

**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**THURSDAY 6TH AUGUST 2026, AT 6.00 P.M.**

PRESENT: Councillors B. Kumar (Vice- Chairman in the Chair), A. Bailes, D. J. A. Forsythe, E. M. S. Gray , R. E. Lambert, D. J. Nicholl, S. T Nock (substituting for Councillor H. J. Jones), S. R. Peters, S. A Robinson (substituting for Councillor J. Clarke) and J. D. Stanley.

Officers: Mr. D. M. Birch, Miss. E. Cox, Mrs. C. Gilbert, Mrs. E. Davies and Mr. J. Swann.

Also Present: Mr. M. Clohessy (Legal Advisor - Anthony Collins Solicitors).

10/26

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors M. Marshall (Chairman), J. Clarke and H. J. Jones.

Councillor S. A. Robinson was in attendance as the substitute Member for Councillor J. Clarke and Councillor S. T. Nock was in attendance as the substitute Member for Councillor H. J. Jones.

11/26

**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor A. Bailes declared an Other Disclosable Interest in regard to Agenda Item No. 5 – Planning Application 26/00446/PIP, Land at Dagnell End Road, Redditch. In that as the Ward Councillor for Alvechurch South, he had called the application in to be considered by the Committee, and as such was predetermined. Councillor A. Bailes retired to the public gallery, and after speaking as Ward Member immediately left the meeting room for the remainder of this agenda item and took no part in the Committee's consideration nor voting on this matter.

Councillor A. Bailes declared a Personal Non- Pecuniary Interest in regard to Agenda Item No. 7 – Planning Application 26/00610/PIP, Land south of Callow Hill, Alvechurch, in that his spouse Councillor R. Bailes had called the application in to be considered by the Committee. He highlighted that he had not formed an opinion in relation to the application and would approach the matter with an open mind.

12/26

## **MINUTES**

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> June 2026 were received.

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> June 2026 be approved as a correct record.

13/26

## **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 Members prior to the meeting commencing, with a paper copy also made available to Members at the meeting.

Members indicated that they had had sufficient time to read the contents of the Committee Update and were happy to proceed.

*As detailed in the preamble above, Councillor A. Bailes retired to the public gallery.*

14/26

## **26/00446/PIP - ERECTION OF UP TO 5 DWELLINGS. LAND AT DAGNELL END ROAD, REDDITCH. MR P BUBB**

It was being reported to the Planning Committee for consideration at the request of Councillor A. Bailes, Ward Councillor, in accordance with the Council's constitution.

Further information was included in the Committee Update, which detailed an objection from Alvechurch Parish Council. The representations from the Parish Council outlined that the land should be considered as green belt and agricultural in nature, and therefore inappropriate to be considered for development.

A copy of the Committee Update was 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 highlighted that the application was for planning in principle (PIP) for up to five dwellings, and that the site was currently an open parcel of land (a paddock).

It was outlined that the application was for PIP, which was a specific planning consent route designed for small- scale housing based developments. As such, the Council could only assess the site's suitability on three factors, namely location, land use and amount of development.

Officers presented the presentation slides, as detailed on pages 27- 31 of the main agenda pack, which included a site location plan.

The attention of Members was drawn to the conclusion of green belt matters on page 25 of the main agenda pack. Officers had concluded that whilst the site was situated within the green belt, due to its proximity to a large built up urban area (Redditch) and other considerations as detailed in the report, the site itself was classified as grey belt.

No objections from members of the public had been received.

Worcestershire County Council as the highways authority and North Worcestershire Water Management had not objected to the application at PIP stage.

The proposal would support continued housing delivery in the District.

Further information, including relevant planning history, the Bromsgrove District Plan, the Alvechurch Neighbourhood Plan, housing availability considerations and the need to demonstrate a five- year housing land supply was relayed to the Committee.

It was noted that the application for PIP was recommended to be granted. It was further noted that the application could not be subject to conditions and that if granted, a further application for Technical Details Consent (TDC) must be submitted and approved, before any development could commence.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Democratic Services Officer read out a statement in opposition to the application, which had been submitted by the Chairman of Alvechurch Parish Council, Councillor M. Worrall. Councillor A. Bailes also addressed the Committee in his capacity as Ward Councillor, in opposition to the application. Having addressed the Committee, Councillor A. Bailes immediately left the room.

Members then debated the application. From the comments and questions by members of the Committee, the following responses were made, and issues highlighted:

- North Worcestershire Water Management (NWWM) had acknowledged that the site was within the catchment of the River Arrow, however had categorised it as Flood Zone 1, which meant there was no significant fluvial flood risk to the site.
- Records held by NWWM indicated that flooding had been reported previously at Dagnell End Road, therefore if the application was granted, a detailed drainage strategy was required to be submitted at the TDC stage.
- It was noted that Dagnell End Road was not wholly served by a footpath for pedestrians.
- There was no requirement for site layout plans to be submitted to the Council at PIP stage.
- Officers had concluded that the site was in a sustainable location due to its proximity to Redditch town centre and an urban sprawl.

Members were advised that if granted, any application submitted at TDC stage could be subject to conditions. Other factors, including the street scene and high quality design principles would also be considered.

On being put to the vote it was

**RESOLVED** that having had regard to all the information before them and all other material considerations that planning permission be granted.

*Following consideration of the above matter referred to at Minute No. 14/26, Councillor A. Bailes returned to the room.*

15/26

**26/00608/PIP - PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE FOR THE ERECTION OF BETWEEN 6NO. AND 8NO. DWELLINGS. LAND AT LITTLEHEATH LANE, LICKEY END. H2LAND LTD**

The Chairman advised the Committee that this item had been withdrawn from the agenda at the request of the applicant's agent.

16/26

**26/00610/PIP - DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 9 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE. LAND SOUTH OF CALLOW HILL ROAD, ALVECHURCH. MR S FIELD.**

It was being reported to the Planning Committee for consideration at the request of Councillor R. Bailes, Ward Councillor, in accordance with the Council's constitution.

It was noted that there was no Committee Update for this item.

Officers presented the report, and in doing so highlighted that the application was for planning in principle (PIP) for up to nine dwellings, and that the site was currently part of an uncultivated agricultural field.

It was outlined that the application was for PIP, which was a specific planning consent route designed for small- scale housing based developments. As such, the Council could only assess the site's suitability on three factors, namely location, land use and amount of development.

Officers presented the presentation slides, as detailed on pages 71- 74 of the main agenda pack, which included a site location plan and an illustrative plan of the proposed development.

It was noted that officers advised the Committee that the site was in a suitable location.

Eleven objections from members of the public had been received, in relation to the sustainability of the site, the proximity to the canal bridge,

the impact upon the landscape and other concerns. Alvechurch Parish Council had also objected to the proposals.

A number of consultees had made advisory comments, including Worcestershire Regulatory Services (WRS) in relation to noise and contaminated land, Worcestershire Archive and Archaeological Service in relation to historic environment and the Conservation Officer in relation to the preservation of the canal.

Worcestershire County Council as the highways authority, North Worcestershire Water Management, the Canals and River Trust and National Rail had not objected to the application at PIP stage.

The proposal would support continued housing delivery in the District.

Further information, including relevant planning history, the Bromsgrove District Plan, the Alvechurch Neighbourhood Plan, housing availability considerations and the need to demonstrate a five- year housing land supply was relayed to the Committee.

It was noted that the application for PIP was recommended to be granted. It was further noted that the application could not be subject to conditions and that if granted, a further application for Technical Details Consent (TDC) must be submitted and approved, before any development could commence.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Sharon Rippington, a local resident addressed the Committee in opposition to the application. In addition, Sian Griffiths, representing RCA Regeneration (the Applicant's Planning Agent), addressed the Committee in support of the application. Furthermore, Councillor T. Williams, Member of Alvechurch Parish Council addressed the Committee in opposition to the proposals.

Councillor R. Bailes also addressed the Committee in her capacity as Ward Councillor, in opposition to the application. Having addressed the Committee, Councillor R. Bailes then left the room.

Members then debated the application. From the comments and questions by members of the Committee, the following responses were made, and issues highlighted:

- The site was in close proximity to both the canal, the railway and the M42 motorway.
- The Bromsgrove District Landscape and Visual Sensitivity Study outlined that the area which encompassed the site was sensitive to housing due to the strong tree cover, pastures and grasslands, its recreational use and biodiversity value.
- The site was on the edge of the village and accessed via narrow rural roads only.
- Members in attendance broadly consented that they had concerns in relation to the sustainability of the site.

- Members expressed concern in relation to the submissions from WRS which stated that the site was in close proximity to a landfill site with a known history of gassing and that nearby ponds may contain unknown landfill.
- Local residents were opposed to development on the site.

Members attention was drawn to the outcome of an Appeal Decision by the Planning Inspectorate on page 69 of the main agenda pack.

The Legal Advisor addressed the Committee and outlined that as this was an application for PIP Members could only assess the site's suitability on three factors, namely location, land use and amount of development. Members were also advised that if adequate reasons were not given there was a risk their decision would be overturned at appeal and potentially be subject to a costs award.

The meeting was adjourned between 7.28- 7.50 p.m. to enable Committee Members to consider the information before them.

An alternate recommendation for refusal was tabled due to the following considerations:

- Development was deemed unacceptable due to the site's proximity to both the canal and M42 motorway.
- The site was isolated in nature and outside the village boundary.
- The site lacked sustainable and safe access to amenities and facilities.

The recommendation was subsequently proposed and seconded by Members of the Committee.

On being put to the vote it was

**RESOLVED** that having had regard to all the information before them and all other material considerations that planning permission be refused for the reasons detailed in the preamble above.

17/26

## **PLANNING PERFORMANCE REPORT - QUARTER ONE**

The Development Management Manager presented the Planning Performance Report - Quarter One (1<sup>st</sup> April 2026- 30<sup>th</sup> June 2026) for Members' consideration.

In doing so it was highlighted that planning performance was based on a one-year rolling assessment period and measured the speed of decision making. The speed of decision making was highlighted on page 75 of the main agenda pack.

Officers explained that the speed of decision making for major applications over the rolling one- year period was 84.6% and 84.4% for non- major applications over the rolling one- year period. The Government required a minimum of 60% of major applications and 70%

of non-major applications to be determined in time, or within an agreed extension of time.

In terms of the quality of the decision making, no Local Planning Authority should exceed 10% of decisions being overturned at appeal. Members were asked to note that the data detailed within the report was intentionally nine months behind the date of publication to allow a time lag for appeals in the pipeline to be determined.

Details of appeal decisions received in Quarter One and cost award outcomes relating to recent planning appeals were provided to Members for information.

In response to a question from a Member, the Development Management Manager highlighted that the Planning team were benefiting from additional resources and increased staffing capacity.

**RESOLVED** that the Planning Performance Report - Quarter Four be noted.

The meeting closed at 8.00 p.m.

Chairman