

**Bromsgrove District Council
Planning Committee**

**Committee Updates
12 February 2026**

24/00533/REM Land to west of Foxlydiate Lane/Pumphouse Lane, Redditch

- Amended plans have been received with regard the boundary with Longbarn and the proposed play area.

Longbarn

- The amended plans now show the existing hedge positioned within the rear garden of Longbarn (previously these was incorrectly shown as within the application site).

Play Area

- The position of the play area has been adjusted within the Village Green to provide two separate access points linked to the proposed footpath network
- The proposed equipment now includes the provision of a springer with a backrest and interactive boards which are useable from ground level
- It is considered that these improve the range of play options to improve inclusivity.

The amended plan will be captured in the list of approved plans suggested condition set out on page 44.

- Leisure Services has been consulted on the amended plans and comments are currently awaited; therefore the recommendation remains as set out in the main report.

25/00803/FUL 7 Churchfields Road, Bromsgrove

No updates

25/00872/FUL 18 Broadfields, Hagley

1 representation received raising the issue of the Ancient Light Law

Officer response:

- Residential amenity and, in that respect, impact on light, can be material considerations when it comes to granting planning permission. However, the matter of rights to light or ancient light law, are private law rights and are not planning considerations
- Section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides that in dealing with an application for planning permission the authority shall have regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application and any other material considerations; and
- The Bromsgrove District Plan and the High-Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that development should ensure a reasonable standard of amenity reflecting the character of the local area. In all cases particular regard will be paid to avoiding (among other things) loss of daylight, overshadowing and overbearing impact. In considering all proposals for development in Bromsgrove District, regard will be had to compatibility with adjoining uses and the impact on residential amenity (Policy BDP1(e) of the Local Plan).
- Members will note that the issue of residential amenity is dealt with on page 89 of the published report. It is concluded that the proposal would not lead to an excessive or unreasonable impact on existing neighbouring occupants.

2 representations received raising the following issues (summarised):

- Highways safety and lack of evidence - We have seen no evidence of any traffic monitoring or

on site assessment by Worcestershire County Council Highways. Without baseline data, it is difficult to understand how the proposal can be considered safe. Residents report over 100 vehicle movements on this road during school weekdays, and the reduced visibility at the junction with Broadfields, which would mean drivers would only see oncoming traffic at very short distances. This presents a clear highways safety concern that has not been adequately assessed.

- **Parking and frontage layout** - The proposed parking arrangement mirrors that of 22a Winds Point, where parking was intended to be located at the rear of the property. As outlined above, the approved plans for that development showed a landscaped frontage and planting to soften boundary, however, the frontage has been used for vehicle parking, and the approved planting has not been delivered. Given this precedent, there is no assurance that the same issues would not arise again. Parking on the corner pavement would have a direct impact on local residents, particularly vulnerable pedestrians, and would exacerbate existing safety concerns at this junction.
- **Cumulative housing pressure in Hagley** - There are multiple large scale housing developments already approved or progressing through the planning system in Hagley, including schemes for more than 30 homes within 200 yards of this site. This proposed dwelling would also be the eighth additional property added to the estate. In this context, it is difficult to justify the need for an additional single dwelling in a constrained and sensitive location, particularly where it introduces highways and amenity impacts that larger, planned developments are better placed to mitigate.
- **Non compliance with approved plans and conditions on the previous development** - This directly questions enforceability and the reliability of the applicant's assurances.
- **Highways safety and lack of evidence** - A clear, material planning concern where the evidence base is weak or absent.
- **The proposal not following the established development pattern** - A simple, visual point that clearly demonstrates harm to the character of the area.

Officer response:

All issues are addressed in the published report