

**Bromsgrove District Council
Planning Committee**

**Committee Updates
11th April 2022**

19/00615/OUT Foxlydiate Hotel, Birchfield Road, Redditch

Representations

The omitted date relating to receipt of the first representation from Bentley Pauncefoot Parish Council is 08/06/2019

Leisure Services

An appropriate contribution for off-site provision (if required) is currently being discussed with Leisure colleagues, together with location. Delegated authority to the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Leisure is also sought to resolve that issue.

WCC Highways

For clarification, Tudor Grange Academy relates to that located at Redditch (Woodrow Drive, Redditch, B98 7UH)

The Passenger Transport at Worcestershire County Council have confirmed the advised contribution remains relevant and necessary, based upon the costs of the dedicated schools transport service as a result of the development proposals associated with the application.

North Worcestershire Water Management

No objection subject to conditions

Recommendation

As per the report from the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Leisure but with additional provision (iv):

That the application be approved, and Outline planning permission be GRANTED subject to DELEGATED AUTHORITY be given to the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Leisure Services to:

- i) agree a suitable and satisfactory legal mechanism to secure the contributions and requirements set out in the following schedule, and
- ii) agree the final scope, detailed wording and numbering of the planning conditions to be imposed as set out in the following summary list, and
- iii) to consider the content of any representation received post-committee but prior to issuing of the decision notice (pending completion of the s106 agreement) without reference back to Planning Committee.
- iv) agree an appropriate contribution and location for off-site open space provision (if required)

21/01657/FUL 277 Birmingham Road, Bromsgrove

Following the publication of the committee report, the applicant has made two further submissions.

The first is an appeal decision in Solihull MBC from March 2022 for the demolition of an existing garden centre and associated buildings, and the erection of an extra care facility (Use Class C2) comprising: a village care centre; 39no. one and two bedroom care suites; 46no. one and two bedroom care apartments (Reference: APP/Q4625/W/21/3285876 (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)).

In this case, the appeal (which was in the Green belt) was allowed as the Inspector agreed that this reduction in construction development would have a positive impact on the openness of the green belt, although additional height and an increase in volume would harm the openness of the

site visually and spatially and were therefore inappropriate. In addition, while some benefits to the character and appearance of the site will materialize, it will still urbanize the site, which will reduce the character and appearance of the nearby area.

In the balancing exercise, the Inspector concluded that there was a high level of unmet need for extra-care accommodation. Solihull was largely reliant on windfall sites to meet the need for specialist housing for its elderly residents, and this need could not be met on such sites outside the green belt. It would also generate employment and contribute to improving the Council's housing land supply, which stood at less than five years. These factors amounted to the very special circumstances required to support the appeal.

The applicant considers this to be a comparable site to the current application site and has outlined that the success of this appeal represents substantial positive weight in favour of approving the Bromsgrove scheme, which is considered to be finely balanced insofar as its merits as a development and its potential impact on the Green Belt. Therefore, this appeal should be taken into account as part of the officer's final assessment of the application ahead of presenting it to the committee members.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development and site circumstances are different from those in this application and are not comparable. They are in a different part of the country (albeit within the Midlands and the Green Belt) and where a different development plan applies.

Members will also have received on Friday 8th April a Committee Briefing note. This provides a summary of the case that the applicant has made and outlines correctly that the objections to the proposal relate to heritage and the site's Green Belt location.

It is not the purpose of this update to provide a detailed rebuttal to this work, and the committee report covers the pertinent points. However, it is important to reiterate that there is a disagreement regarding the loss of the non designated heritage assets. As outlined in the Briefing Note the applicant considers that the level of significance of the site is limited (low). The conservation team, consider that, on a local scale, it has a high importance which they believe needs to be recognised.

Although not a designated heritage asset, the building is a non-designated heritage asset, and one that would be of high importance on our local list. They have outlined some of the reasons below:

- o The architect, Alfred Chatwin, was an important Birmingham architect, and was responsible for designing/ altering several churches in Birmingham, many of which are listed, including St. Augustine's, Edgbaston, and St. Martin's, Birmingham. Chatwin also did work across the country, showing that he was also recognised nationally. The building therefore represents the work of this important and significant Architect.

- o Although rectories were commonly built in this time, this one is uniquely complete internally and externally. It therefore clearly shows the Architectural intention and the history of the building can easily be read.

- o The building represents this period of time where rectories were commonly built and illustrates something of this social/ historic movement.

In light of the above, greater weight should be given to the significance of the building (medium), and therefore the magnitude of its total demolition would be higher than if its importance was considered to be low as argued by the applicant.