

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

MONDAY, 10TH OCTOBER 2022, AT 6.00 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors H. J. Jones (Chairman), A. D. Kriss (Vice-Chairman), A. J. B. Beaumont, G. N. Denaro, S. P. Douglas, A. B. L. English, M. Glass, J. E. King, M. A. Sherrey and C. J. Spencer

Officers: Mr. D. M. Birch, Ms. J. Chambers, Mr. R. Keyte, Mr. M. Rowan (via Microsoft Teams) and Mrs. P. Ross

19/22 **TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES**

There were no apologies for absence.

20/22 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor A. B. L. English declared in relation to Agenda Item No.5 - (Planning Application – 22/00801/FUL – Seafeld Farm, Seafeld Lane, Portway, Redditch, Worcestershire, B98 9DB in that she would be addressing the Committee for this item as Ward Councillor under the Council's public speaking rules. Following the conclusion of public speaking, Councillor A. B. L. English left the meeting room.

21/22 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 5th September were received.

That the minutes be amended at Minute No. 17/22, paragraph 7, page 3 and paragraph 10, page 4 - Planning Application 8 Forest Close, Lickey End, Bromsgrove, B60 1JU, as follows:-

That the word subordinate be changed to read insubordinate.

RESOLVED that, subject to the amendment as detailed in the preamble, that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 5th September 2022, be approved as a correct record.

22/22 **UPDATES TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS REPORTED AT THE MEETING (TO BE CIRCULATED PRIOR TO THE START OF THE MEETING)**

The Chairman announced that a Committee Update had been circulated to all Planning Committee Members and asked all Members if they had received and read the Committee Update.

All Members agreed that they had received and read the Committee Update.

23/22

22/00801/FUL - DEMOLITION OF 2NO. EXISTING POULTRY BUILDING AND ERECTION OF CLEAR SPAN PORTAL FRAME BUILDING TO FORM ADDITIONAL SEASONAL LIVESTOCK AREA - SEAFIELD FARM, SEAFIELD LANE, PORTWAY, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE B98 9DB - ATTWELL

Officers drew Members' attention to the Committee Update, which detailed an amended Recommendation, Revised Condition 3, an additional Condition 8 and new Informatives. Copies of which Members had been given the opportunity to read and copies of which were provided to Members and published on the Council's website prior to the commencement of the meeting.

Officers presented the report and in doing so drew Members' attention to the presentation slides, as detailed on pages 20 to 26 of the main agenda report; and the additional slides showing the proposed drainage plan and additional photos of the buildings proposed for demolition.

The application site formed part of Seafield Farm operated by Seafield Pedigrees Ltd; and was located to the west of Seafield Lane. It was currently occupied by 2 former poultry sheds, and these had been more recently used for lambing. Due to age and storm damage, the buildings were in a dilapidated state.

The application originally proposed the 'Demolition of 2No. existing poultry building and erection of clear span portal frame building to form additional seasonal livestock area and secure farm storage, with internal area for hay and straw storage'. Following concerns, this was amended so that the farm storage, hay and straw storage elements were withdrawn from the application.

The brochure for the farm park refers to a 'lambing barn.' This building lay adjacent to the derelict poultry sheds. It was a re-purposed former poultry building and ventilation was limited. The Agricultural Consultant had advised that it was not well-suited to lambing.

The existing cattle building was extended in 2020 under an agricultural notification. The applicant did advise that this had enabled a creeper area for calves following professional advice regarding improvements to animal welfare. The Agricultural Consultant had advised that the existing cattle building was well-suited to livestock.

The existing cattle shed cannot accommodate all the cows for over-wintering. Throughout the application process, the farmer had stressed

the need for over-wintering accommodation for his livestock. The existing cattle shed could accommodate 68-81 cows. The proposed cattle shed would accommodate 45-54 cattle. Although at the upper end of the space allowance, the Agricultural Consultant had advised that the herd size of approximately 120 suckler cows was considered to justify the additional space.

With regard to sheep, the Agricultural Consultant had advised that the proposed sheep pens would be capable of housing of the order of 200 ewes if housed in groups, or less if divided into individual lambing pens. The buildings would, therefore, house the larger flock of sheep, which would be housed from December to circa February / March.

The application form stated that storm water would drain to soakaways. North Worcestershire Water Management (NWWM) had advised that due to the clay soils this would be unlikely to be feasible. The agent had subsequently explained that there would be no increase in runoff from the site compared to the pre-development situation. No additional surfacing was proposed and rainwater systems of existing buildings were plumbed directly into the adjacent ditch. NWWM did request further clarification on this matter, details of which were included on page 3 of the Committee Update; with the recommendation of an additional condition.

The supporting statement stated that waste water would be plumbed into existing below ground surface water drainage system there would be a water tank installed onto the downpipes to feed into water trough system, rainwater to be filtered by rainstore system to ensure safe for use. NWWM had recommended a Condition regarding manure storage to protect run off polluting water courses.

WRS was consulted regarding contaminated land and their response was detailed on page 1 of the Committee Update.

Officers concluded that the proposed agricultural building fell within a limited and closed list that was appropriate development within the Green Belt. The agricultural need for the development had been established. Design, layout, location, appearance and impact on amenity of this agricultural building were considered appropriate and acceptable.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Applicant, Mr. M. Attwell addressed the Committee, and Councillor A. B. L. English, Ward Member also addressed the Committee.

Members then considered the application, which officers had recommended be approved.

In response to the request made by the Applicant, Mr. Attwell during his address to the Committee asking for the removal of Condition 4, "The building hereby approved shall not be open to the public visiting the Attwell Farm Park".

Members questioned if this Condition could be removed, and the implications should the Committee be minded to remove Condition 4.

Officers clarified that the application before Members had been considered and assessed by officers as an agricultural building, which the application had been submitted as. Condition 4 was to ensure the satisfactory operation of the site and to protect the Green Belt. The site was located in the Green Belt where development was only considered appropriate if it fell within a closed list of exceptions and buildings for agriculture were identified as one of the exceptions. The farm had two uses, as a Farm Park and as a working farm. To allow members of the public to visit the working farm extended into education/leisure use and beyond the agricultural use and would therefore be considered and assessed under different criteria in the Green Belt and could be deemed inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Further debate followed on the Attwell Farm Park and the agricultural buildings being proposed; with officers suggesting that the animals could be made available to view at the Attwell Farm Park and that trainees and college students would not be visiting the farm as part of the Attwell Farm Park attraction.

During the debate Councillor A. D. Kriss questioned how enforceable the Condition would be and therefore proposed an Alternative Recommendation that Condition 4 be removed, which was seconded by Councillor S. P. Douglas.

On being put to the vote, the Alternative Recommendation was lost.

RESOLVED that planning permission be approved subject to: -

- a) delegated powers be granted to the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Leisure Services to determine the application following:
 - (i) The expiry of the consultation period on 13 October 2022 and in the event that further representations were received, that delegated powers be granted to the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Leisure and Services, in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee, to assess whether new material considerations had been raised and to issue a decision after the expiry of the publicity period accordingly;
- b) Conditions 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7, as detailed on pages 16 and 17 the main agenda report;
- c) revised Condition 3, as detailed on page 2 and 3 of the Committee Update;
- d) new Condition 8, as detailed on page 3 of the Committee Update;

and

- e) two new Informatives for Discharge Responsibility and Protected Species, as detailed on page 3 of the Committee Update.

24/22

22/01137/S73 - REMOVAL OF CONDITION 3 (PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS) AND VARIATION OF CONDITION 6 (CONSERVATION ROOFLIGHTS) OF PLANNING APPROVAL 21/01248/FUL SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, THE BARN, WOODMAN LANE, CLENT, STOURBRIDGE, WORCESTERSHIRE DY9 9PX - MS. J. WILLETTS

This application was withdrawn from the Agenda.

The meeting closed at 6.39 p.m.

Chairman