become car-based trips which would be unacceptable. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy BDP1, BDP2 and BDP16 of the District Plan, and paragraphs 11, 110 and 112 of the NPPF.

Design and Layout

Paragraphs 126-136 of the NPPF deal with high quality design and in particular states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

BDP19 of the Bromsgrove District Plan sets a series of criteria by which high quality people focussed space will be achieved. The new dwellings would be a mixture of single and two storey dwellings, that would be detached and semi detached and form courtyard settings to be finished in materials to be controlled by conditions.

The layout of the site is considered to be acceptable complying with Policy BDP19 of the District Plan and guidance set out in the Council's SPD on High Quality Design.

Drainage

The proposed development site is situated in the catchment of Spring Brook. The site falls within flood zone 1 and it is not considered that there is any significant fluvial flood risk to the site. A Drainage Impact Assessment has been provided with the application and this sufficiently summarises the flood risk to the site. The Drainage Assessment proposes a drainage layout which in principle is considered acceptable. North Worcestershire Water Management have considered the details submitted and recommend a drainage condition.

Ecology

The application is accompanied by a series of ecological appraisals that confirms that there appears to be no obvious and immediate issues for this development with regard to protected species and no further dedicated surveys for any species are recommended. Appropriate enhancement conditions in accordance with the Worcestershire Biodiversity Action Plan would be recommended.

Affordable Housing

Policy BDP 8 of the Bromsgrove District Plan requires 30% affordable housing on brownfield sites accommodating less than 200 houses. The proposal would generate the need for 2 affordable dwellings to be provided on site.

Paragraph 63 of the NPPF states that to support the re-use of brownfield land, where vacant buildings are being reused or redeveloped, any affordable housing contribution due should be reduced by a proportionate amount. The existing structures are not vacant to be re-used or re-developed, so a reduction in affordable housing contribution would not be warranted on this occasion.

The applicant has offered to purchase 1 No. 4 bedroom residential unit (house) and 1 No. 2 bedroom residential unit (house/flat) in Bromsgrove and they be offered to BDHT to be made available as social rented accommodation. The applicant states the following in respect to this approach:-

- The proposal is not a monetary contribution but is a proposal to supply housing that better matches the need and requirements of the Council Housing department, by providing this in locations within Bromsgrove that better suit the needs of the housing association that Housing have asked us to partner with.
- This proposal provides the benefit of this housing being provided within 6 months of approval of all pre-construction planning conditions, rather than at the end of the build project; this represents a benefit of what may amount to 18 months to 2 years, alongside an assurance of the provision of this housing, to help manage urgent housing needs.
- Although providing affordable housing away from the development site might represent a departure from this aspect of policy, we believe that we are providing a solution to satisfy the principal aims of this policy.

Paragraph 8.2 of Policy BDP8 states that in exceptional circumstances where the applicant can fully demonstrate that the required target cannot be achieved, the Council are able to negotiate a lower provision. However, the policy does not allow this to be provided through the payment of commuted sums for off-site provision and as such, a registered social housing provider would be required to adopt a certain number of units as affordable homes. The reasoned justification for the policy states that there is a significant unmet demand for affordable housing in the district. Accordingly, the provision of affordable housing is a fundamental consideration for new residential schemes.

Making an off site proposal in lieu of onsite provision should not be regarded as an alternate option determined by preference or convenience to the developer. The applicant has requested that the requirement for an offsite affordable housing provision, rather than the provision of on-site affordable housing be considered by the Local Planning Authority (LPA).

However, in light of the above considerations officers would be reluctant to accept an off site proposal in lieu of on-site provision, the principle drawback is that it does not actually secure the delivery of the affordable housing, nor does it identify an alternate site where such housing might be provided and delivered in an equivalent form. Paragraph 63 of the

NPPF states that – “Where a need for affordable housing is identified, planning policies should specify the type of affordable housing required, and expect it to be met on-site unless:

- a) off-site provision or an appropriate financial contribution in lieu can be robustly justified; and
- b) the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities.

For the reasons set out above, the LPA do not consider that the off site proposal in lieu of on site affordable housing has been robustly justified and as the site does not contain vacant buildings to be reused or redeveloped, the reduction in this provision would not be warranted on this occasion.

In its current form, the proposal makes no provision for on site affordable housing. Moreover, there is no mechanism before the Council to secure such provision. Therefore, the proposal would fail to contribute towards the significant unmet demand within the district. This is a significant and demonstrable shortcoming of the proposal. Accordingly, it is a matter to which should be attached substantial weight in consideration of the proposal. For the reasons identified above, I conclude that the provision of affordable housing in line with the requirements of the development plan is necessary and that this has not been adequately provided for through this proposal. Moreover, a lack of provision would prevent the proposal from helping the district meet its specific affordable housing needs. It would therefore be contrary to Policies BDP6 and BDP8 of the Bromsgrove District Plan which relate to infrastructure provision for new development, including the requirements for affordable housing.

Planning Obligations

In accordance with Paragraph 56 of the NPPF and Section 122 of the CIL regulations, planning obligations would be sought to mitigate the impact of this major development, should the application be recommended for approval. The site exceeds 0.5 hectares (0.64 hectares) and the total floorspace of the new development would exceed 1000 square metres and as such is a major application that would generate S106 contributions. The obligation in this case would cover the following if recommended for approval:-

- 2 No. affordable housing units provided on site
- £52.24 per dwelling towards the provision of wheelie bins for the development
- £26,844 towards free home to school transport for eligible students under 16 years of age.
- £2,760 to secure the funding for Kingfisher PCN or Nightingales PCN to provide additional infrastructure/extension/reconfigure existing premises to improve overall access.
- A S106 Monitoring fee TBC

Conclusion

The proposed development would not be inappropriate in Green Belt terms, as there would be a minor benefit in terms of the openness of the Green Belt due to the reduction of built development on the application site. The Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply and given that the proposal has been found to comply with policy for development within the Green Belt the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. The provision of housing will make a small contribution to the housing supply

position in the district as well as providing jobs through the construction process in the short term. However, future occupants of the proposal would not have suitable access to local services and facilities and as such would be heavily reliant on a private motor vehicle. This harm is to some degree moderated by the existing employment use of the site that could generate more vehicle trips than the proposal in its own right. Nevertheless, there is still moderate harm associated with this.

It is considered that the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Whilst new dwellings in this location would bring some benefits, these would be largely limited and are outweighed by the significant harm caused by virtue of the unsustainable location of the application site. The proposal does not therefore benefit from the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development as outline in paragraph 11 of the NPPF, and having regard to the issues outlined above, would represent an unacceptable form of development.

In addition, the proposal would fail to provide on site affordable housing as required by the development plan. This is a significant and demonstrable shortfall of the proposal and as a consequence, would prevent the proposal from helping the district meet its specific affordable housing needs. As such the proposal would not accord with policies in the District Plan and the NPPF and would represent an unacceptable form of development.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be **Refused**

Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposal by reason of its distance from essential services, job opportunities, and the future occupier's reliance upon motor vehicles as a means of transport would result in an unsustainable form of development. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies BDP1, BDP2 and BDP16 of the Bromsgrove District Plan and paragraphs 11, 110 and 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposal would not deliver 30% affordable housing on site in accordance with the requirements of the development plan for brown field sites and the applicant has not demonstrated that the need could not be met on site in a form that was acceptable to an RSL. The proposal fails to quantify and qualify an acceptable alternative for consideration by the Local Planning Authority in lieu of provision on site and a lack of provision would prevent the proposal from helping the district meet its specific affordable housing needs. It would therefore fail to accord with Policies BDP1, BDP6 and BDP8 of the Bromsgrove District Plan and paragraph 63 of the NPPF.

Case Officer: Sharron Williams Tel: 01527 534061 Ext 3372
Email: sharron.williams@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk