

Minutes of Planning Committee meeting 10/1/2020 at the Trinity Centre Office 11am.

Cllr S Nock, J Harvey, J King, resident member S Woodhouse, EO and visiting resident S Howe in attendance (just for item 1)

19/01388/FUL Land To Rear Of 34-36 Lickey Square Lickey Birmingham Worcestershire B45 8HB. Construction of 2 No. Detached dwelling houses to the rear of 34-36 Lickey Square and associated vehicular access. Lickey and Blackwell Parish Council object to this application on the following grounds based largely on our Neighbourhood Plan.

1. NDP 5.3 Housing encourages developers to build smaller houses for first time buyers and smaller households. These proposed large houses are out of character for the area and are being squeezed into a woodland rear garden.

2. NDP 6.13 & 6.14 provides protection for existing trees and hedges with or without TPO protection - this site has a blanket TPO. 7.14 Trees and hedges are an important feature of front and rear gardens. The removal of mature trees would have a detrimental effect on the character of the area and the street scene from Lickey Square despite what the privately commissioned Arboricultural Report has to say.

3. NDP NE1- 3.7 Flood risk - no plan has been put forward despite residents' concerns. The PC are especially concerned due to the proposed raising of the level of the garden - to overall 10m higher than the road -which it is planned to support with a retaining wall adjacent to the next property which would be on a lower level and potentially at risk of flood/landslide.

4. NDP BD2-3 Suitable access should be provided and roadside trees protected. The visibility splay required has not been proven to be possible due to TPO trees and third party fencing and trees. If minded to grant permission to the build we would like a requirement included for BDC to ENSURE that access from the site will have the necessary visibility splay of 43m in either direction.

5. NDP 7.6 7.27 7.28 and BD3 Garden development can have an adverse effect. Large gardens provide a green setting and mature trees and hedgerows should be protected to maintain the character of the area and provide habitat for local wildlife. Development that significantly increases ground coverage because of the scale of buildings will be refused. The amenity and privacy of residential neighbours is also a key consideration. (BDC policy BDP1)

The Parish Council support residents' concerns and objections, we are also aware that an ombudsman investigation is underway with regard to development on this site.

Should BDC be minded to grant permission we would like conditions in place to ensure that there is Planting and landscaping to screen neighbours.

19/01553/FUL 2 billy lane Demolish existing conservatory and replace with new extension. Lickey and Blackwell Parish Council have no objection as long as advice from Footpaths and Conservation officer is followed.

19/01291/FUL 220 Old Birmingham Road Marlbrook Replacement Building. Lickey and Blackwell Parish Council have no objection to this application.

19/01624/FUL 6 St Catherines Road Blackwell. Proposed rear conservatory. Lickey and Blackwell Parish Council have no objection to this application.

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING 24TH JANUARY 11AM AT THE TRINITY CENTRE

Apologies from AD and JH – Present SN, SW, JK and EO

19/01628/FUL 3 Denehurst Close, Barnt Green. Render and timber clad part of existing dwelling house, alterations to fenestrations, addition of porch canopy, new front boundary wall and gate and new glass balustrade to flat roof to form roof terrace. Lickey and Blackwell Parish Council have no objection to this application as long as the Tree Officer's advice is followed.

20/00014/FUL 21 Lickey Rock, Marlbrook, Bromsgrove, Worcestershire B60 1HF. Single storey rear extension. Lickey and Blackwell Parish Council have no objection to this application.

Notes from planning committee meeting 7th February with Ruth Bamford.

Ruth came to speak to us in response to our letter about a planning application for a 2500+ development at Foxlydiate which is in Bromsgrove district but will be used towards Redditch housing need quotas. She agreed that the quota for Redditch will change but has not yet been agreed, and is likely to be for 3000 fewer houses.

She gave us some technical answers as to the procedure of deciding numbers of houses required and the duty to cooperate with neighbouring districts. She does work for both planning department in Redditch and Bromsgrove (conflict of interest?) and says that the district does not make the decision about allocation of development to a particular district's quotas. This is decided based on the individual district plan and is the decision of the inspector.

If Bromsgrove wants to make these Foxlydiate houses part of its own quota, it is possible, but it is the decision of the inspector and can only happen as part of the district plan review. It should be around 2 years before houses are built on the site as the current applications are dealing with building infrastructure roads for the development. Any houses built before the new Bromsgrove district plan is adopted will definitely form part of the Redditch housing need quota as it stands whether they need them or not.

If the Bromsgrove district plan agrees to shift any further houses on this development to the Bromsgrove quota then this will only apply to houses that are built after the district plan has been adopted. How those quotas are arrived at is very mysterious. This number is not decided by central government but by the district itself with agreement of the inspector.

It looks as if this development will go ahead and we need to consider the impact of it. If we have objections or wish to have improvements to highways we need to demonstrate (for example) that an increased number of cars are coming from the area where the development will be. And we need to predict that more will come. This cannot wait until the development has happened it has to be put forward beforehand. As do any other requests for improved infrastructure. We need to be able to prove a correlation between the development and an impact of it on roads and infrastructure.

More positive news came from Ruth regarding the district council's attitude towards adopting leisure spaces on new developments.

The Hearn study was referred to in a question from Stephen. Ruth says that the local plan has to regard it as a background document. Calling for sites for consultation for development is not in anyway promoting the ideas put forward in the Hearn study. Ruth claims that looking at the call for sites data – it does not look as if a 'Barntchurch' is going to be possible anyway???

To prove traffic problems Google Maps historic data can be used as evidence about highways.

We may need to pay for studies/consultants to prove impact on our highways and infrastructure to have the evidence to persuade WCC that work needs to be done on highways/ BDC that conditions need to be put into any granting of permission to development.