

Public Document Pack

Planning Committee
6th November 2025

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

THURSDAY 6TH NOVEMBER 2025, AT 6.00 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors H. J. Jones (Chairman), S. J. Baxter, D. J. A. Forsythe, E. M. S. Gray, R. J. Hunter (substituting for Councillor J. Clarke), P. M. McDonald (substituting for Councillor M. Marshall), and S. R. Peters

Officers: Mrs. R. Bamford, Mr. D. M. Birch, Mr. M. Howarth, (Anthony Collins Solicitors) Mr. G. Nock, representing Worcestershire County Council, Highways, Ms. S. Williams and Mrs. P. Ross

45/25

TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor M. Marshall, with Councillor P. M. McDonald in attendance as the substitute Member. Councillor J. Clarke with Councillor R. J. Hunter in attendance as the substitute Member.

Apologies for absence were also received from Councillors A Bailes, R. E. Lambert, J. Robinson and J. D. Stanley.

46/25

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

47/25

UPDATES

There was no Committee Update on this occasion.

48/25

25/00346/REM - RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION (APPEARANCE, LAYOUT AND SCALE AS APPROPRIATE TO THE DEVELOPMENT) FOR THE CREATION OF A SPINE ROAD WITH ASSOCIATED DRAINAGE INFRASTRUCTURE AND A TEMPORARY SITE COMPOUND, PURSUANT TO OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION REFERENCE 16/0335 (ALLOWED AT APPEAL UNDER REFERENCE APP/ P1805/W/20/3265948) FOR 1,300 DWELLINGS AT PERRYFIELDS, BROMSGROVE. LAND AT PERRYFIELDS ROAD, BROMSGROVE. TAYLOR WIMPEY UK LTD

Officers presented the report and presentation slides and in doing so highlighted that the application was for the remaining section of the main

movement corridor (spine road) and associated infrastructure works and was intended to serve the remaining phases of this development.

Phase 1 development off the Stourbridge Road had been under construction for some time, whilst Phase 2 being currently off the Kidderminster Road.

Officers highlighted that this application followed the granting of outline planning permission at appeal and the approval of external access arrangements by the Planning Inspectorate.

The Reserved Matters application brought forward the important details for approval which would allow confirmation of the appearance, layout and scale of the spine road link which was key to deliver the overall transport strategy of the site.

Mini roundabouts were shown as well as spurs to serve future residents/commercial phases.

Two sections of Perryfields Road, and a section of Fockbury Mill Lane would ultimately be severed as part of this section of the main route corridor. The stopping up of these roads would enable enhanced quality cycle/pedestrian facilities, ensuring less reliance on the car.

Officers highlighted that the principle of the stopping up of these roads had already been considered at the outline stage and approved in principle and was clearly indicated within the suite of approved plans, namely the Access and Movement Parameters Plan and also conditioned accordingly within the appeal decision (Condition 35).

A through connection between Kidderminster Road and Stourbridge Road would be maintained as part of this development aligning with the approved and conditioned Access and Movement Parameter Plan, as detailed at Figure 3.6 Parameter Plans and Access and Movement slide, on page 21 of the main agenda pack.

From a highway and transportation perspective, this application principally comprised of the spine road connection between the Perryfields Phase 1 residential site, as approved in November 2023 under the Reserved Matters application and the Phase 2 portion of the site by Kidderminster Road, as approved in January 2025.

The section of the spine road relevant to this planning application had been designed in accordance with the principles established as part of the outline approval set by the Planning Inspectorate.

To achieve these established principles a 6.1m wide road had been provided. There was localised widening at the bends along the spine road which was necessary to safely accommodate two-way traffic based on vehicle tracking data. The required 20mph design speed had been achieved through a combination of measures including horizontal

alignment, three mini-roundabouts, and a build-out feature on the northern section. A ghost right-turn arrangement had also been provided for the existing school.

There was a combination of 2m footways and a 3.5m wide shared foot/cycleway provided on the spine road through the development site. A signalised crossing was proposed where the active travel corridor switched from the northbound approach to the southbound.

The proposed spine road had been subject to an independent Road Safety Audit (RSA) Stage 1/2 and a designer response produced. The findings of the RSA were considered by Worcestershire County Council. County Highways had raised no objection to the proposal but had emphasised that although this planning application focused primarily on the layout of the main spine road which formed the through route movement corridor of the development; it was important to note that several other elements of the site, including the local centre, future school, potential modifications to the existing school, and additional residential parcels were still in the pre-planning stages.

As highlighted in the report representations were received from residents and the Bromsgrove Society in respect of severing Perryfields Road, and off site junction improvements. Members were asked to note that the severing of Perryfields Road, and off site junction improvements had already been set by the outline planning consent; and that the spine road accorded with the planning principles set by the Planning Inspectorate and aligned with the approved and conditioned Access and Movement Parameter Plan.

Members' attention was drawn to the Public Rights of Way Matters, as detailed on page 15 of the main agenda pack.

Officers further drew Members' attention to the information on Drainage Matters and the drainage layout with the inclusion of four SuDS ponds, a below-ground attenuation tank and the pumping station, as detailed on pages 15 and 16 of the main agenda pack.

It was anticipated that the temporary site compound was proposed to be provided on site until the end of 2027. Given the length of time that this would be located on site, consideration needed to be given to neighbouring occupiers in terms of how the temporary compound operated during this time. This would be included in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and would be required to be discharged under Condition 11 of the outline approval.

Officers concluded that this was an allocated development site. The Reserved Matters under consideration were in accordance with the approved plans of the outline approval and relevant conditions imposed by the Planning Inspector. Taking account of material planning considerations, the development was acceptable, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Ms. G. Johnson, the Applicant's Planning agent and Councillor K. Taylor, Ward Member addressed the Committee.

Members then considered the Reserved Matters application, which Officers had recommended be approved.

The Chairman took the opportunity to remind Members that they were being asked to consider the Reserved Matters application only.

Members expressed some concern with regard to Condition 11, and the possibility of stricter controls in respect of screening and the suppression of dust that existing residents were currently experiencing, and the presumptive proposed stopping up in three different places. The stopping up permission had already been given by WCC at previous meetings but now needed to go through due process. This application was asking Members to look at the viability and impact on the roads in Bromsgrove and not the stopping up of the roads.

In response Officers acknowledged that there had been some experience of dust and disturbance during Phase 1, however there was a CEMP for each phase of the development to ensure that any previous problems were not experienced, and no disruption to new residents on Perryfields Drive and other residents on the Perryfields Road area.

Reserved Matters approved had been granted for the stopping up of Perryfields Road, as detailed in the report and as shown on page 21 of the main agenda pack, the Figure 3.6 Parameter Plans and Access and Movement slide, of the main agenda pack.

Mr. G. Nock, a representative of Worcestershire County Council (WCC), Highways further explained that WCC Highways had had to consider the constraints parameters, this was something that had been scrutinised and previously deferred by WCC Highways pending an independent Road Safety Audit (RSA). Any impact on the roads around Bromsgrove Town Centre, had been considered and mitigated. A Section 278 Agreement would ensure connectivity and integration within the overall development.

The Development Management Manager referred to 'Other Matters' as detailed on page 16 of the main agenda pack, and informed Members that they could request or ask for additional measures to be included in the CEMP.

Some Members were still concerned with the stopping up Perryfields Road and a section of Fockbury Mill Lane, where would people from Dodford and the other side of Perryfields Road go once the stopping up had taken place? Member expressed their concerns with regard to accessing the area around the school; and as detailed in the report 'ensuring less reliance on the car.' Some Members stated that it did not

take into consideration people who had to travel by car or people with disabilities. Some Members further stated that they could not see the logic of stopping up Perryfields Road. The roads may look wide, but they were very narrow and close to some residents front doors. Was there the possibility to have more entrances and exits?

In response Mr. G. Nock, WCC, Highways, stated that there would be points where residents could join the spine road and that it was a balance of ensuring that all people had been considered in each phase approved in respect to the location of the spine road and the stopping up of Perryfields Road. The same level of scrutiny had been applied to this scheme to ensure that it did not prejudice any users.

Members were advised that they were considering a piece of infrastructure with no houses as yet. However, the provision of additional footpaths and any additional infrastructure measures / requirements, would be reviewed under the Reserved Matters of future phased schemes.

Members further reiterated that they were aware of what was agreed by the Planning Inspectorate under appeal; but they were also fully aware of the impact on residents following the approval of phases 1 and 2 currently under construction. Members would expect any future variations to the agreed Conditions, would come back to Planning Committee Members for their consideration.

Whilst Members understood the traffic calming measures that would be put in place, some Members queried through traffic and the 6.1m wide road being provided, as this seemed narrow for a major thoroughfare for cars and buses. Members were seeking some reassurance on this matter.

In response Mr. G. Nock, WCC, Highways, commented that the corridor was absolutely balanced, with widening and bends. With regards to it being a public transport corridor, vehicle tracking and large vehicle tracking had been simulated. From a highways design perspective the bends were linear and in line with the existing Perryfields Road and the widening ensured safe turning. Nationally and locally 6.1m was the most appropriate answer to balance movement of motorised vehicles, with active travel for pedestrians and cyclists.

The section of the spine road relevant to this Reserved Matters application had been designed in accordance with the principles established as part of the outline approval as set by the Planning Inspectorate.

Members continued to express their concerns with regard to the stopping up of Perryfields Road and the need to strengthen up Condition 11. Some Members also suggested if the Reserved Matters application should be deferred, in order to gather more evidence from existing

residents, new residents and residents (on the west side) who would be taking their children to the nearby school.

In response Mr. G. Nock, WCC, Highways, reiterated that all off site matters, traffic assessments had been scrutinised and mitigated and were included in the public enquiry and in the Planning Inspectorate's report.

With the agreement of the Chairman, the Assistant Director for Planning, Leisure and Culture Services took the opportunity to remind Planning Committee Members that with regard to Condition 11 and the CEMP, that Members could inform the contents of the CEMP, hours of operation etc. What would Members like to see in this document.

The Council's Legal Advisor stated that in order to assist Members, that Condition 11 needed to be looked at in its entirety for Members to see what was specifically included, and for Members to consider what they wanted included. With this in mind the Council's Legal Advisor read out Condition 11.

The Council's Legal Advisor further reminded Members that they were being asked to consider the Reserved Matters application before them, Members could not consider the outline planning permission that was granted at appeal, as this was already approved. Members should be mindful to give clear reasons should they decide to defer this application.

Members thanked the Council's Legal Advisor, however Members stated that they did not have a problem with Condition 11, the issue was with the detail behind each item. Work could not continue until the Reserved Matters application was approved, and Members did not want any works to be carried out until they could see the full details of Condition 11.

The Development Management Manager highlighted that Members were being asked to consider Conditions 1 and 2, as part of the Reserved Matters application; Condition 11 was not included. Members were not involved in the discharge of Conditions, as Officers discharged any agreed Conditions.

Further debate followed on the stopping up of the roads, with some Members who knew the area well, stating that the full impact of the stopping up needed to be looked at comprehensively. Should Members be minded to approve were they approving the stopping up order? The report stated 'only in principle' so Members could make that decision surely? Finding a balance between riding a bike and walking against using a car, did not stop the houses being built. Members needed to ensure that we met resident's needs.

In response Mr. G. Nock, WCC, Highways, stated that he was not aware of any stopping up order being made. The Reserved Matters application before Members was for the remaining section of the spine road.

Officers further reiterated that the stopping up of the two sections of Perryfields Road and a section of Fockbury Mill Lane, would be carried out by WCC Highways under the Highways Act 1980, Section 278, and that the outline planning application was approved at appeal.

The Assistant Director for Planning, Leisure and Culture Services took the opportunity to explain that Mr. G. Nock, WCC, Highways, had clarified that WCC Highways would follow a specific procedure for the stopping up of the roads. As reiterated during the course of the meeting, the main route corridor for the development as a whole, had been agreed in principle, at appeal, so the principle of stopping up of the roads had been approved at the outline stage, it was not within Members gift to change this. Members were being asked to consider the practical elements of the final section of the spine road under the Reserved Matters application. Members could consider the CEMP, and how to shape this in respect of:-

- Hours
- Mud / dust management

At this stage in the meeting, the Chairman announced a break in order for Officers to provide the Committee with full details of Condition 11, the Council's Legal Advisor time to check the Council's Constitution, Scheme of Delegations and for Members to have a comfort break.

Accordingly, the meeting stood adjourned from 19:17 hours to 19:28 hours.

Having reconvened, Officers provided a presentation slide detailing Condition 11.

Having briefly discussed Condition 11, Members were in agreement that an additional Recommendation be included as follows:-

(3) that the Planning Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman be consulted in relation to the content of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which was required to be submitted and approved in accordance with Condition 11 of the outline consent, in order to ensure that a robust (CEMP) was provided.

Having been proposed and seconded and on being taken to the vote, it was

RESOLVED that

- 1) the Reserved Matters application be approved,
- 2) delegated powers be granted to the Assistant Director for Planning, Leisure and Culture Services to agree the final scope and detailed wording and numbering of conditions as set out on

pages 16 and 17 of the main agenda pack, and the additional condition, as detailed in the preamble above; and

- 3) the Planning Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman be consulted in relation to the content of the Construction Environmental Plan (CEMP) which was required to be submitted and approved in accordance with Condition 11 of the outline consent, in order to ensure that a robust (CEMP) was provided.

49/25

PLANNING PERFORMANCE REPORT: QUARTER 2

The Development Management Manager informed Members that the report was for Quarter Two (1st July 2025 to 30th September 2025).

It was highlighted that there were no concerns with regard to Decision Making, Quality of Decision Making or Speed of Decision Making.

As requested by the Committee the report also contained a list of Appeal Decisions. There were no cost award outcomes relating to recent planning appeals to report.

The Chairman took the opportunity to remind the Committee that the report was for noting only.

RESOLVED that the Planning Performance Information report, Quarter 2 – 1st July 2025 to 30th September 2025, be noted.

50/25

TO CONSIDER ANY URGENT BUSINESS, DETAILS OF WHICH HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED TO THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF LEGAL, DEMOCRATIC AND PROCUREMENT SERVICES PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE MEETING AND WHICH THE CHAIRMAN, BY REASON OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, CONSIDERS TO BE OF SO URGENT A NATURE THAT IT CANNOT WAIT UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING.

There was no urgent business on this occasion.

The meeting closed at 7.36 p.m.

Chairman