

**Bromsgrove District Council
Planning Committee**

**Committee Updates
9 April 2026**

17/01468/FUL Stourbridge Road Car Park, Stourbridge Road, Bromsgrove

Nine further objections have been received in relation to the application raising the following material planning matters:

- Traffic congestion with additional traffic gridlocking the town
- The highway impact will be severe
- The principle of the development is not acceptable
- Harm to pedestrian environment and undermines sustainable development objectives
- Inconsistent with health and wellbeing objectives
- Disturbance to residential and town centre amenity through 24 hour opening
- The design is not good enough
- Environmental impact through the loss of trees
- Loss of car parking
- Not the right place for the development
- Increased air pollution
- Loss of car parking

One further letter of support has been received raising the following material planning matters:

- The highway issues wouldn't change as a result of the application
- The proposal will result in extra jobs and visitors to the town
- Other schools are closer to similar outlets than this site
- Access for those who cannot drive
- Make use of the car park

As a result there are now 454 contributors on the application; 427 of which are recorded as objection and 26 of which are recorded as support.

19/00140/OUT Alvechurch Football Club, Redditch Road, Alvechurch

No updates

25/00612/S73 Attwell Farm Park, Seafeld Lane, Beoley

Updated Tree Officer comments

- The mention of no-dig construction in Dwg. No. 913 01 REV B without any of the expected detail is not sufficient.
- There is no indication of the extent of the root protection areas of the retained trees and by that virtue no indication of the extent the no-dig methodology. Additionally, no Arboricultural Survey or Impact Assessment has been submitted which would identify the conflicts and propose a methodology and specification for no-dig construction.
- Recommends submission of an Arboricultural Survey and Impact Assessment and a method statement to detail working within the root protected area of retained trees to include: lifting of the existing surface, decompaction due to retrospective nature of the application, and the proposed no-dig solution including the grade and specification of an indicative product to be used.

Updated WRS comments

- The available records and documents that have been submitted have been reviewed, including the noise assessment and draft noise management plan, which outlines mitigation measures

for events and live music as well as management of potential noise from patrons.

- WRS Technical Pollution Team acknowledge that at times there could be a marginal increase in noise levels, but the assessment is appropriately robust.
- It is anticipated noise is unlikely to increase to a level that would adversely impact the nearest residential receptors, providing the noise management plan is adhered to
- WRS would recommend a condition is in place to this effect.
- Also, recommend details of lighting to be submitted

Further comments received from Beoley Residents' Association:

- Suggest that Cherry Pit Lane, Brockhill Lane, Carpenters Hill and Whitepits Lane are all impacted by Attwell Farm Park traffic and that damage is occurring by a significant increase in traffic since the opening of the Farm Park.
- Reference 4 PICs on Seafield Lane (08/01/2021, 20/08/2021, 28/01/2023, 25/10/2024) and 1 PIC on Carpenters Hill (23/08/2022).
- Also refer to local knowledge of 1 accident in February 2026 on Seafield Lane and another in March 2026 on Carpenters Hill

Response of Worcestershire Highways to Beoley Residents' Association further comments:

- The scale of development and the local highway network will influence the size of the local study area used to consider PIC history in the surrounding area. Often, this might be to nearby or key local junctions, with a typical study area being approximately a 500m distance of the site, in terms of considering the direct impact of new development traffic.
- It is acknowledged PICs have occurred on sections of Seafield Lane, outside the local study area, as well as on Carpenter Lane. On a link like Seafield Lane, one or two PICs a year would not tend to raise a highway safety concern and is in line with the average PIC record for many similar roads. It would be impossible to determine, from the PIC data, if any of the persons involved were directly related to the Animal Park or not.
- Even taking account of a much wider study area, which included these PICs, the frequency of occurrence does not suggest any significant highway safety issue in the area that would justify a recommendation of refusal.
- In terms of damage to the local highway network, these roads are public, with no restrictions related to cars. Hence, this is a highway maintenance issue, rather than a development management issue so, again, it would be unreasonable to seek to justify refusal for such a reason.

Updated Planning Assessment and Conclusion

- Tree matters - It is considered that tree protection matters raised by the Tree Officer can be addressed by a suitable planning condition.
- WRS (Noise Assessment and Mitigation) has confirmed that the methodology and the submitted noise assessment is robust. It is acknowledged that there may be an increase in noise levels. As explained in the Committee Report, planning policy does not seek to prevent all noise. A draft Management Plan has been submitted and WRS has advised the use of a planning condition to ensure it is adhered to. Thus, it is considered that noise management matters can be addressed by a suitable planning condition.
- PICs/traffic/highway damage - With regard to the further comments received from Beoley Residents' Association and comments by the Highway Authority, it is important to consider national planning policy. The NPPF makes clear that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios. The site benefits from an existing planning permission and there is no restriction on visitor numbers or travel routes. Taking account of the additional comments provided by Beoley Residents' Association the Highway Authority advises that the frequency of the accident occurrence does not suggest any significant highway safety

issue in the area that would justify a recommendation of refusal. The Highway Authority has raised no objection. It is not considered that there are any highway matters that would warrant a recommendation of refusal.

Conclusion

There is no change to the planning conclusion and recommendation which remain as set out in the main agenda report, these include reference to tree protection and noise management.

25/00749/FUL Dominion Racing Stables, Seafield Lane, Beoley

- The applicant's Agent has provided a representation via Public Access. The Agent has stated that when the gates are closed, the development would be largely screened from the public realm and therefore the visual impact on the openness of the Green Belt is not harmful and does not conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt.
- As set out within the report on page 118, any gates that meet the requirements of Permitted Development cannot be controlled by the Local Planning Authority.
- It is not however, the Officer's view that the development would be screened by these gates from Billesley Lane, Seafield Lane (initial stretch) or Lilley Green Road (by Moorfield Cottages) as a result of the rising topography and also the access from Billesley Lane would be visible. The concealing of the track by landscaping or the gates is not considered an approach that is acceptable, mitigation rarely removes the initial harm.

25/00803/FUL 7 Churchfields Road, Bromsgrove

Since the publication of the Report, there has been one further letter of representation, summarised below:

- Headcounts of pedestrian use along Churchfields Road between 08:30 - 08:40, and 15:20 - 15:30 hours; and the introduction of construction activity will cause a safety risk for road users;
- Noise and pollution and the effects on the health and wellbeing of nearby residents;
- Concerns over asbestos containing material.

Matters relating to noise, dust and construction traffic have been addressed via the implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan should permission be granted, alongside the developer working in accordance with Worcestershire Regulatory Services Code of Best Practice for Demolition and Construction Sites.

Matters relating to asbestos would be an operational issue for the developer to deal with, in accordance with the Health and Safety Executive.

The applicant has also mirrored these views. Their full comments are available on Public Access and summarised below:

- The site would be boarded out to HSE standards site regulations and would not operate or build within the public highway.
- There would be no parking by any site staff on Churchfields Road during the day
- No site drop off during these times as the control of access of materials is controlled by the developer and collection from Travis Perkins in Bromsgrove
- Collection would be by a small flatbread as and when required
- Site office is located close to the site on land owned by the developer and where site operatives will park their vehicles.

A further representation has been received, showing the visibility splay conducted by an independent party.