

## WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

### PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT CONTROL) COMMITTEE

6<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2005

#### PART B

<b>WF.580/05 : A</b>		Proposal:	Full : <b>Provision of 1.8m high galvanised palisade fence and matching gates (<i>amended plans</i>) at Electric Sub Station, Gheluveld Avenue, Kidderminster</b>
Date Received:	28.7.05		
Agent:	-		
Ord. Sheet:	8377 SE		
Policy:	D.1, D.18 (AWFDLP)		
Case Officer:	J. Howells		
Ward:	Broadwaters	Applicant:	Wyre Forest Community Housing

**Site Location and Description:** This application relates to the electric sub station, situated on land between No 16 Gheluveld Avenue and No 41 The Foxholes. The sub station has a close-boarded fence immediately surrounding it and is set back from the pavement edge by an area of land to the front. This land is further separated from the pavement by a mesh fence gate, but with no adjoining fence panels on either side. The proposed amendment is for palisade fencing and gate across the whole front boundary of the site for a distance of approximately 6.5m, along the rear of the pavement edge, rather than the weld mesh fencing approved in July 2005. The fencing would still be 1.8m in height as per the approved scheme.

**Planning History:** Provision of 1.8m high galvanised palisade fence and matching gates : Approved 19<sup>th</sup> July 2005

**Consultations and Representations:** Highway Authority – No objections

Neighbour – One representation of support received from the occupiers of No 41 The Foxholes concerned with the following: The site contains dangerous electrical equipment and at present is not fully secure. This proposal meets the need by providing a fence that is difficult to climb and offers improved security. The open space in front of the site attracts young people and we have had our fence vandalised, youngster's climb over the fence into the sub station to retrieve footballs. We are not in favour of the weldmesh fencing, which was proposed after the original plans were drawn up, as it would not deter youngsters from climbing the fence and would not improve security. We are looking for security of the site and added protection to the adjoining property. Detailed discussions have also taken place with the occupier of 16 Gheluveld Avenue, although no representations in writing have been received.

**Officer Comments:** Policies D.1 and D.18 of the Adopted Local Plan state that new development must be designed and sited to complement and respect any adjacent development; and must harmonise with the existing landscape. Palisade fencing is not normally considered appropriate in a residential area such as this. The surrounding street scene is of low walls and/or hedges and it is considered that the proposed palisade fencing would result in an alien feature which would detract visually from the street scene. Due to the adverse visual impact of the palisade fencing, the original application was amended to weld mesh style fencing with small apertures. From previous experience of considering security fencing, it is considered that a determined person could potentially climb either fence type and as such the palisade fencing proposed would not overcome the fears of the neighbouring residents about the anti social behaviour.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** In view of the above, the proposed amendment to the style of fencing is **NOT** considered **ACCEPTABLE** as a minor amendment to permission WF.580/05.

**WF.1169/04**

Date Received: 4.11.04  
Agent: PCP Design  
Ord. Sheet: 8479-8579  
Policy: D.1, D.17 (AWFDLP)  
Case Officer: S. Allum  
Ward: Cookley

Proposal: Full : **Two storey and single storey rear extensions at 82 Castle Road, Cookley**

Applicant: Mr. C. Price

---

**Site Location and Description:** This application relates to a mid terrace property situated on the eastern side of Castle Road in Cookley. The proposal is for a part two storey and a part single storey extension to the rear of the property. The plans submitted also show a similar extension to the rear of the neighbouring property (80 Castle Road) which if implemented together would result in a shared gable feature on the rear elevation.

**Planning History:** WF. 495/04 – Two storey extension to rear after demolition of existing outbuildings : Withdrawn

NO 80 CASTLE ROAD

WF. 512/04 – Two storey extension : Withdrawn

WF .1170/04 – Two storey and single storey rear extensions : Pending consideration

**Consultations and Representations:** Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council – Recommend approval subject to agreement that work is carried out on 82 and 80 at the same time

Environment Agency - No objection subject to note (regarding site being within 250m of landfill site)

Neighbour - No representations received.

**Officer Comments:** When the extensions at No's 80 and 82 Castle Road are considered together as shown on the submitted plans their design is considered acceptable and they would not result in an adverse impact on each others amenity. However concern was raised during the consideration of previous applications for larger extensions at the two properties about what would happen if the proposed extensions were only carried out at one of the two properties. Without both schemes being implemented together, the proposed extensions would result in an unacceptable loss of light to the habitable rooms served by windows on the rear elevation of the neighbouring property. The plans were therefore amended to overcome the design issues and the applicant/agent was advised at pre-application stage that in order for the proposed development to be considered acceptable it would be necessary for any planning permission to be subject to a legal agreement which would require the extensions at both properties to be built at the same time. The applicant was also advised that the legal agreement needed to be submitted at the same time as the applications.

A letter was submitted with the current application, signed by both applicants, which confirmed that they agreed that the works would be carried out in conjunction with each other. However following legal advice this letter was not considered sufficient for a unilateral undertaking. A draft legal agreement has subsequently been produced but not returned by the applicant or agent. It has now been over 10 months since the application was submitted and in the absence of the completed legal agreement the proposed extensions cannot be considered acceptable.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** In view of the above I recommend that planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reason:

1. The proposed extension by virtue of its height and location would restrict daylight to the habitable rooms served by existing windows on the rear elevation of the neighbouring property No 80 Castle Road. Without a legal agreement to require the proposed extensions at No's 80 and 82 Castle Road to be built at the same time the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies D.1 and D.17 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan which seek to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties.

**WF.1170/04**

Date Received: 4.11.04  
Agent: PCP Design  
Ord. Sheet: 8479-8579  
Policy: D.1, D.17 (AWFDLP)  
Case Officer: S. Allum  
Ward: Cookley

Proposal: Full : **Two storey and single storey rear extensions at 80 Castle Road, Cookley**

Applicant: Mr. M. B. Turley

---

**Site Location and Description:** This application relates to a mid terrace property situated on the eastern side of Castle Road in Cookley. The proposal is for a part two storey and a part single storey extension to the rear of the property. The plans submitted also show a similar extension to the rear of the neighbouring property (82 Castle Road) which if implemented together would result in a shared gable feature on the rear elevation.

**Planning History:** WF. 512/04 – Two storey extension : Withdrawn

NO 82 CASTLE ROAD

WF. 495/04 – Two storey extension to rear after demolition of existing outbuildings : Withdrawn

WF .1169/04 – Two storey and single storey rear extensions : Pending consideration

**Consultations and Representations:** Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council – Recommend approval subject to agreement that work is carried out on 82 and 80 at the same time

Environment Agency - No objection subject to note (regarding site being within 250m of landfill site)

Neighbour - No representations received.

**Officer Comments:** When the extensions at No's 80 and 82 Castle Road are considered together as shown on the submitted plans their design is considered acceptable and they would not result in an adverse impact on each others amenity. However concern was raised during the consideration of previous applications for larger extensions at the two properties about what would happen if the proposed extensions were only carried out at one of the two properties. Without both schemes being implemented together, the proposed extensions would result in an unacceptable loss of light to the habitable rooms served by windows on the rear elevation of the neighbouring property. The plans were therefore amended to overcome the design issues and the applicant/agent was advised at pre-application stage that in order for the proposed development to be considered acceptable it would be necessary for any planning permission to be subject to a legal agreement which would require the extensions at both properties to be built at the same time. The applicant was also advised that the legal agreement needed to be submitted at the same time as the applications.

A letter was submitted with the current application, signed by both applicants, which confirmed that they agreed that the works would be carried out in conjunction with each other. However following legal advice this letter was not considered sufficient for a unilateral undertaking. A draft legal agreement has subsequently been produced but not returned by the applicant or agent. It has now been over 10 months since the application was submitted and in the absence of the completed legal agreement the proposed extensions cannot be considered acceptable.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** In view of the above I recommend that planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reason:

1. The proposed extension by virtue of its height and location would restrict daylight to the habitable rooms served by existing windows on the rear elevation of the neighbouring property No. 82 Castle Road. Without a legal agreement to require the proposed extensions at No's 80 and 82 Castle Road to be built at the same time the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies D.1 and D.17 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan which seek to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties.

<b>WF.457/05</b>		Proposal:	Full: <b>Change of use of unit 23C to B2 use for the manufacture of timber products (sheds and fencing) (retrospective) at Unit 23C Clensmore Business Park, Clensmore Street, Kidderminster</b>
Date Received:	26.4.05		
Agent:	Engineering & Building Design		
Ord. Sheet:	8277 SE		
Policy:	E.2, TR.9, TR.17, NR.11 (AWFDLP)		
Case Officer:	C. Bishop		
Ward:	Broadwaters	Applicant:	Mr. M. Jones

**Site Location and Description:** The application site relates to a unit on Clensmore Business Park. The unit is located within a building which contains a total of four units which is sited where Clensmore Street turns sharply by Limekiln Bridge. Unit 23C is located to the rear of the building and is accessed from the private car park. The proposal is retrospective and seeks permission to change the use of the unit from storage (Use Class B8) to Use Class B2 (General Industry).

**Planning History:** (most relevant) WF.122/05 - Excavation of soil over part of site, re-grading of existing embankments and the laying of a hard surfaced area to facilitate the open storage of motor vehicles (retrospective) and change of use of the land to allow the open storage of motor vehicles : Approved

**Consultations and Representations:** Highway Authority – Concerns regarding the junction of Broad Street and the principal road A451. The division of this original one user site to multi individual units, within the same Use Class, may have an impact on the existing traffic light control junction. The Owner/Applicant should be requested to submit a Traffic Assessment especially identifying trip rates from the individual units at this particular junction. Environment Agency – No objection subject to conditions

British Waterways – No objection

Environmental Health – This is a HSE enforced premises but have serious concerns about the vehicle movements and traffic flow around the site. The site owners need to look at traffic movements and pedestrian segregation; details of noise assessment required

Neighbours/Site Notice – No representations received

**Officer Comments:** The building is within an area allocated for Employment purposes in the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan Policy E.2 states that development falling within Class B uses will be permitted subject to compliance with other policies within the Local Plan. In principle the change of use is considered to be compatible with this industrial area which is isolated from residential properties, the nearest one being approximately 100m away. The Highways Authority have raised concerns regarding the potential impact on the existing traffic light control junction at Broad Street/A451 and has requested a Traffic Assessment. The applicant has provided information on the no. of trips generated by the B2 use which are nominal. The applicants have confirmed that 2 x customer cars visit the site per day; 3 x deliveries to clients per day by 7T vehicle; and 1 x delivery to site per week by 22T vehicle. The timber products are for the residential market and are generated by mail order and not by members of the public visiting the site. It is felt that to insist upon the applicants undertaking a Traffic Assessment for the entire site would be unreasonable in this instance. As stated previously, the application is retrospective and no complaints have been received about the existing use of the premises. The occupation of the unit could be controlled by a personalised condition so any subsequent changes in occupation or use would require planning permission and any changes in vehicular movements could be considered at that stage.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** I therefore recommend **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:

1. A6 (Full with No Reserved Matters);
2. A10 (Personal Permission);
3. F2 (Insulation of Plant and Machinery);
4. No outside storage;
- 5 & 6 Environment Agency Notes Environmental Health.

Reason for Approval – The change of use is compliant with the land use requirements as laid out in policy E.2 of the Local Plan. The use is considered to be capable of implementation without creating serious adverse effects on the amenity of the locality, or highway safety.

**WF.657/05**  
Date Received: 17.6.05  
Agent: Sign Specialists Ltd.  
Ord. Sheet: 8376 NW  
Policy: AD.1, AD.2, CA.3, LB.3  
(AWFDLP)  
SD.2, CTC.19 (WCSP)  
QE.5 (RPG11)  
Case Officer: S. Allum  
Ward: Greenhill

Proposal: Advertisement : **Non-illuminated fascia sign and illuminated hanging sign (Church Street elevation) at Lloyds Pharmacy, 13 Bull Ring, Kidderminster**  
Applicant: AAH plc

**Site Location and Description:** Lloyds Pharmacy is prominently located on the corner of the Bull Ring and Church Street in Kidderminster town centre. This is a Grade II Listed Building within the Church Street Conservation Area. This part of the town centre is also allocated as a 'Secondary Shopping Area' in the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan. The proposal is to erect a fascia sign (3.9 m long x 450 mm deep) and a bracket hung, projecting sign (600mm high x 604mm projection) on the elevation of the building facing Church Street.

**Planning History:** WF.191/83 - Shopfront : Approved

WF.918/00 : New shopfront and internal refurbishment : Approved

**Consultations and Representations:** Highway Authority – No objections

Conservation Officer - I do not feel that the fascia panel is appropriate for this elevation, and does not conform with the requirements set out in the SPG on Shop-front Design in Historic Areas, in particular Section 6. With regards to the hanging sign, I am prepared to accept this, under condition that the materials and method of sign writing are approved in writing prior to the commencement of works on site. Furthermore, I would also like to see details of the proposed illumination of the hanging sign. I note that the current signage on this elevation, relating to the same business, does not enjoy any consent, in particular the single sign adjacent to the side door. This is not an appropriate sign, either in position or in materials and does not conform to adopted policy, and does not sit well with the Listed Building, in terms of position, and materials. **RECOMMENDATION:** Object on the grounds that the proposals will be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Listed Building.

Site Notice/Advertisement – No representations received

**Officer Comments:** I agree with the Conservation Officer's comments on this application. Notwithstanding the negative impact of the fascia advertisement on this Grade II Listed Building (see WF.679/05 on this Agenda), the proposal would also fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Church Street Conservation Area. The proposed hanging sign however is considered to be acceptable in this context, subject to conditions.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** The proposal is only partly in compliance with the relevant policies of the Development Plan. I therefore recommend **APPROVAL** to the **illuminated hanging sign**, subject to the following conditions:-

1. and 2. Standard advertisement; 3. Details of sign writing finish to be submitted; 4. Technical details of means of illumination to be submitted

and **REFUSAL** is recommended for the proposed **fascia sign** for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed fascia sign would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of this Grade II Listed Building. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies QE.5 of RPG11, Policies SD.2 and CTC.19 of the adopted Worcestershire County Structure Plan and Policies LB.2, LB.3 and AD.2 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.
2. The design and location of the proposed fascia sign would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Church Street Conservation Area, contrary to the requirements of Policy QE.5 of RPG11, Policies SD.2, CTC.19 and CTC.20 of the adopted Worcestershire County Structure Plan and Policies AD.2 and CA.3 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan

**WF.663/05**  
Date Received: 20.6.05  
Agent: C. J. Didlick  
Ord. Sheet: 7674 7774  
Policy: LA.1,LA.2,TM.1,TR.7,RT.13  
Case Officer: J. Summerfield

Proposal: Full : **Variations of Conditions 3, 4 and 5 of Planning Permission WF.105/97 to allow the opening of the tea room and toilets for year round use to serve the shop touring caravan site, fishing pool and fruit picking at Doddingtree Farm, Cleobury Road, Bewdley**  
Applicant: Mr. J. Hopley

Ward: Bewdley and Arley

Applicant: Mr. J. Hopley

**Site Location and Description:** The site is known as Doddingtree Farm and accommodates various activities comprising 'pick your own' fruit picking, a five pitch caravan site, an area for camping and fishing pool. The site also accommodates a tea shop with toilets and a farmshop. The current conditions with respect to the tea room and toilets restrict the use of the tea room from between April and October (condition 3), and do not allow it to open for use between dusk and dawn nor at any time outside the opening hours of the farmshop/pick your own operation (condition 4). Condition 5 states that the toilets and tea room shall be used ancillary to the fruit growing, picking and sales for use by customers and pickers only, and does not allow a separate or independent use.

**Planning History:** (of relevance) WF.368/75 – Pack house and store : Approved 30<sup>th</sup> June 1975  
WF.284/86 – Continued use of existing shop to include sale of bulky animal feed : Refused 28<sup>th</sup> May 1986.  
WF.742/88 – Extension (Bewdley Fruits) : Approved 18<sup>th</sup> August 1988  
WF.243/90 – Extension to existing farmshop : Approved 22<sup>nd</sup> May 1990  
WF.668/92 – Existing irrigation pool to be used for coarse fishing : Approved 10<sup>th</sup> November 1992  
WF.296/96 – Change of use of existing pack house building as a tea room during fruit picking season only : Approved 16<sup>th</sup> July 1996. WF.105/97 – Construction of portaloo toilet building and use of tea room from 1<sup>st</sup> April to 31<sup>st</sup> October : Approved 25<sup>th</sup> March 1997

**Consultations and Representations:** Bewdley Town Council – Recommend approval  
Highway Authority – Awaiting comments. Environment Agency – No objection subject to conditions  
Environmental Health – Awaiting comments. Forward Planning Manager – No comment  
Disability Action Wyre Forest – No detailed drawings included but increased usage of facilities should reasonably we believe be criteria for examining the access performance of the site and building  
Neighbour/Site Notice : one letter of objection raises the following concerns – I do not feel that a planning application should be made for the change of use as it is no longer used as a tea room. It was provided for fruit pickers to refresh themselves not for people off the road to go for a meal. I fear that an extension of this restaurant will soon follow with music and drinks licenses applied for. With added noise, with cars leaving late at night and the restaurant developing into a club house for the caravans and tents at this site. The toilets/washing facilities are unacceptable. The building is the former packing house – does a timber building comply with all the regulations for toilet facilities? This building has developed into a restaurant; it should not have its conditions removed.

**Officer Comments:** Policy TM.1 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan allows tourism related development including the extension of existing attractions and facilities providing that their design is satisfactory, they are environmentally acceptable and the traffic generated can be safely accommodated. The tea room was first approved as such in 1996 and its use has been restricted since that date to the summer months to restrict the tea room from becoming a new and independent use. Whilst the opening of the tea room all year around would continue providing a facility for the fruit picking and shop customers it would also provide a facility for visitors to the fishing pool, and the caravanners/campers. It is considered that the majority of trade would be for these recreational and tourism purposes rather than for drive by trade. Furthermore, with only fourteen covers the proposed facility is not considered to be of a size capable of significantly adversely affecting neighbours' amenity or drawing significant trade from Bewdley town centre. The nearest residential property is in excess of 50 metres across the Cleobury Road.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** I recommend **delegated APPROVAL** subject to no objections being received from Environmental Health and subject to the following conditions:-  
1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters); 2. A11 (Approved plans); 3. E2 (Foul and surface water); 4. The tea room hereby approved shall only be used as an A3 use, strictly in association with the camp site, farmshop, fishing course and pick your own operation. It shall not be used, sold or let independently from the above tourist/visitor attractions and agricultural operation unless otherwise agreed in writing; 5. J22 (No takeaway).

**Reason for Approval** The proposed tea room for all year around use is considered to comply with tourism policies of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan without creating serious adverse effect on the amenity of the immediate locality or highway safety.

<b>WF.676/05</b>		Proposal:	Outline: <b>Two residential dwellings after demolition of existing dwelling and garage on site (access to be determined) at 'Tethers End', Callow Hill, Rock</b>
Date Received:	22.6.05		
Agent:	Mr. H. Green		
Ord. Sheet:	7274-7374		
Policies:	H.2, TR.9, TR.17, D.1, D.3, D.4, LA.6, NC.6 (AWFDLP)		
Case Officer:	J. Summerfield	Applicant:	Rock Garage
Ward:	Rock		

---

**Site Location and Description:** The application site is rectangular in shape with a frontage to the Cleobury Road and a depth of approximately 45m. It lies adjacent to the existing petrol filling station known as Rock Garage and currently accommodates one detached dwelling. The site also contains a mature copper beech tree which is protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The application seeks consent in outline for two dwellings with only the means of access is to be considered at this stage.

**Planning History:** None

**Consultations and Representations:** Rock Parish Council – Recommend refusal, this is over development on a small site. The Parish Council has great concerns for public safety in relation to the access.

Highway Authority – Views awaited

Environment Agency – Views awaited

Severn Trent Water - No objections subject to conditions

Arboricultural Officer – The proposals require the demolition of the existing house and the construction of two new properties. Neither of these operations should have an impact on the health or condition of the copper beech tree, situated at the front right of the property protected by the Callow Hill Tree Preservation Order No. 60 (1980).

Environmental Health – No objections subject to conditions

Disability Action Wyre Forest - New dwellings should be designed to meet current standards for accessible housing

Health and Safety Executive – Awaiting comments; Trading Standards Service (Petroleum Inspectorate) – Awaiting comments

Neighbour – No comments received

**Officer Comments:** The starting point for the consideration of this application is Policy H.2 of the Adopted Local Plan. This policy allows development within the settlement boundary of Callow Hill, subject to it being infill development of one or two dwellings in a gap in an otherwise built-up frontage on previously developed land. It is considered that the proposal meets these policy requirements. Furthermore, albeit that the proposal would replace one dwelling with two, the illustrative layout demonstrates that a spacious arrangement could be achieved which takes account of the siting of the protected tree at the front of the site.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** I therefore recommend **delegated APPROVAL** subject to no objections being received from the outstanding consultations and subject to the following conditions :

1. A1 (Standard Outline);
2. A2 (Standard Outline – Reserved Matters);
3. A3 (Reserved Matters Only);
4. A5 (Scope of Outline Permission - 9 metres from TPO tree);
5. A11 (Approved Plans);
6. B1a (Samples/Details of Materials)
7. B11 (Details of Enclosure);
8. B13 (Levels Details);
9. E2 (Foul and Surface Water);
10. C4 (Protection of Trees – No Burning);
11. C5 (Hand Digging Near Trees);
12. D1. (Contaminated Land)

Reason for Approval - The principle of residential development comprising two dwellings is acceptable at this location. The impact upon highway safety and the existing protected tree has been assessed and it is considered that there will be no undue implications subject to conditions. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with the policies listed above.

**WF.679/05**

Date Received: 23.6.05  
 Agent: Sign Specialists Ltd.  
 Ord. Sheet: 8376 NW  
 Policy: LB.2, LB.3, AD.2  
 (AWFDLP); SD.2,  
 CTC.19 (WCSP);  
 QE.5 (RPG11)  
 Case Officer: S. Allum  
 Ward: Greenhill

Proposal: Listed Building Consent :  
**Fascia sign and  
 externally illuminated  
 projecting sign at Lloyds  
 Pharmacy, 13 Bull Ring,  
 Kidderminster**

Applicant: AAH plc

---

**Site Location and Description:** Lloyds Pharmacy is prominently located on the corner of the Bull Ring and Church Street in Kidderminster town centre. This is a Grade II Listed Building within the Church Street Conservation Area. The proposal is to erect a fascia sign (3.9m long x 450 mm deep) and a bracket hung, projecting sign (600mm high x 504 mm projection) on the elevation of the building facing Church Street. This application for Listed Building Consent should be read in conjunction with Advertisement Consent Application WF.657/05 on this Agenda.

**Planning History:** WF.191/93 – New shopfront : Approved  
 WF.918/00 – New shopfront and internal alterations : Approved

**Consultations and Representations:** Highway Authority – No objections  
Conservation Officer - I do not feel that the fascia panel is appropriate for this elevation, and does not conform with the requirements set out in the SPG on Shop-front Design in Historic Areas, in particular Section 6. With regards to the hanging sign, I am prepared to accept this, under condition that the materials and method of sign writing are approved in writing prior to the commencement of works on site. Furthermore, I would also like to see details of the proposed illumination of the hanging sign. I note that the current signage on this elevation, relating to the same business, does not enjoy any consent, in particular the single sign adjacent to the side door. This is not an appropriate sign, either in position or in materials and does not conform to adopted policy, and does not sit well with the Listed Building, in terms of position, and materials. **RECOMMENDATION:** Object on the grounds that the proposals will be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Listed Building.

Neighbour/Site Notice/Advertisement – No representations received

**Officer Comments:** I agree with the Conservation Officer's comments on this application. Although the hanging sign is acceptable in principle, it is not possible to 'split' the decision on an application for Listed Building Consent, and as such a refusal recommendation for the whole scheme is the only option in this case.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** The scheme as a whole does not meet the criteria of the Listed Building policies within the Development Plan. I therefore recommend **REFUSAL** for the following reason:-

1. The submitted scheme of advertisements is incapable of implementation without visually harming the external character and appearance of this Grade II Listed Building. This is contrary to Policy QE.5 of RPG11, Policies SD.2 and CTC.19 of the adopted Worcestershire County Structure Plan and Policies LB.2, LB.3 and AD.2 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

<b>WF.717/05</b>		Proposal:	<b>Full : Erection of a stable block and change of use of the land for the keeping of horses on land off New Wood Lane, Blakedown</b>
Date Received:	6.7.05		
Agent:	-		
Ord. Sheet:	8677 8777		
Policy:	GB.1,GB.2,GB.3,GB.6, EQ.2, EQ.3.TR.9, LR.8 (AWFDLP) D.38, D.39 (WCSP)		
Case Officer:	S. Allum		
Ward:	Blakedown & Chaddesley	Applicant:	Mrs. S. Wilks

---

**Site Location and Description:** The land in question is presently a Green Belt agricultural field of six acres with an existing gated vehicular access to/from the extreme western end of New Wood Lane, close to the junction with the A456 Trunk Road. The proposal is to change the use of the land to the 'keeping of horses' and the erection of a timber stable block (12 metres long x 3.5 metres wide x 3.4 metres high to ridge) to be located adjacent to a tall Conifer hedgerow rear to New Wood Lane.

**Planning History:** None relevant

**Consultations and Representations:** Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council – No objections; suggests there is a complete turning circle for horseboxes and hardstanding within the site.

Highway Authority – No objections subject to conditions and note

Highways Agency – No objections

Environmental Health – No adverse comments; The Ramblers' Association – No response received

Neighbour/Site Notice : seven letters of objection received – Serious highway hazard – blind bend – lane only 13 ft. wide. Increase in traffic in and out of field will cause increased risk of accident/injury. Slow manoeuvring will cause dangerous situation. Over past 12 months our area, especially Deansford Lane, has been proliferation of horse fields and stabling, much of it unsightly and horse traffic has increased in New Wood Lane – traffic hazard – concerned about possibility of more stables and extra use in future, compounding the problem. Untidiness of site in future with many assorted additions would also be a concern.

Three letters of support received – Plans will ensure field is kept in good order to avoid the risk of unplanned use which is likely to lead to the unsightly and haphazard placing of loose boxes and their attendant detritus. Appropriate use of the land. Applicant is a reliable, honest and responsible person – keen to maintain local countryside in an appropriate manner.

**Officer Comments:** The use of land in the Green Belt for outdoor recreational pursuits is acceptable in principle. New buildings, however, must be directly related to the needs of the use of the land, and be restricted to the minimum size necessary. I feel that the building applied for here satisfies both criteria. The location chosen is also appropriate close to a landscape boundary screen, and the existing highway access is deemed to be satisfactory by the Highway Authority. The use of the land for keeping of horses and the erection of the stable block would not create any adverse effect on the amenity of neighbours.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** This proposal conforms to the appropriate policies of the Development Plan. I therefore recommend **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions, and in consideration of Articles 1 & 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998:-

1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters);
  2. A11 (Approved plans);
  3. B1 (Samples of materials);
  4. J11 (Stables – no commercial use);
  5. & 6. Highway;
  7. C6 (Landscaping – small scheme);
  8. C8 (Landscaping – implementation);
  9. J35 (Hand tools only);
- Note - Highway

Reason for Approval

The proposal is considered to be appropriate development in the Green Belt, and no harm would be created in relation to openness, visual amenity, neighbour amenity or highway safety. For these reasons, the proposal is considered to be in conformity with the policies listed above.

<b>WF.718/05</b>		Proposal:	<b>Full : Erection of a stable block and change of use of the land for the keeping of horses on land off New Wood Lane, Blakedown</b>
Date Received:	6.7.05		
Agent:	-		
Ord. Sheet:	8677 8777		
Policy:	GB.1,GB.2,GB.3,GB.6, EQ.2, EQ.3, TR.9, LR.8 (AWFDLP) D.38, D.39 (WCSP)		
Case Officer:	S. Allum		
Ward:	Blakedown & Chaddesley	Applicant:	Stefanie R. Herbert

---

**Site Location and Description:** The land in question is presently a Green Belt agricultural field of six acres, with an existing gated vehicular access to/from the extreme western end of New Wood Lane, close to the junction with the A456 Trunk Road. The proposal is to change the use of the land to the 'keeping of horses' and the erection of a timber stable block (12 metres long x 3.5 metres wide x 3.4 metres high to ridge) to be located adjacent to a hedgerow bounding a public bridleway.

**Planning History:** None relevant

**Consultations and Representations:** Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council – No objections; suggests there is a complete turning circle for horseboxes and hardstanding within the site.

Highway Authority – No objections subject to conditions and note

Highways Agency – No objections

Environmental Health – No adverse comments

The Ramblers' Association – No response received

Neighbour/Site Notice : seven letters of objection received – Serious highway hazard – blind bend – lane only 13 ft. wide. Increase in traffic in and out of field will cause increased risk of accident/injury. Slow manoeuvring will cause dangerous situation. Over past 12 months our area, especially Deansford Lane, has been proliferation of horse fields and stabling, much of it unsightly and horse traffic has increased in New Wood Lane – traffic hazard – concerned about possibility of more stables and extra use in future, compounding the problem. Untidiness of site in future with many assorted additions would also be a concern.

Three letters of support received – Plans will ensure field is kept in good order to avoid the risk of unplanned use which is likely to lead to the unsightly and haphazard placing of loose boxes and their attendant detritus. Appropriate use of the land. Applicant is a reliable, honest and responsible person – keen to maintain local countryside in an appropriate manner.

**Officer Comments:** The use of land in the Green Belt for outdoor recreational pursuits is acceptable in principle. New buildings, however, must be directly related to the needs of the use of the land, and be restricted to the minimum size necessary. I feel that the building applied for here satisfies both criteria. The location chosen is also appropriate close to a landscape boundary screen, and the existing highway access is deemed to be satisfactory by the Highway Authority. The use of the land for keeping of horses and the erection of the stable block would not create any adverse effect on the amenity of neighbours.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** This proposal conforms to the appropriate policies of the Development Plan. I therefore recommend **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions, and in consideration of Articles 1 & 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998:-

1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters);
  2. A11 (Approved plans);
  3. B1 (Samples of materials);
  4. J11 (Stables – no commercial use);
  5. & 6. Highway;
  7. C6 (Landscaping – small scheme);
  8. C8 (Landscaping – implementation);
  9. J35 (Hand tools only);
- Note - Highway

Reason for Approval

The proposal is considered to be appropriate development in the Green Belt, and no harm would be created in relation to openness, visual amenity, neighbour amenity or highway safety. For these reasons, the proposal is considered to be in conformity with the policies listed above.

<b>WF.722/05</b>	Proposal:	Listed Building Consent:
Date Received: 07.07.05		<b>Installation of no. 5</b>
Agent: Stride Treglown		<b>external air conditioning</b>
Ord. Sheet: 7875 SE		<b>units at Barclays Bank,</b>
Policy: LB.1, LB.2, LB.3,		<b>67 Load Street, Bewdley</b>
(AWFDLP); PPG15		
Case Officer: C. Bishop	Applicant:	Barclays Plc
Ward: Bewdley & Arley		

---

**Site Location and Description:** The application site is located on the northern side of Load Street immediately adjacent to the entrance to Load Street car park. The property is Listed and also within the Conservation Area. The application seeks listed building consent for the installation of 5 no. air conditioning units which would be mounted to the rear wall of the building.

**Planning History:** None relevant

**Consultations and Representations:** Bewdley Town Council – The Town Council recommend refusal on the grounds that the air conditioning units are an intrusion to the visual amenity in a Conservation Area.

Conservation Officer – No objections subject to the units being lowered below the top of the curtilage wall to reduce their impact on both the Listed Building and Conservation Area.

Cultural, Leisure and Commercial Services (Property Services Section) – Views awaited

Neighbours/Site Notice – No representations made

**Officer Comments:** The application proposes to install 5 no. external air conditioning units on the rear elevation of the building at two different levels. Three units would be wall mounted at ground level and two at a higher level. The property benefits from a yard area to the rear which is enclosed by a high curtilage brick wall. Originally the two higher level units would have been visible from the adjacent car park entrance however the scheme has been amended so that the two units have been lowered and would no longer be visible from outside of the yard area. This also makes them exempt from planning permission. The wall which the air conditioning units would be attached to is a 20<sup>th</sup> century addition to the building which is not considered to be of historic importance in its own right. The proposal in its revised form is considered to be in accordance with Policies LB.1, LB.2 and LB.3 of the Adopted Local Plan and Government advice in PPG15.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** I therefore recommend the application for **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:

1. A7 (Listed Building/Conservation Area Consent)

Reason for Approval: The proposed air conditioning units are considered to be acceptable in terms of their impact on the character and appearance of this Grade II Listed Building. For these reasons the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the policies listed above.

**WF.725/05**

Date Received: 15.7.05  
Agent: Central Building Design  
Ord. Sheet: 8376 SW  
Policy: KTC.4,RT.13,LB.1,  
TR.9,TR.17 (AWFDLP)  
QE.5 (RPG 11)  
Case Officer: P. Wrigglesworth  
Ward: Greenhill

Proposal: Full : **Change of use and subdivision of existing unit to form wine bar at Unit X (fronting Green Street), New Road Complex, Kidderminster**

Applicant: Mr. R. Appleby/  
Mr. M. Jones

---

**Site Location and Description:** The proposal seeks to subdivide part of a furniture outlet next to the cinema in Green Street. It involves the change of use to a wine bar the public area measures approximately 16 metres by 9.5 metres. The property is a Grade II Listed Building.

**Planning History:** None relevant

**Consultations and Representations:**

Highway Authority – Views awaited

Conservation Officer – No planning objections

Disability Action Wyre Forest – Welcomes access statement. Several detailed questions raised (*information forwarded to applicants' agent*)

Crime Risk Manager – Advice received to improve safety and security (*information forwarded to applicants' agent*)

Neighbour/Advertisement - No representations received

**Officer Comments:** This site falls within the Green Street Mixed Use Area as defined by Policy KTC.4 of the Wyre Forest District Local Plan. This policy permits food and drink establishments such as this and there is therefore no conflict with the Local Plan in terms of land usage. Indeed, a wine bar in this location will complement the cinema use adjacent and add vitality to the night-time economy of this part of the town centre. This is a Listed Building and no works are proposed which affect the exterior of the premises. The Conservation Officer raises no objection to the application but points out that Listed building consent will also be required.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** I recommend **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:

1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters);
  2. A11 (Approved plans);
  3. No external alterations;
  4. Materials;
  5. No flues/extraction systems;
- Notes A. Crime Risk Manager, B. SN4 (No Listed Building Consent); C. SN5 (No advertisements); D. SN10 (Disabled Persons Act 1981)

Reason for Approval

The proposal is acceptable in this location, the development does not impact on residential amenity and the change of use is compatible in principle with the character and appearance of the Listed Building. The development accords with policies contained in the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

**WF.726/05**

Date Received: 8.7.05  
Agent: PCP Design  
Ord. Sheet: 8176SW  
Policy: D.1, D.3, D.17 (AWFDLP)  
Case Officer: J. McKenzie-Watts  
Ward: Habberley and Blakebrook

Proposal: Full: **First floor rear extension, single storey front extension and new porch at 3 Western Way, Kidderminster**

Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Woodward

**Site Location and Description:** Number 3 Western Way is a link detached dwelling located towards the top of Bewdley Hill in Kidderminster. The application seeks consent to erect a first floor rear extension, single storey front extension to create garage and new porch.

**Planning History:** None relevant

**Consultations and Representations:** Highway Authority – no objection

Disability Action Wyre Forest – Comments relating to the extension however the comments will be dealt with at the building regulations stage of the process

Neighbour/Site Notice : Two letters of objection from the same neighbour – The houses in Western Way are all the same and if number 3 has these alterations it would spoil the look of the property. The properties have a 'restricted covenant' on them. If the plans are approved to 'attach' further to our property then our house would surely become more semi-detached than link detached and we have no desire to become further attached. This would surely open the 'floodgates' in Western Way for everyone to follow suit and we risk a very nice link-detached cul-de-sac location becoming a road of partially-terraced properties. A further concern is that having a garage door right outside our living room window will take away some of our privacy. At the moment the way our houses are situated, and number 3 does sit forward than our house, people can enjoy a certain amount of privacy in their lounge without having somebody stood within approximately one foot of their lounge window.

The neighbour also raises objections relating to issues covered by Building Regulations (i.e. party wall and supporting wall).

**Officer Comments:** The application is for the erection of a first floor rear extension to create an en-suite, a small 3.2m single storey extension to create a garage and a 2.3 x 1.2m porch to the front. All the extensions have been designed to complement the existing dwelling and comply with policy. The adjoining neighbour has raised various objections relating to the garage extension particularly concerning a lintel to be connected to their property. Revised drawings have been received showing the omission of the lintel and this should help to alleviate their concerns. However, most of the other concerns are issues that will be covered at the Building Regulations stage of the process and therefore cannot be taken into account when determining this application. Regarding the restrictive covenant, this states that nothing shall be erected between the front wall of the dwelling and the footpath, it is not concerned however, with extensions to the side of the property in the position proposed. In any event, such a legal restriction is not a material planning consideration. The neighbours are also worried about the garage door outside their living room window and that this will take away some of their privacy. The garage door is set back from the main building line and as such will not result in overlooking. I do not consider that the development would have a significantly harmful impact on this neighbouring property. Overall, the proposals are acceptable and the objections raised are not sufficient justification to refuse the application.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** In view of the above and in consideration of Articles 1 & 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998, I recommend **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions: 1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters); 2. A11 (Approved plans); 3.B3 (Finishing materials to match)

Reason for Approval

The proposed extensions are considered to be of an appropriate scale and design to the main dwelling and will have an acceptable appearance in the street scene. The impact of the extension upon the neighbouring property has been carefully assessed and it is considered that there will be no undue impact upon their amenity. For these reasons the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the policies listed above

<b>WF.728/05</b>		Proposal:	<b>Full : Demolition of existing and construction of no. 2 dwellings including extended vehicular access and retaining wall (Re-submission of WF.480/05) at 15 Telford Drive, Bewdley</b>
Date Received:	11.7.05		
Agent:	Barnett Taylor Associates		
Ord. Sheet:	7875 SW		
Policy:	H.2, D.1, D.3, D.4, D.10, D.11, D.13, NR.4, NR.9, TR.9, TR.17 (AWFDLP); D.3 (WCSP): QE.3, CF.2, CF.3 (RPG11)		
Case Officer:	C. Bishop		
Ward:	Bewdley and Arley	Applicant:	Mr. and Mrs. Roberts

---

**Site Location and Description:** No. 15 Telford Drive is a modern split level dwelling located at the end of the cul-de-sac to the west of Bewdley town centre. The application site is characterised by differences in the land levels with the ground rising to the rear towards Rosenhurst Drive. Due to the changes in land levels part of the application site is visible from Bewdley town centre and from across the river. The application proposes to demolish the existing dwelling and erect 2 no. split level dwellings with access off Telford Drive.

**Planning History:** WF.20776 Garage – Approved; WF.118/79 Erection of one dwelling (land adjacent 15)- Withdrawn; WF.1130/80 Dwelling (adj 15) – Approved; WF.829/85 Domestic extension to form study and games room – Approved; WF.480/05 Erection of two detached dwellings with integral garages and vehicular access from Telford Drive following demolition of existing dwelling – Withdrawn.

**Consultations and Representations:** Bewdley Town Council – The Town Council recommends refusal on the grounds that it is an over development of the site; the sky line will be impeded and the site is not appropriate for 2 buildings.

Highway Authority – Views awaited. Severn Trent Water – Views awaited

Arboricultural Officer – No objections on arboricultural grounds

Conservation Officer – No objections. Environmental Health – No objections subject to conditions

Disability Action Wyre Forest – Recommend refusal; the three storey unit with garage at lower level and flight of external steps to entrance would not be accessible.

Neighbours/Site Notice : one letter received – Our major and critical concern is the potential for collateral damage to our property which currently has the garage and a rear extension of no. 15 attached to our principal wall and which will need to be made good following demolition; concerns of the general effects of demolition, excavation, and in particular substantial piling of foundations all of which have the potential for damage to our property and there may be a wider general safety concern on the possibility of land slippage; condition should be imposed to ensure the applicants effect maximum insurance cover to deal with damage arising to our property should this occur and the production of evidence that this is in place before work is permitted; we see this is also protection for the Council.

**Officer Comments:** The application site is within an area washed over for residential use as identified on the Proposals Map. The site currently serves one dwelling with associated parking and garden area and is considered to be previously developed land. This application is a re-submission of an earlier application that was withdrawn following concerns about the scale and design of the proposed replacement dwellings. The scale of the proposed dwellings have been significantly reduced and the design amended so they would be more in keeping with the existing development within Telford Drive. Whilst split level dwellings of the type proposed would not normally be considered to be acceptable in view of the type of development surrounding the application site it is felt that a dwelling which would be more in keeping with current design guidance would be alien within this street scene. It is felt that two dwellings can be achieved on the site without an adverse impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties, surrounding area or highway safety. Concerns have been raised regarding the potential instability of the ground. In order to keep the height of the dwelling to an acceptable level it is proposed to reduce the ground levels on part of the plot (adjacent to the existing dwelling). Whilst the scheme includes the provision of retaining walls a condition can also be imposed to request an investigation as to whether the site is affected by slope instability and to agree remedial measures if appropriate. The other issues raised by the neighbour and Disability Action Wyre Forest are not material planning considerations and would be dealt with through Building Regulations and the Party Wall Act.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** The neighbours' comments and the provisions of Articles 1 & 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into consideration, however, it is considered that the proposal meets the criteria of the relevant policies and therefore the application is recommended for **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:

1. A6 (Full with No Reserved Matters); 2. A11 (Approved Plans); 3. B1 (Samples/Details of Materials); 4. B11 (Details of Enclosure); 5. B13 (Levels Details); 6. (Slope Instability); 6. E2 (Foul and Surface Water); 7. J13 (Hours of Work); 8. J14 (Hours of Deliveries/Collections). Note SN12 (Neighbours' rights)

**Reason for Approval** – The proposed development is situated within an area allocated for residential purposes and is considered to constitute previously developed land. The layout and design of the development, is considered to be acceptable, not adversely affecting the character of the immediate area or the street scene. The affect on the neighbouring properties has been carefully considered however it is felt that there will be no significant loss of amenity to residents. It is also considered that the proposal will not result in an adverse impact on highway safety. For these reasons the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the policies listed above.

<b>WF.735/05</b>		Proposal:	<b>Full : Single storey extensions to either side to provide garage and ancillary accommodation at Fullwood, Callow Hill, Bewdley</b>
Date Received:	11.7.05		
Agent:	Engineering & Building Design		
Ord. Sheet:	748 736		
Policy:	H.18, D.1, D.3, D.5, D.17, LA.1, LA.2, TR.9, TR.17 (AWFDLP)		
Case Officer:	S. Allum		
Ward:	Rock	Applicant:	Mr. & Mrs. R. Webb

---

**Site Location and Description:** 'Fullwood' is a detached dwelling located in open countryside to the west of Bewdley. The property is accessed via a narrow lane off Long Bank along with neighbouring dwellings, most of which are sited in large plots. There is a history of previous extensions (see below). The proposal is to erect two further ground floor extensions, one to house a garage/store, and the other a lounge extension. From the information supplied, I understand that the extensions are partly to provide self contained ground floor accommodation for the owner, for medical reasons.

**Planning History:**

WF.644/81 – Extension – Approved  
 WF.150/01 – First floor extension above existing garage – Approved

**Consultations and Representations:**

Rock Parish Council – Recommends refusal – over-development of the original footprint – application retrospective in part.

Highway Authority – No objection

Disability Action Wyre Forest – Opportunity should be considered to upgrade the property to current access standards as required by Part M of the Building Regulations, i.e. to ensure that the entrance is step-free and that the ground floor toilet has an outward opening door.

Neighbours/Site Notice : 6 letters of objection received - Main grounds of objection – increase in traffic probable result of extended accommodation. Little difference in rejection of new house in the lane (WF.688/04) and one to extend a house for multi-family occupancy, when it comes to traffic volumes. Existing dangerous access to 'Fullwood' Any increase would exacerbate current problem – increase danger to vehicles and pedestrians alike. Extension would be completely out of place in the lane – dominant feature in an area of otherwise smaller buildings – height of garage may deprive Mount Pleasant bungalow of light. Seems unnecessarily tall. Introduction of dormer windows at a later date may enable additional living accommodation in roof space – possibility of creating entirely separate property. Has re-assessment for rateable value been undertaken.

**Officer Comments:** As this dwelling has been extended previously, a key element in determining this application is the cumulative impact of the previous and proposed extension on the original building. In that regard the proposed extensions go beyond what is acceptable in my view, particularly in relation to the increase in floor area. The design of the extensions appears unsympathetic to the form of the original building, particularly the garage, which features an asymmetrical roof. Also the floor plan design fails to demonstrate to an adequate degree that the new work is ancillary to the existing dwelling unit – for example the room designated as 'bed-sit' contains its own entrance door. Finally, although the neighbours are clearly objecting strongly to the highways and access aspects of the scheme the Highway Authority has offered a 'no objection' comment.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** The proposal fails to comply with the appropriate housing and design policies of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan. I therefore recommend **REFUSAL** for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed extensions are considered to be poorly designed and disproportionate additions relative to the size of the original building. This is contrary to Policies D.1, D.3, D.5 and D.17 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.
2. The proposal also fails to meet the requirements of Policy H.18 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan in relation to 'accommodation for dependants' in that the 'bed sit' room is shown to benefit from an independent external entrance door.

**WF.739/05** Proposal: Full: **Single storey extension to rear at Tinkers Acre, St. Johns Lane, Bewdley**  
Date Received: 13.7.05  
Agent: M.A King Design  
Ord. Sheet: 7474-7574  
Policy: D.3, D.17, LA.2  
Case Officer: J. McKenzie-Watts  
Ward: Rock and Ribbesford Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. R. Taylerson

---

**Site Location and Description:** Tinkers Acre is a detached bungalow located within the Landscape Protection Area to the west of Bewdley Town Centre. The current application seeks to erect a ground floor extension to the rear to enlarge the existing kitchen/dining room and provide a new conservatory after demolition of the existing veranda.

**Planning History:** WF647/81 Alterations and Extensions – Approval  
WF365/98 Extension to form new bedroom and bathroom – Approval  
WF990/03 conversion of garage to self contained accommodation for dependant relative, bay window to front – Approved  
WF1046/03 Extension to side after demolition of veranda, WC, garage and store – Approved

**Consultations and Representations:** Rock Parish Council – The Parish Council recommend refusal because of over development within the original footprint  
Highway Authority – No objection

Disability Action Wyre Forest – Opportunity should be considered to upgrade the property to current access standards as required by part M of the Building Regulations, i.e. to ensure that the entrance is step-free and that the ground floor toilet has an outward opening door.

Neighbour/Site Notice – No objection

**Officer Comments:** The application is for the demolition of an existing veranda and replacement with a brick extension to enlarge the current kitchen / dining room and erection of a new conservatory and a small extension to the existing utility/store room which would add 22 sq. m in floor area. Although the property has been extended considerably in the past, the current proposal would modernise the existing glass lean to structure with a better designed extension which would comply with policy as it would not overwhelm the original. The Parish Council has objected to the proposal on the grounds of over-development of the site. However, after checking the planning history of the site, it is my opinion that this is not the case as part of the current scheme would simply replace the existing verandah. The proposal would have no impact on the Landscape Protection Area and would enhance the property by erecting an extension that would be more in keeping with the existing. Disability Action Wyre Forest comment on improvements that could be made to the property as part of this application, however these points will be dealt with at the Building Regulations stage and therefore cannot be taken into account when determining the outcome of this planing application. Overall, the proposals are acceptable and the objection raised is not sufficient justification to refuse the application.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** I recommend **APPROVAL** subject to the conditions below:

1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters); 2. A11 (Approved plans); 3.B3 (Finishing materials to match)

Reason for Approval

The proposed extensions are considered to be of an appropriate scale and design to the main dwelling and will have an acceptable appearance. The impact of the extension upon the neighbouring property has been carefully assessed and it is considered that there will be no undue impact upon their amenity. For these reasons the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the policies listed above

**WF.742/05 / WF.743/05**  
Date Received: 14.7.05  
Agent: Futurama  
Ord. Sheet: 8177 NE  
Policy: AD.1 (AWFDLP)  
Case Officer: P. Round

Proposal: Advertisement : **Various internally illuminated and non-illuminated fascia signs, three freestanding totem signs and various car park signs at The Co-op Store (Local Retail)**  
Advertisement : **One externally illuminated projecting sign and two internally illuminated fascia signs at The Co-op Store (Travel), Franche Road, Kidderminster**  
CWS Retail Financial Services

Ward: Franche

Applicant:

**Site Location and Description:** The Co-op store is located off Wilton Avenue in the Franche area of Kidderminster. The store combines a supermarket, travel agents and pharmacy all under one roof. Two separate applications for advertisement consent have been submitted for complete new signage for the store, as part of the re-branding of the store.

**Planning History:** Numerous but of relevance:

WF.635/93 – Signs : Approved. WF.915/99 – Projecting ATM sign : Approved

WF.88/05 – Internally illuminated fascia and projecting signs : Approved

**Consultations and Representations:** Highway Authority – No objection

Neighbour/Site Notice : one letter received – 1. All external illuminated signs and lights to be turned off 30 minutes after store closes and not to be turned back on until 15 minutes before store reopens; 2. Time clock for above illuminated signs and lights to be altered when British Summertime starts and ends; 3. All work to be done after 8.00 a.m. and finished before 7.00 p.m. and no work to be carried out on the above mentioned signs on a Sunday; 4. No trees to be cut down please as they help to filter some of the noise and fumes; 5. A further point I would like to bring to the Committee's attention as the sign at the corner of Franche Road/Wilton Avenue and two signs at the entrance to the car park in Wilton Avenue are outside the building line, so are they allowed?

**Officer Comments:** Consideration of advertisement applications are centred on two main criteria, that of amenity and public safety. The current applications are replacements for the existing signage that exists at the store. The current signage appears dated and in the main consists of individually illuminated letters. The signage proposed is of a modern design, and is part of a national re-branding of all Co-op services. Where illuminated signage is required this is achieved through halo illumination allowing illumination only around the edges of the sign. As no additional signs are being proposed, the number of signs proposed is not in question. The design and means of illumination of the signs are considered appropriate for this building and the surrounding area. Revised plans have been received that reduce the size of the signs allowing them to be more in keeping with the architectural features of the building. Neighbouring properties will not be adversely affected by this proposal. In respect of public safety the Highway Authority have not raised an objection, and as such it is felt that public safety will not be compromised. Dealing now with the points raised by the neighbour. The applicants are amenable to the request that the illumination be restricted by a timer and are happy for a condition to be imposed on any consent given. The Local Planning Authority cannot restrict hours of work on the signage, however contact has been made with the applicants making them aware of this concern. No trees are to be felled as part of this scheme. The signs at the entrance and the junction with Franche Road replace existing signs in these locations. The signage proposals are considered to acceptable and to conform with Policy AD.1 of the Local Plan

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** I therefore recommend **APPROVAL** to applications WF.742/05 and WF.743/05 subject to the following conditions:-

1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters); 2. A11 (Approved plans); Note – Identification of approved plans

**WF.745/05**

Date Received: 13.7.05

Agent: -

Ord. Sheet: 8678 8778

Policy: D.4, NC.6 (AWFDLP)

Case Officer: A. Needham

Ward: Blakedown & Chaddesley

Proposal: Tree Preservation Order :  
**Fell a Scots Pine at 11A Mill  
Close, Blakedown**

Applicant: Dr. Payne

**Site Location and Description:** The tree is a mature Scots Pine, approximately 14m tall and is situated in close proximity to the applicant's property no. 11 Mill Close, Blakedown, but is under the ownership of 11a Mill Close.

**Planning History:** None relevant

**Consultations and Representations:**

Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council – No representation received

Highway Authority – No representation received

Ward Members – No representations received

Neighbour – No representation received

**Officer Comments:** The tree is a mature Scots Pine approximately 14m tall with a slight lean towards the applicant's property. It is in excellent condition, contributing greatly to the amenity of the locality. The tarmac public footpath, which is approximately 3m remote from the tree, has some minor damage that may be as a result of the tree. However, the tarmac drive of no. 11 Mill Close has a number of cracks, which are considered likely to be as a result of the root growth of the nearby Scots Pine tree.

The applicant indicates that the tree's roots have damaged his drain. I would suggest that trees generally do not have the capacity to damage drains, but do have the capacity to enter already damaged drains and cause blockages as they proliferate. It is generally recommended that the drain be mended and made water tight to prevent roots entering rather than remove an important tree.

Four other trees, situated to the front of properties in Mill Close, have been removed over the last 3 years. However, all of those trees have not been of significant stature and have had structural flaws, which justified their removal. Replacement trees have been planted for all those removed.

If the Local Authority refuses permission to fell the Scots Pine tree, then it may be liable to pay compensation for any damage that results as a direct result of their decision. It might be argued that refusal to fell a tree resulted in continued damage to a drain or tarmac surface, and a Local Authority may be pursued for recovery of costs.

The tree has been re-inspected and is not considered to be 'outstanding' or 'special' in terms of the amenity it provides due to other trees of the same species in the area and, as such, I reluctantly conclude that consent should be given for it to be removed and replaced.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** I recommend that the application to fell the Scots Pine be **APPROVED** subject to a suitable replacement tree being planted in the vicinity of the removed tree.

**WF.746/05 : WF.747/05**

Date Received: 14.7.05  
 Agent: Grace Plant & Associates  
 Ord. Sheet: 8673 8773  
 Policy: D.1,D.3,D.17,GB.1,GB.2  
 GB.6,LB.1,LB.2,LB.3,  
 LB.5 (AWFDLP)  
 CTC.19 (WCSP)

Proposal: Full / Listed Building Consent :  
**Erection of a single storey  
 extension to form dining room  
 and new gates at Bank Farm  
 House, Shenstone**

Case Officer: P. Wigglesworth

Ward: Blakedown & Chaddesley

Applicant: G. Crowder

**Site Location and Description:** Bank Farm House is a Grade II Listed Building located in the settlement of Shenstone. The site is within the Green Belt. It is proposed to erect a single storey dining room extension with rear porch on the rear elevation. It is also proposed to construct a pair of steel gates between existing piers at the vehicular entrance to the premises. The applications submitted are for both planning permission and Listed Building consent.

**Planning History:** Most recent WF.621/05 Installation of window, bricking up door, removal of some internal walls and removal of internal wc : Approved

**Consultations and Representations:** Stone Parish Council – Recommend refusal.

Extension would alter the substance of this listed building

Highway Authority – No objection

Conservation Officer – No objection (see below)

Neighbour/Site Notice/Advertisement – No representations received

**Officer Comments:** This is an application for a relatively small single storey extension to the rear and as such the development is well within the parameters of the Local Plan Green Belt extension Policy GB.1iv. In design terms the extension is also satisfactory and compliant with Policies D.1, D.3 and D.17 of the Local Plan. However, this is also a Listed Building and the Parish Council have raised an objection on the grounds that the extension would alter the substance of the Listed Building. The Council's Conservation Officer after re-examining the proposal in the light of the Parish Council's views has commented as follows: 'Due to the size of the proposed extension, the design, and the proposed materials, it is my opinion that the proposals will not detract from the character and appearance of the building. The extension has large amounts of glazing, and with appropriate facing materials, such as those used on the previous extension, it is my view that the impact on the Listed Building will be low. In response to the comments from the Parish Council, the proposals *will* alter the substance of the Listed Building, as they are for an extension to the property, which will alter its appearance, and as such its substance. However, in terms of both the visual and physical impact on its character and appearance, I do not feel that this will be sufficient as to warrant refusal'. I would concur with these views and also point out that the gates are in keeping with the listed building and the extension being at the rear of the rear will have no impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** I recommend **APPROVAL** of both the application for planning permission and Listed Building Consent subject to the following conditions:  
 WF.746/05 – 1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters); 2. A11 (Approved plans); 3. B1 (Samples/details of materials); 4. B2 (Sample brick panel); 5. B9 (Details of windows and doors); 6. Colour of gates to be agreed

WF.747/05 – 1. A7 (Listed Building Consent)

Reason for Approval The proposed alterations are considered to be of a design that would not detract from the character and appearance of this Listed Building. The effects of the development on neighbouring property has been carefully assessed and it is considered that there will be no undue loss of amenity. The proposal is thus in accordance with the policies listed above.

<b>WF.750/05</b>		Proposal:	Full: <b>Erection of two storey extension to include kitchen, dining, garage, guest suite (demolition of garage) at Stanway Mead, 4 New Wood Lane, Blakedown</b>
Date Received:	15.7.05		
Agent:			
Ord. Sheet:	874 778		
Policy:	GB.1, GB.2, GB.6, D.1, D.3, D.4, D.5, D.17		
Case Officer:	S. Allum	Applicant:	Mr. & Mrs. T. Bills
Ward:	Blakedown & Chaddesley		

---

**Site Location and Description:** 'Stanway Mead' is a detached dwelling in the Green Belt, located in a large domestic curtilage and set well back from the highway. There are neighbouring properties of similar layout and scale. The only previous alterations to the property have been the erection of a flat roofed detached double garage, close to the main house, which is to be demolished as part of this proposal. The current scheme is a scaled down re-submission, following withdrawal of the previous application to allow further negotiations on the size and scale of the extensions.

**Planning History:** WF.152/76 – Double Garage : Approved

WF.323/05 – Demolition of existing garage, erection of 2 storey extensions at front/side/rear : Withdrawn

**Consultations and Representations:** Churchill & Blakedown Parish Council – No objections  
Highway Authority – No objections

Disability Action Wyre Forest – New entrance should if possible be step free

Neighbours/Site Notice : one letter of objection received -This application, if granted, would adversely affect my use and enjoyment of my own property. From the deposited plans, I believe a boundary wall of the proposed development would be only 2'.6" away from my boundary, and it would include windows overlooking my property, which would result in the invasion of my privacy and inhibit the use I make of my garden. Moreover, the closeness of the development would also impact adversely upon my rights of light. Finally, I believe a mature oak tree standing upon the boundary dividing our two properties would be endangered if the development in respect of which planning permission is sought were to proceed.

Arboricultural Officer – Trees on site are not afforded statutory protection by a Tree Preservation Order and are not situated within a Conservation Area. The site and surrounding area contains many trees, including Oak and Scots Pine, which form the character of the locality. An Oak tree and several Scots Pine trees are present in the vicinity of the proposed extension. I consider it likely that the oak would need to be removed to which I have no objection in the view of the abundance of other trees present and its lean. It should be possible to retain the Scots Pine trees, however removal of a couple of them, would not, in my opinion significantly affect the amenity of the locality.

**Officer Comments:** The objective in the negotiations leading to this resubmission has been to scale down the extensions to a point where they can be considered to be proportionate to the size of the original building. This, I feel, has now been achieved, the increase in floor area being 46%, and volume 22%. The design is also sympathetic to the architectural style of the dwelling and the setting, including the privacy and amenity of the adjoining neighbours. All windows on the sensitive East facing elevation are 'high level' style and obscure glazed, to protect privacy. Finally, the views of the Arboricultural Officer are accepted in relation to the status of adjacent trees.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** This proposal now complies with Green Belt, design and amenity policies. I therefore recommend **APPROVAL** subject to conditions and in consideration of Articles 1 and 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998.

1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters); 2. A11 (Approve Plans); 3. Matching materials; 4. Obscure glazed windows on east facing elevation; 5. No further windows in east facing elevation; Disabled access note; Private matters note.

Reason for Approval

The proposal is considered to be appropriate development in the Green Belt because the size and scale of the extension is proportionate to the original building. The impact of the extension upon neighbouring properties and existing trees has been carefully assessed. It is considered that amenity and privacy of these neighbours would not be adversely affected to a serious degree. For these reasons the proposal is considered to be in compliance with the above policies.

<b>WF.754/05</b>		Proposal:	Full: <b>Erection of two storey and single storey extensions, alterations, detached double garage and new access onto Drayton Road at Pound House, Drayton Road, Bluntington</b>
Date Received:	18.07.05		
Agent:	Mr. R. Insley		
Ord. Sheet:	8874-8974		
Policy:	GB.1, GB.2, GB.6, D.1, D.3, D.4, D.5, D.17, TR.9, TR.17 (AWFDLP), D.12, D.38, D.39 (AWCSP)		
Case Officer:	S. Allum		
Ward:	Blakedown & Chaddesley	Applicant:	Mr. J. Driscoll

---

**Site Location and Description:** Pound House is a detached dwelling located in the open Green Belt to the North East of Chaddesley Corbett village. In the absence of any planning history regarding previous extensions, I am satisfied from my visual inspection on site that the dwelling existed substantially in its present volume before 1<sup>st</sup> July 1948 (the date of the introduction of the first Planning Acts). The proposal now is to erect a combination of two storey and ground floor extensions on the south facing elevation, together with a detached double garage with associated access onto Drayton Road. (The principle of the last two elements have already received the benefit of planning permission under WF.43/02.)

**Planning History:** WF.43/02 - Formation of drive, access, forecourt and turning areas, and construction of double garage in garden: Approved.

**Consultations and Representations:**

Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council – Suggest highway appraisal, replacement trees, query size of development compared with original footprint.

Highway Authority – No objections subject to conditions.

Neighbour/Site Notice – No representations received.

**Officer Comments:** Green Belt policy in the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan makes it clear that extensions to existing dwellings in the Green Belt must not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling. In this case my calculations reveal that the extensions applied for would increase the existing floor area by 43% and the volume would be increased by 20%. Although no specific percentage increase figure is incorporated in policy GB.1, I feel that the scale of these extensions is appropriate and reasonable. The proposal is also well designed in that the existing architectural character of the building is respected and developed in the new work. No element of the design, including the first floor balcony, would impact negatively on any neighbouring property. Regarding the proposed garage and access, this is broadly similar to the approved scheme. Three small hedging trees would require removal to facilitate the access, and this is acceptable in terms of landscape impact. Although it would not be possible to replace vegetation in the hedgerow, the scheme shows tree planting within the site, which is a welcome compensation for this minimal loss. I feel these measures satisfactorily address the concerns of the Parish Council.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** This proposal conforms with Green Belt, Design and Highway Policies. I therefore recommend **APPROVAL** subject to conditions, and in consideration of Articles 1 & 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998:

1. A6 (Full with No Reserved Matters);
2. A11 (Approved Plans);
3. B3 (Finishing Materials to Match);
4. C6 (Landscaping – Small Scheme);
5. C8 (Landscape Implementation);
- 6 – 9. Highways Conditions. Notes – Highway Notes

Reason for Approval

The proposed extensions, detached garage and highway access are considered to be appropriate development and will not harm the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt or highway safety. For these reasons the proposal is considered to be in compliance with the policies listed above.

**WF.756/05**

Date Received: 18.7. 05

Agent: Engineering & Building Design

Ord. Sheet: 7472-7572

Policy: H.2, LA.1, LA.2  
(AWFDLP); CTC.1,  
CTC.4 (WCSP)

Case Officer: J. Summerfield

Ward: Rock

Proposal: Full : **Detached garage/  
store at Wisteria Cottage,  
Bliss Gate, Rock**

Applicant: Mr P Phillips

---

**Site Location and Description:** The site fronts Heightington Road within Bliss Gate. The site is within the Landscape Protection Area and Area of Great Landscape Value. The application seeks consent for a two bay garage and store measuring approximately 10 metres by 5.5 metres and 5.3 metres to the ridge. The garage/store would be sited in front of the existing dwelling and outbuildings.

**Planning History:** KR.53/64 (outline) – Dwelling : Refused 26<sup>th</sup> February 1964.

WF.457/82 (outline) – Dwelling : Refused 6<sup>th</sup> July 1982

WF.104/83 – Extensions to front side and rear : Approved 25<sup>th</sup> March 1983

WF.509/88 – First floor extension : Approved 15<sup>th</sup> June 1988

WF.350/89 – Rear porch : Approved 23<sup>rd</sup> May 1989

WF.871/92 – Extension : Approved 8<sup>th</sup> December 1992

WF.315/96 – Extension : Approved 25<sup>th</sup> June 1996

WF.531/97 – Conservatory : Approved 14<sup>th</sup> August 1997

**Consultations and Representations:**

Rock Parish Council – Recommend approval

Highway Authority – No objections

Neighbour/Site Notice – No representations received

**Officer Comments:** Policy D.17 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan advises that residential extensions including curtilage buildings and previous extensions must be in scale with and be subservient to the original building and not create an incongruous feature within the landscape. Alongside the original cottage which has been extended previously lies a pre-1948 two-storey outbuilding, two sheds, a caravan and a stable. It is considered that due to its size, massing and position forward of all the other structures on site the proposed building would appear overly prominent within the site and therefore together with the other structures would visually over-whelm the original cottage. The proposal would also have an adverse effect on the character of the Landscape Protection Area and Area of Great Landscape Value.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** I therefore recommend **REFUSAL** for the following reason:

1. By virtue of its size and massing, together with its siting forward of all the existing structures on site, it is considered that the proposed development would, together with the existing structures visually overwhelm the original building, appear over prominent within the site and add to the clutter of the existing structures. The proposed development would therefore have an adverse effect on the character of the Landscape Protection Area and Area of Great Landscape Value. As such the proposal is considered contrary to Policies D.17, LA.1 and LA.2 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan and Policies CTC.1 and CTC.4 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan.

**WF.759/05**

Date Received: 19.7.05

Agent: Engineering & Building Design

Ord. Sheet: 8177 NW

Policy: D.1,D.3,D.17,TR.9,TR.17  
(AWFDLP)

Case Officer: S. Allum

Ward: Franche

Proposal: Full : **Two storey side extension, front porch and detached garage at 81 Audley Drive, Kidderminster**

Applicant: Mr. M. Jones

---

**Site Location and Description:** No. 81 Audley Drive is a prominently located detached dwelling on the open plan Ferndale estate, approximately 2 km north west of Kidderminster town centre. The proposal is to erect a two storey extension to the side of the dwelling, on the elevation facing Audley Drive, together with a detached single garage with access to the highway and a forward facing porch to enclose the existing front door.

**Planning History:** WF.1198/02 – Erection of a dwelling with new vehicular access on land adjacent 81 Audley Drive : Refused; Appeal dismissed

**Consultations and Representations:** Highway Authority – Views awaited

Severn Trent Water Ltd. – Views awaited

Neighbour – No representations received

**Officer Comments:** Members will be aware that Policy D.17 requires that extensions or alterations to existing residential properties must be in scale with and visually subservient to the form of the original building. The development must also harmonise with the existing townscape and not create incongruous features. In this case, the size (particularly the width and height) of the proposed extension is considered to be disproportionate in the context of this policy. The excessive scale and mass of the extension would also be particularly apparent from the public highway on this very prominent corner site. Additionally, the provision of a second 'front door' into the proposed extension is not felt to be a desirable design feature in what is being shown as an extension to the main dwelling. Finally, the proposed porch and detached garage are considered to be satisfactory.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** The proposed two storey side extension is clearly contrary to the design policies in the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Design Quality. I therefore recommend **REFUSAL** for the following reasons, and in consideration of Articles 1 and 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998:-

1. The design, scale and massing of the proposed two storey extension is considered to be disproportionate to the form of the original building, contrary to the provisions of Policies D.1 and D.17 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Design Quality.
2. The proposed two storey extension would appear as a strident and incongruous feature in the street scene, to the detriment of the original open plan layout and the visual amenity of the area. This is contrary to Policies D.1, D.3 and D.17 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.
3. The design of the front elevation of the proposed extension which incorporates an additional entrance door is not considered to be an appropriate feature on an extension to an existing dwelling. This is contrary to Policies D.1 and D.17 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

<b>WF.760/05</b>		Proposal:	<b>Full: Erection of detached dwelling at Home Farm, Franche Court Drive, Kidderminster</b>
Date Received:	19.07.05		
Agent:	Engineering & Building Design		
Ord. Sheet:	8278 SW		
Policy:	H.2, D.1, D.3, D.10, D.11, NR.9, GB.1, GB.6, LA.2, TR.9, TR.17 (AWFDLP)		
Case Officer:	C. Bishop	Applicant:	Mrs D Dowles
Ward:	Franche (adjacent Wolverley)		

**Site Location and Description:** The application site is accessed via a track off the end of Franche Court Drive cul-de-sac just over a mile north west of Kidderminster town centre. The land is allocated for residential purposes within the Local Plan and is previously developed. The site is immediately adjacent to the designated West Midlands Green Belt. The application seeks permission for a detached dwelling.

**Planning History:** WF.623/99 Erection of two dwellings on land adjacent Home Farm – Refused; WF.47/00 Erection of a dwelling and garage and alteration to existing access at Home Farm – Approved in outline; WF.304/05 Erection of detached dwelling – withdrawn.

**Consultations and Representations:** Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council – Views awaited Highway Authority – No objection subject to same conditions as WF.45/00. Disability Action Wyre Forest – New access gate from drive would be better placed centrally to serve both properties; entrance to be step free in accordance with Part M (*this is a matter for Building Regulations*). Neighbour/Site Notice : 3 letters received – Development would have an adverse impact on privacy being so close to Home Farm; highway hazard; loss of car parking space for two cars and haulage vehicle; cars would need to be parked on Franche Court Drive; loss of livestock that currently exists on the site; object to the uprooting of the hedge and encroachment of the green belt; it is not an infill development and raises questions of building further into the fields; the garden is required for immediate use of Home Farm and the use of and enjoyment of the existing property would be extremely limited.

**Officer Comments:** The principle of residential development on this site has already been accepted by WF.47/00. This application is a re-submission of WF.304/05 which was withdrawn following concerns about the overall height of the proposed dwelling. The outline approval was granted subject to a condition that required the overall height of the dwelling not to exceed the height of the dwelling shown on the illustrative scheme. This condition was imposed to enable the Local Planning Authority to control the height of the dwelling, in the interests of ensuring the impact on the adjacent land which is allocated Green Belt and Landscape Protection Area is minimised. The design of the dwelling shown on the indicative scheme with the outline application however is no longer considered to comply with current Local Plan Policies or the Adopted Design Quality Supplementary Design Guide. The current application proposes a dormer bungalow of an overall height of 5.3 metres. The design is considered to be more in keeping with the surrounding development whilst not harming the visual amenity of the adjacent Landscape Protection Area and Green Belt. Both properties would benefit from sufficient private amenity space without encroaching into the adjacent Green Belt land. With regards to the highway safety issues the existing and proposed property would have the necessary off street car parking facilities. The views of the Highway Authority are awaited.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** The neighbours' comments and the provisions of Articles 1 & 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into consideration, however, it is considered that the proposal meets the criteria of the relevant policies and therefore the application is recommended for **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:

1. A6 (Full with No Reserved Matters); 2. A11 (Approved Plans); 3. B1 (Samples/Details of Materials); 4. B11 (Details of Enclosure); 5. B13 (Levels Details); 6. C6 (Landscaping – Small Scheme); 7. C8 (Landscape Implementation); 8. E2 (Foul and Surface Water); 9. J8 (No Further Windows). Note – SN12 (Neighbours' rights).

**Reason for Approval:** The proposed dwelling is situated within an area allocated for residential purposes and is considered to constitute previously developed land. The siting and design of the dwelling is considered to be acceptable. The impact of the dwelling upon neighbouring properties has been carefully assessed and it is considered that there will be no undue impact upon their amenity. The scheme would not have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the adjacent Landscape Protection Area of Green Belt. The development would not have an adverse impact on in terms of highway safety. For these reasons the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the policies listed above.

**WF.762/05**

Date Received: 27.7.05  
Agent: -  
Ord. Sheet: 8069 NW  
Policy: H.8, TR.9, TR.17, D.1  
(AWFDLP)

Proposal: Full : **Change of use to small care home (Use Class C2) at 'Rutland Villa', 62 Cheshire Avenue, Stourport on Severn**

Case Officer: S. Allum

Ward: Areley Kings

Applicant: Minster Pathways

**Site Location and Description:** 'Rutland Villa' is a dwelling located in a residential cul-de-sac in the southern outskirts of Stourport on Severn. The exact nature of the proposal has been explained by the applicant as the 24 hour care of three young adults with mild/moderate learning difficulties. The applicant also submits that: *'The focus of the Home is to give three residents a normal and fulfilling life to assist them with life skills, activities, education and developing them in order for them to be part of the community and to live in as independent environmental as possible. The Home will be registered by the Commission for Social Care inspection at Worcester to ensure compliance with the Care Home Regulations and National minimum standards. Residents will be supervised by a small staff group who are qualified to do so for 24 hours a day. There will be no adverse effects to the local community. The Home also has adequate parking facilities, as there would be a maximum of two cars parked there at any one time. The Home is reflective of the Government's White Paper called 'Valuing People' which is a Paper that affords the opportunity for people with learning difficulties to live a normal life and not be discriminated against. The residents who will live at the Home would not be a risk in any way to the local community: the service will accommodate adults with learning difficulties such as aspergers syndrome'*.

**Planning History:** None relevant

**Consultations and Representations:** Stourport on Severn Town Council – Views awaited

Highway Authority – Views awaited

Commission for Social Care Inspection – Premises are suitable for three adults with a learning disability.

Disability Action Wyre Forest – 1. Drawing information provided is very poor; 2. The existing property has a stepped entrance and steps also appear to be shown from the hall into both the dining room and sitting room. As the application provided no information on proposals to improve access and because the proposed change of use is likely to bring the property into a use category where we feel accessibility is likely to be a greater rather than lesser requirement we recommend that it be refused.

Neighbour : seven letters of objection/concern received – Application not clear; fear over possible future use for care of persons with mental illness or drug/alcohol abuse; anti-social behaviour/crime; increased traffic; noise; loss of privacy; streets will be used as playground. Disturbance to local residents at unreasonable hours. Many elderly people and young children in and around Cheshire Avenue – worried about used syringes etc.

**Officer Comments:** Policy H.8 makes it clear that proposals for small scale non-residential development within residential areas will be considered on their merits, but will only be approved where the use is compatible with the general character and appearance of the residential area and where it would be unlikely to harm the amenities of adjoining dwellings or the area generally by virtue of noise, traffic, smoke, fumes, dust, grit or similar. In the light of the additional information provided by the applicant in this case and the level of care facilities, I am satisfied that the spirit of this policy would be satisfied. Rather than granting an unrestricted Class C2 use, a condition is proposed to restrict the use to that operated by the applicant, i.e. a personal planning permission. The effect of this would be to enable the Local Planning Authority to have control of the site in the event of any subservient change of ownership. Finally, I do not feel that the comments of Disability Action Wyre Forest are sufficient to warrant a refusal recommendation for those reasons alone. A note is proposed however advising the applicant of the Part M requirements in terms of access.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** Having considered all the material considerations of this case, I am of the view that the relevant Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan policies are satisfied. I therefore recommend **APPROVAL** subject to conditions, and in consideration of Articles 1 & 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998:-

1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters); 2. A11 (Approved plans); 3. Personal permission to Minster Pathways Ltd.; Note – Disabled Access

Reason for Approval The proposed change of use is considered to be compatible to the general character of the residential area and subject to conditions will not cause a significant loss of amenity to nearby residential properties. The proposal is thus considered to comply with the policies listed above

**WF.763/05** Proposal: Full : **Tractor store at 'Wrights Place', Buckeridge Rock**  
Date Received: 20.7.06  
Agent: M G Baynton  
Ord. Sheet: 7074-7174  
Policy: D1, D3, D5, D11, D17  
LA2 (AWDLP)  
Case Officer: J. Howells  
Ward: Rock Applicant: Mr and Mrs North

---

**Site Location and Description:** This application relates to 'Wrights Place' which is a detached property within Buckeridge to the far West of the district. The site is within the Landscape Protection Area and Area of Great Landscape Value. It is also adjacent to the Tanners Brook Meadow Special Wildlife Site. The application seeks consent to erect a double garage/tractor store within the domestic curtilage of the property.

**Planning History:** WF/90/03 – Two storey extension to side and canopy : Approved and currently under construction

**Consultations and Representations:**

Rock Parish Council – The Parish Council recommends refusal on this application. The Council believes that the proposed tractor store would be too remote from the existing dwelling.

Highway Authority – No objections

Worcestershire Wildlife Trust – You will be aware that the site is immediately adjacent to the Tanners Brook Special Wildlife Site and we would wish to be assured that there would be no adverse impacts on the meadow as a result of the proposals.

Neighbour - No representations received

**Officer Comments:** Policy D.5 of Adopted Local Plan states that development proposals in the countryside must, where appropriate be sited adjacent to existing buildings rather than in isolated positions. Policy D17 requires curtilage buildings to harmonise with the existing landscape and not to create incongruous features. In this case the proposed garage/tractor store will be located approximately 10m from the original building and will be within approximately 5m of the dwelling once the extension is complete. Therefore the siting of the building is not considered to be isolated from the existing dwelling as suggested by the Parish Council. The building would be 8.8 x 7.9m in size with a ridge height of 4.5m. The size of the building has been reduced following pre-application advice and is now considered to be an acceptable size in this location. The applicant has agreed to retain the existing hedge/trees, which will further screen the building from the road and as such the proposal will not have an adverse visual impact on the landscape. The building will be rendered with stone work on the front elevation to match the dwelling. The design of the store is therefore in keeping with the existing property and blends in with the surroundings. The property is in a remote location and therefore the proposal is not considered to adversely affect neighbour amenity. With respect to the comments of the Worcestershire Wildlife Trust the proposed building will not be located within the actual Special Wildlife Site which is adjacent to the boundary of the site.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** In view of the above I recommend **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:

1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters); 2. A11 (Approved plans); 3. B3 (Finishing materials to match); 4. J6 (Building – domestic purposes only <Wrights Place>); 5. C11 (Maintenance of existing hedges)

Reason for Approval

The proposed tractor store is considered to be of an appropriate size and design. The impact of the tractor store upon neighbouring properties has been carefully assessed and it is considered that there will be no undue impact upon their amenity. For these reasons the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the policy listed above

<b>WF.766/05</b>	Proposal:	Full : <b>Variation of Condition 2 and removal of Condition 4 of WF.1256/89 to replace existing caravan with large twin unit at Brandslodge Coppice, Lynalls Lane, Far Forest</b>
Date Received: 21.07.05		
Agent: C. J. Didlick		
Ord. Sheet: 7275 7375		
Policy: D.1, D.3, D.5, LA1, LA.2, TR.9 (AWFDLP)		
Case Officer: S. Allum	Applicant:	Mr. R. Evans
Ward: Rock		

---

**Site Location and Description:** Brandslodge Coppice is a piece of land 0.3 hectares in size located in a wooded area of Far Forest. The site is within the Landscape Protection Area. The land itself benefits from a planning permission granted in 1989 for the retention of a mobile home on the site. The size of this unit was controlled by condition 2 and the siting of a chalet, prefabricated home or similar structure was specifically prevented by condition 4. This application now seeks to amend and remove these conditions respectively, to allow a larger mobile home to be erected to replace the existing caravan which is 9.3 metres long x 3.2 metres wide. The dimensions of the proposed unit are 9.2 metres long x 6.1 metres wide. This is a portable unit, which is assembled from two halves and features a low, ridged roof and dark brown timber clad walls. Officers are satisfied that it falls within the definition of a caravan.

**Planning History:** WF.1256/89 – Retention of mobile home: Approved  
 WF.29/93 – Residential dwelling: Refused

**Consultations and Representations:**

Rock Parish Council – Recommends Refusal and urges the Development Control Committee to support the existing conditions. Parish Council believes that if conditions are relaxed it would set a precedent on future residential holiday homes.

Highway Authority – Views awaited

Disability Action Wyre Forest – Unable to assess whether access will be improved or worsened.

Neighbour/Site Notice – No representations received to date.

**Officer Comments:** In the context of the reasons given for Conditions 2 and 4 in the 1989 consent, namely to ‘prevent unnecessary deterioration of the amenities of the area’ and ‘to retain control over the erection of permanent dwellings at the site’, the proposal on this occasion would not, in my view, compromise those original objectives. With respect to the Parish Council’s comments, the proposed unit is no more permanent than the existing caravan. Although it is approximately twice the floor area and slightly higher to the ridged roof, due to the timber boarding, the visual impact on the surroundings would be less than the existing white caravan. Furthermore, conditions can be imposed to ensure that the existing caravan is removed from the site, and that the plinth upon which the new unit is to be placed is no higher than that existing.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** This proposal complies with the appropriate Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan policies and I therefore recommend **APPROVAL** subject to conditions, and in consideration of Articles 1 & 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998: 1. A6 (Full with No Reserved Matters); 2. A11 Approved Plans); 3. Levels details to be submitted; 4. Existing caravan to be removed from site; 5. No sheds, canopies or other structures to be attached; 6. This permission is for a twin unit caravan which shall be strictly in accordance with the submitted plans and photographs. Note – Disabled Access

Reason for Approval

The variation and removal respectively of Conditions 2 and 4 of Planning Permission WF.1256/89 would not compromise the Council’s original reasons for applying such conditions. Furthermore, neither the setting of the site within the Landscape Protection Area or the amenity of neighbours would be harmed by these changes. For these reasons, the proposal is considered to conform to the policies of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan listed above.

<b>WF.768/05</b>		Proposal:	<b>Full : Erection of a single storey extension to provide new entrance at King Charles I School, Comberton Road, Kidderminster</b>
Date Received:	22.7.05		
Agent:	Landmark Architects & Consultants		
Ord. Sheet:	8476 SW		
Policy:	D1, D3, D18, CY5, LB5, TR17 (AWFDLP)		
Case Officer:	S. Allum		
Ward:	Offmore & Comberton	Applicant:	King Charles 1 School

---

**Site Location and Description:** King Charles 1 School occupies a site adjacent to the crossroads between Chester Road South and Comberton Road. The site of the proposed reception extension is well away from these road frontages, attached to a 1960's flat roofed teaching block, and close to the Grade II Listed Highgrove House. The extension is of 'modern' design with a curved roof and timber clad walls.

**Planning History:** WF.1195/03 New science classroom and associated facilities – Approved  
 WF126/05 LBC conversion of first floor meeting room to school offices and conversion of ground floor locker room to fitness room – Approved  
 WF521/05 LBC removal of first floor partition between kitchen/store and adjacent office to form new office – Approved.

**Consultations and Representations:** Highway Authority – Views awaited  
Worcestershire County Council (Property Services) – Views awaited;  
Highways Agency – No objections

Conservation Officer – Whilst this proposal is set within the vicinity of a Listed Building, it is not attached to the Listed Building, but to the modern 1960's school block opposite it. Currently, there is a poor quality "covered walkway" between the two buildings. The proposals seek to remove this, and to create a new entrance feature to this building, enabling visitors to the school to readily identify the principle entrance. Whilst the construction is of a modern style, I feel that this is in line with the ethics of this building, which itself is an example of architecture of its time. The new proposal is of high quality, and will improve the current setting of both the historic building, and the more modern one. I have no objections to the proposals, and recommend for approval, subject to the following conditions : All external facing materials to be approved in writing prior to the commencement of works on site; RECOMMENDATION : I do not have any objections over these proposals, and recommend for approval, subject to the condition outlined above.

Disability Action Wyre Forest – 1. An access statement should be provided with this application, in particular setting out the school's access policy and how the proposed entrance is to be used. 2. Details of parking and route from car park to be shown. 3. Proposed Disabled Toilet to be designed fully to current Part M recommended standards  
 4. Reception counter to be suitable for wheelchair users if possible for staff as well as visitors. 5. Hearing enhancement system to be incorporated at Reception. 6. Adequate space to be allowed for wheelchair visitors waiting in reception. 7. Signage and colour schemes to be in accordance with recommendations made by the Royal National Institute for the Blind and the JMU Access Partnership in their publications 'Building Sight' and 'Sign Design Guide'

Site Notice/Advertisement – No representations received

**Officer Comments:** Given that this proposed extension is located in close proximity to the Grade II Listed Highgrove House, the comments of the Conservation Officer are crucial. I agree with the essence of his response. The design compliments the setting by being different to the style of the adjacent buildings, thereby avoiding the pitfalls of 'pastiche'. In view of the comments of Disability Action Wyre Forest, an Access Statement has been requested.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** This proposal meets the criteria of the appropriate Development Plan policies. I therefore recommend **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:-  
 1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters); 2. A11 (Approved plans); 3. B1 (Materials samples); Note – Disabled access

Reason for Approval : The proposed extension is considered to be well designed, and complementary in its form and materials to the setting of the adjacent Grade II Listed Highgrove House, and the other unlisted school buildings. As such, the proposal is considered to comply with the policies listed above.

<b>WF.769/05</b>		Proposal:	<b>Full : Erection of first floor extension and single storey utility room extension at 2 Well Lane, Rushock</b>
Date Received:	22.07.05		
Agent:	C C Davies		
Ord. Sheet:	8870 - 8970		
Policy:	D.1, D.3, D.5, D.17, GB.1 (AWFDLP) D.39 (WCSP)		
Case Officer:	C. Bishop		
Ward:	Blakedown & Chaddesley	Applicant:	Mr. and Mrs. G. Palmer

---

**Site Location and Description:** No. 2 Well Lane is a semi-detached red brick cottage in a remote location just south west of Rushock village. The application seeks permission to replace an existing lean-to to the side of the dwelling and extend over an existing single storey flat roof extension.

**Planning History:** WF.35/76 Vehicular access – Approved; WF.500/76 Extension – Approved; WF.238/81 Rear extension – Approved; WF.739/91 Demolish existing entrance lobby, addition of entrance hall, porch and utility and conservatory – Approved; WF.264/05 erection of first floor extension and single storey extension – Refused.

**Consultations and Representations:** Rushock Parish Council – We are conscious that this house has already been extended but we have no objection and note that amended plans have reduced the adverse effect on the neighbouring house.

Highway Authority – Views awaited Disability Action Wyre Forest - Opportunities should be considered to make property more accessible.

Neighbour/Site Notice – One letter of support received as they believe the proposed works would greatly enhance the appearance of the property in the locality.

**Officer Comments:** The application site is within the Green Belt where Policy GB.1 allows for residential extensions provided it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling. The dwelling has previously been extended at single storey and two storey levels to the rear which have already increased the floor area of the original dwelling by more than 100%. The proposal has been modified only slightly from the previous submission which was refused. The ridge height of the first floor extension has been lowered by 400mm. Although the extension would assist to remove an area of flat roof, due to its position and the extent of previous extensions it is not considered to be a very special circumstance. The reduction in ridge height is marginal and it is felt that the proposed extension would continue to have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property by way of loss of light and when considered together with the previous extensions and alterations it would continue to dominate the original building. The applicant has provided some information in support of the application, including the need for an increase in living accommodation and the need to reside near to the family farm. However these families circumstances are not considered to carry sufficient weight to override the relevant policies of the Development Plan.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** The applicants' circumstances have been taken into consideration however I do not regard these to be material considerations which are sufficient to outweigh the above policies. The provisions of Articles 1 & 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into consideration, however, the application is recommended for **REFUSAL** for the following reasons:

1. The application site is within an area designated as part of the West Midlands Green Belt. The proposed extension, when considered together with previous extensions and alterations, would result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. The development is therefore inappropriate development within the Green Belt and contrary to Policy GB.1 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan and Policy D.39 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan. There are no very special circumstances to justify why these policies should be overridden.
2. The proposed extension by virtue of its size and design and when considered together with previous extensions, would not be subservient to the original building and would be overwhelming. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy D.17 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.
3. The proposed extension, by virtue of its design and location, would lead to a serious and significant loss of amenity to 1 Well Lane by way of restricting light to a ground floor dining room window. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies D.1 and D.17 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

**WF. 775/05**

Date Received: 27.7.05  
 Agent: Central Building Design  
 Ord. Sheet: 8276 SE  
 Policy: H.2, D.1, D.3, D.9, D.10,  
 D.13, D.16, NR.2, TR.9  
 TR.17 (AWFDLP)  
 CY.4 (WCSP)

Proposal: Full : **Erection of two blocks to form seven no. flats with associated parking at 2 Plimsoll Street, Kidderminster**

Case Officer: P. Round  
 Ward: Sutton Park

Applicant: N. and A. Spragg Developments Ltd.

**Site Location and Description:** The former Edwards Garage is located off Plimsoll Street close to its junction with Wood Street. The garage has now been demolished and the site is now vacant. The proposal seeks for the erection of two blocks to form 7 flats, with associated parking.

**Planning History:** Various but of relevance  
 WF.134/04 – Erection of two blocks to form 9 no. flats

**Consultations and Representations:**

Highway Authority – No objections subject to conditions

Environment Agency – Awaiting comments

Severn Trent Water Ltd. – Awaiting comments

Environmental Health – No objection subject to condition

Neighbour – One letter received regarding boundary treatment

**Officer Comments:** This is in essence a re-submission of the previous scheme with a reduction in the number of units from 9 to 7. The major elements of the scheme remain the same, although this application does propose some minor modifications to the fenestration of the buildings. The principle of the development is established via the previous permission. The scheme remains acceptable in all respects and will not have an adverse impact on the character of the area or neighbouring properties. The access arrangement remain unchanged and the parking provision meets the Local Plan standards. Due to the current scheme incorporating two bedroom flats, an education contribution is required which needs to be secured through a Section 106 Agreement.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** I recommend **delegated APPROVAL** subject to the completion of a **Section 106 Agreement** to secure education contributions and the following conditions:

1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters);
  2. A11 (Approved plans);
  3. B1 (Samples/details of materials);
  5. Highway;
  6. J1 (Removal of permitted development - residential);
  7. C8 (Landscape implementation).
- Notes – A. SN1 (Removal of permitted development rights); B. SN12 (Neighbours' rights); C.

**Highway**Reason for Approval

The development site is allocated for residential purposes in the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan and constitutes previously developed land. The layout and design of the two blocks reflects the character and local distinctiveness of the area, creating an overall attractive appearance. The proposal provides the required amenity, parking and access provision for the properties in accordance with the requirements of the Local Plan. The impact of the development on neighbouring properties has been carefully assessed and it is considered that there will be no undue loss of amenity to nearby residents. For these reasons the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the policies listed above.

<b>WF.784/05</b>		Proposal:	Full: <b>Side and rear extensions, pitched roof over existing garage and additional accommodation in roof space at Stag Hill, 17 New Wood Lane, Blakedown</b>
Date Received:	27.07.05		
Agent:	Jason Asbury		
Ord. Sheet:	8677-8777		
Policy:	D.1, D.3, D.5, D.17, GB.1 (AWFLDLP) D.39 (WCSP)		
Case Officer:	C. Bishop		
Ward:	Blakedown & Chaddesley	Applicant:	Adam Walker

---

**Site Location and Description:** The application site is a modern detached bungalow located south of Blakedown village on the northern side of New Wood Lane. The application seeks permission to extend the property to the side and rear and convert the roof space to provide additional living accommodation.

**Planning History:** WF.624/89 New double garage and alterations to existing – Approved

**Consultations and Representations:**

Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council – No objections

Highway Authority – Views awaited

Ramblers Association – Views awaited

Neighbours/Site Notice – One letter of ‘no objection’

**Officer Comments:** The property is located within the designated West Midlands Green Belt where Policy GB.1 states that residential extensions must not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Policy D.17 also says residential extensions should be subservient to and not overwhelm the original building, which should retain its visual dominance. The property has previously been extended to the side to provide a garage, store and porch. The application proposes to demolish the previous extension and replace with an extension to the side and rear. To the rear it is proposed to provide living accommodation at two storeys by providing a much lower floor level than the original building. From the rear the extension would have the appearance of a two-storey extension which would overwhelm the rear elevation of the original property and would, therefore be contrary to Policy D.17 of the Local Plan. Furthermore the floor area of the original property would be more than doubled in size which would constitute a disproportionate addition to a dwelling in the Green Belt which would be contrary to Policy GB.1 of the Local Plan. No very special circumstances have been provided to outweigh Local Plan Policies.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** The provisions of Articles 1 & 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into consideration, however the proposals are considered to be contrary to Local Plan Policies GB.1 and D.17 and I therefore recommend **REFUSAL** for the following reasons:

1. The application site is within an area designated as part of West Midlands Green Belt. The proposed extension would result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. The development is therefore inappropriate development within the Green Belt and contrary to Policy GB.1 of the adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan and Policy D.39 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan. There are no very special circumstances to justify why these policies should be overridden.
2. The proposed extension, by virtue of its scale and design, would not be subservient to the original building and would be overwhelming. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy D.17 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

**WF.785/05 : WF.786/05**

Date Received: 2.8.05  
Agent: Stansgate Planning Consultants  
Ord. Sheet: 9078 9178  
Policy: GB.1,GB.2,GB.6,RB.1,D.1  
D.3,LB.1,LB.2,LB.3,CA.1  
CA.4,TR.9,TR.17 (AWFDLP)  
D.12,D.16,D.28,D.39,CTC.19  
(WCSP)

Proposal:

Full / Listed Building Consent : **Repair of outbuilding to include reconstruction of front wall and side wall and construction of new roof. Use of building to provide staff accommodation at Broome House Residential Home, Broome Village, Clent**

Case Officer: P. Wrigglesworth

Ward: Blakedown & Chaddesley

Applicant: Broome House Residential Home

**Site Location and Description:** Broome House is a Grade 11 Listed Building located in Broome Conservation Area. It is proposed to rebuild a lean-to structure to provide staff accommodation comprising 2 bedrooms, bathroom facilities and small breakfast kitchen.

**Planning History:** WF.81/05 & WF.82/05 - Change of use to staff accommodation : Approved (NB adj. building) WF.373/05 & WF.374/05 – Replacement building for staff accommodation : Refused

**Consultations and Representations:** Broome Parish Council – Views awaited.

Severn Trent Water Ltd. – No objections Conservation Officer – Recommends refusal

Disability Action Wyre Forest – Comments received regarding floor levels.

Neighbours/Site Notice – No comments received.

Applicant's case (in brief): Listed building consent not needed for reinstatement and repair on a like for like basis; rebuilding/repair in original materials would harmonise with other buildings and its setting in accordance with Policy LB.2; significant need for staff accommodation; conversion accords with Green Belt Policy and reduces the need for accommodation in nearby settlements; no adverse impact on Green Belt; no additional parking/hardstanding/private gardens required; Planning Act outlines importance of retaining buildings in good repair – essential it is repaired – proposal will ensure that this occurs; will not be detrimental to visual amenity of Green Belt–building has been in this location for 100 years (see also 'Officer Comments' for other elements of applicant's case)

**Officer Comments:** Planning permission has been granted for the conversion of an adjacent building to staff accommodation. Previous applications affecting the current application building have either been withdrawn or refused on the basis that the building has for all intents and purposes fallen down; the rebuilding and conversion would be contrary to both Green Belt and Rural Building Policies of the Local Plan and would not benefit the character and appearance of the Listed building. The applicant has now employed a Planning Consultant who argues amongst other things that this is not a new building but the repair of an existing one using original materials and furthermore the Council should make every effort to ensure that the building is reinstated in the best interests of the Listed Building and in line with Government Guidance, or failing this, accept a redevelopment proposal in its place. The Council's Conservation Officer is of the view that this is a rebuild of a building that has collapsed and although it is Listed, as a curtilage building associated with the principal house, its demolition could be subject of enforcement action, it was in such poor condition, and in his opinion, did little to improve the setting of the principal building, that its re-building would not be necessary to retain the character and appearance of the main building. The Conservation Officer is also of the opinion that the description of development is inaccurate in that there is little, if anything left of the original building and the proposals seek the rebuilding of the unit, rather than its conversion. I would concur with this view. In addition the development must conform with Policy RB.1 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan if it is to be compliant with Green Belt policy and it fails to do this because the building is not 'substantial' and requires extensive rebuilding.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** I recommend **REFUSAL** of the Planning application for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development constitutes new residential accommodation in the Green Belt which is inappropriate development unless it is compliant with Green Belt Policy. In this case the development does not comply with Green Belt Policy in that the development is not infilling; it does not fulfil an agricultural need and is contrary to the rural buildings conversion Policy in that its rebuilding would constitute extensive alterations and significant building works. To approve the development in the absence of very special circumstances would be contrary to Policies D.12, D.28, D.39 and D.16 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan and Policies GB.1 and RB.1 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan. 2. The remains of the existing structure are of little architectural or historic importance and the removal of the existing building and erection of a new building in its place would not enhance or preserve the character or appearance of this Listed Building and to approve the development in these circumstances would be contrary to Policies LB.1 and LB.2 of the AWFDLP and Policy CTC.19 of the WCSP; and **REFUSAL** of the Listed Building application (WF.786/05) - Reason 2 only.

**WF.789/05**

Date Received: 28.7.05

Agent: Toner Estate Agents

Ord. Sheet: 7875 SE

Policy: RT3 (AWFDLP) PPS6

Case Officer: S. Allum

Ward: Bewdley and Arley

Proposal: Full : **Change of Use at ground floor to Estate Agency/professional services at 56 Load Street Bewdley**

Applicant: Toner Estate Agents

---

**Site Location and Description:** No. 56 Load Street Bewdley is a ground floor shop unit, within Bewdley District Centre. The property is a Grade II Listed Building, most recently in use as a Coffee Shop. The permission for the Coffee Shop was subject to a condition for the benefit of the applicant (See below) but the business has now ceased and the unit is empty. The current proposal is for change of use to an A2 use (Toner Estate Agents), who wish to move from their present premises at 39 Load Street Bewdley.

**Planning History:** WF468/93 LBC Internal Alterations – Approved  
WF.477/94/478/94LBC alterations to form additional dwelling – Approved  
WF.1174/04 Change of Use from Shop (A1) to Coffee Shop (A3) Retrospective – Approved – personal permission to applicant.

**Consultations and Representations:**

Bewdley Town Council – Views awaited

Highway Authority – No objections

Forward Planning – Views awaited

Neighbour/Site Notice/Advertisement – Views awaited

**Officer Comments:** Policy RT3 relates to Bewdley District Centre and seeks to safeguard and enhance Bewdleys existing level of shopping provision. The reasoned justification to Policy RT3 requires an assessment of the use of the three units either side of the application site. Where the proposal results in more than three of the seven units, being for non-retail (A1) uses it will be refused. The proposed A2 use would result in four out of seven units being non-A1. Also the change of use, if approved, would result in 3 adjacent units being non-A1, which is also contrary to Policy RT.3. Unlike the previous approval for a Coffee Shop, I do not believe there are any material circumstances associated with an Estate Agency use to justify any departure from the policy on this occasion.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** This proposal fails to comply with the appropriate retail policy in the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan. I therefore recommend **REFUSAL**, for the following reason :-

1. The proposed A2 use is contrary to the requirements of Policy RT.3 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan in that, if approved, four out of the seven units (the application site plus three each side of it) would be in non-A1 use, and also, the development would result in more than two non-retail (A1) uses adjacent to each other. The proposal would therefore erode the retail offer of Bewdley District Centre.

<b>WF.790/05</b>		Proposal:	Full : <b>Erection of three two-bedroom town houses and car parking on Plots 18-20 Frank Freeman Court, Kidderminster</b>
Date Received:	28.7.05		
Agent:	Central Building Design		
Ord. Sheet:	8377 NE		
Policy:	D.1,D.3,H.2,H.5,TR.9, TR.17 (AWFDLP) QE.3,T7 (RPG11)		
Case Officer:	P. Wigglesworth		
Ward:	Broadwaters	Applicant:	M. and G. Builders

---

**Site Location and Description:** Frank Freeman Court is a cul-de-sac linked to St. Oswalds Close which in turn gives access from the Stourbridge Road in the vicinity of the Rose Theatre. It is proposed to erect three additional terraced properties each providing two bedroomed accommodation. One parking space is provided for each dwelling and a turning area opposite.

**Planning History:** WF.860/02 – Eleven two-bedroom starter homes : Approved  
 WF.981/03 – Two houses with car parking : Approved  
 WF.513/04 – Three two-bedroom houses and one three-bedroom house : Approved  
 WF.645/05 – Three two-bedroom dwellings : Withdrawn

**Consultations and Representations:** Highway Authority – Views awaited

Environment Agency – No objection subject to conditions

Environmental Health – No objection subject to conditions

Arboricultural Officer – No objections; the proposal has no implications for trees on or near the site

Disability Action Wyre Forest – Development should accord with Part M of Building Regulations

Neighbour/Site Notice – No comments received to date (NB One letter of objection to last application on grounds of poor quality road surface which is regenerating due to additional traffic and scheme will worsen situation).

**Officer Comments:** This area of land constitutes previously developed land and lies within an area allocated for residential development. The development therefore accords with Policy H.2 of the adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan. A previous application was withdrawn following criticism relating to the fact that the development was extending the length of roadway with the absence of a turning area. In addition it was felt that there was too much unattractive hardsurfacing areas. The current scheme makes provision for the turning of vehicles and there is a significant increase in planting areas which will soften the appearance of the end of this cul-de-sac. The revised plan also improves the relationship with adjoining property in terms of the style of development and alignment of the proposed dwellings. At the request of the Highway Authority street lighting and traffic calming humps are now shown. This will be the last development in this vicinity as it is considered that any further dwellings would impinge adversely on the trees located in adjacent gardens. In terms of impact on neighbouring property the scheme is judged to be acceptable and not dissimilar from other schemes which the Council has permitted in this street.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** I recommend **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:-

1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters);
2. A11 (Approved plans);
3. B7 (External details – no approval);
4. B11 (Details of enclosure);
5. C6 (Landscaping – small scheme);
6. Levels;
7. Environmental Health;
8. Environment Agency;
9. Highway; Note – SN12 (Neighbours' rights); Environment Agency Note.

Reason for Approval

The proposal is judged to be acceptable in terms of design, impact on neighbouring property and highway safety. The development accords with the adopted policies contained in the Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

**WF.798/05**

Date Received: 1.8.05

Agent: Engineering & Building Design

Ord. Sheet: 7976 SE

Policy: D.1, D.3, D.17, TR.9  
(AWFDLP)

Case Officer: C. Bishop

Ward: Wribbenhall

Proposal: Full : **Two storey side extension at 41 Meadow Rise, Bewdley**

Applicant: Mr. A. Franklyn

---

**Site Location and Description:** No. 41 Meadow Rise is a semi-detached dwelling in a residential area north west of the town centre. The proposal involves the erection of a two storey side extension which would extend towards the boundary of the neighbouring property. The extension would provide a new garage at ground floor and bedroom with ensuite above.

**Planning History:** None

**Consultations and Representations:** Bewdley Town Council – No objections  
Highway Authority – Views awaited

Neighbour : One letter of objection received - Proposed extension will reduce light to hall and landing; extension is out of keeping with similar properties in the road and would create a precedent; proposal would result in semi-detached houses looking like a single block or terrace of houses; proposal would exceed 40% of the volume area which is the maximum permitted; proposal will result in one of two cars parking in the road which will restrict my view whilst reversing; I will not agree to extension being built at the corner of my garage.

Disability Action Wyre Forest – 1. Front entrance to be step-free. 2. GF toilet does not show washbasin. 3. Room length of ground floor toilet appears to be inadequate to achieve 750mm clearance in front of wc.

**Officer Comments:** Adopted planning policy on design makes it clear that proposals for residential extensions must not create a serious adverse affect upon the amenity of neighbouring residents or occupiers. In this case the proposed extension, by virtue of its height and location, would impose a serious and significant adverse affect on the amount of daylight to a ground floor kitchen window on the side elevation of the neighbouring property (No. 43 Meadow Rise). The proposal contravenes the advice set out in the 45 degree code and would therefore be contrary to policies D.1 and D.17 of the Local Plan. As the proposed extension is set back and set down it will not result in terracing impact as suggested by the neighbour. In terms of volume increase, the proposed extension is subservient to the main dwelling and as such considered acceptable. With respect to the highway concerns the Highway Authority has raised no objection as the proposal meets the parking standards in the Local Plan.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** The provisions of Articles 1 & 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into consideration, however, the application is recommended for **REFUSAL** for the following reason:

1. The proposed extension, by reason of its design and location, would lead to a serious and significant loss of amenity to No. 43 Meadow Rise by way of restricting light to a ground floor kitchen window on the side elevation. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies D.1 and D.17 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

<b>WF.801/05</b>		Proposal:	<b>Full : Erection of detached single garage with associated garden storage at The Pound Stables, Drayton Road, Bluntington</b>
Date Received:	1.8.05		
Agent:	Richard J. Slawson		
Ord. Sheet:	8874 8974		
Policy:	GB.1,GB.6,RB.1,RB.5 (AWFDLP) D.38,D.39 (WCSP)		
Case Officer:	S. Allum		
Ward:	Blakedown & Chaddesley	Applicant:	Dr. and Mrs. M. Harvey

---

**Site Location and Description:** The 'Pound Stables' is a converted former garage/agricultural building in the Green Belt, now in use as a dwelling together with an associated piece of land, maintained as domestic curtilage/garden. As is usual with rural dwelling conversion consents, 'permitted development' rights were removed with respect to future extensions and curtilage buildings, hence the submission of this application. The proposal now is to erect a single garage/garden store (6.2 metres long x 4.75 metres wide x 3.5 metres to maximum height) in timber with metal profiled roof. The applicant has submitted a supporting letter which states the building is needed for: Better storage conditions for garden produce and tools; Security for tools and car; More efficient use of space – presently using external storage containers; Internal workshop space. The letter also refers to surrounding neighbours who have similar larger garages/outbuildings; Precedent set by appeal decision at Hobro Barn (WF.1080/02) – similar circumstances; Minimal impact on Green Belt openness.

**Planning History:** WF.1176/01 – Change of use of former pound and ancillary buildings to one dwelling : Approved

WF.710/04 – Pergola, shed and greenhouse : Withdrawn

**Consultations and Representations:** Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council – Views awaited  
Highway Authority – No objections

Conservation Officer – Views awaited

Neighbour/Site Notice – Views awaited (publicity expires 5<sup>th</sup> September 2005)

**Officer Comments:** Current development plan policy makes it clear that proposals for rural building conversion schemes must be considered on the basis of no extensions/extensive alterations/addition of new buildings within the curtilage. The same criteria applies to subsequent proposals following approval and implementation/occupation. Policy RB.5 is specific: 'proposals for the erection of new curtilage buildings, or extensions to dwellings created through the re-use and adaptation of rural buildings will not be permitted'. On this basis there is no opportunity for negotiations on the scale and scope of subsequent development proposals in such circumstances. This stance continues to be taken by officers on applications of this type despite the outcome of the previous appeal at Hobro Barn, Wolverley. In addition, the erection of a detached garage/store would be inappropriate development within the Green Belt and the supporting information does not provide very special circumstances for why Green Belt policies should be overridden

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** The proposal fails to meet the criteria of specific policies of the Development Plan. I therefore recommend **REFUSAL** for the following reasons and in consideration of Articles 1 and 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998:-

1. The proposed garage/store is considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies D.38 and D.39 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan and Policy GB.1 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan. No very special circumstances have been demonstrated to outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness.
2. The application relates to a converted rural building where rural building policies of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan apply. The proposed development would result in the erection of a new curtilage building which would be clearly contrary to Policy RB.5 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

<b>WF.804/05</b>		Proposal:	Outline : <b>Demolition of existing hall and erection of six detached dwellings with associated access drive at Former Parish Hall, Lea Lane, Cookley</b>
Date Received:	2.8.05		
Agent:	-		
Ord. Sheet:	8480 8580		
Policy:	H.2, H.5, H.10, D.1, D.3, D.4, D.9, D.10, D.13, D.16, NR.8, NR.9, GB.1, GB.6, LB.5, TR.7, TR.9, TR.17, CY.4, IMP.1 (AWFDLP)		
Case Officer:	P. Round	Applicant:	Manor Oak Residential Properties Ltd.
Ward:	Cookley		

---

**Site Location and Description:** Cookley Parish Hall is located on the edge of Cookley village on the boundary with the Green Belt being accessed off Lea Lane. The building is in an unsuitable state of repair. The proposal seeks consent for a residential scheme for six properties on the site and is submitted in outline, with siting and access to be determined at this stage.

**Planning History:** WF.335/05 – Nineteen apartments : Withdrawn

**Consultations and Representations:** Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council – Views awaited  
Highway Authority – Recommend refusal (insufficient visibility)

Environment Agency – Views awaited

Severn Trent Water Ltd. – Views awaited

Conservation Officer - Views awaited

Arboricultural Officer – Recommend refusal; amenity space too close to trees

Crime Risk Manager – Views awaited

**Neighbour** : six letters of objection received raising the following concerns – Tree Preservation Order trees must be kept; increased traffic especially close to school; houses are private and not affordable; dwellings will be an eyesore; no need for houses, Parish Hall should be kept; new hall could be built on site rather than on Green Belt; access dangerous – too close to bend; noise, overlooking.

**Officer Comments:** The scheme is submitted following a previous refusal for nineteen affordable apartments. The six dwellings proposed are positioned in a curved formation and utilise the existing access. The access is inadequate in terms of visibility by virtue of its position and a nearby wall. The Highway Authority considers that six properties utilising this unsuitable access will result in highway danger, especially due to the nature and use of Lea Lane. In addition to this, the Yew trees that form the frontage of Lea Lane are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The garden area for Plot 6 would be totally dominated by five trees, which will result in immense pressure being put on these trees to be felled or severely pruned. These trees play an important part in the amenity of this area and their loss or downgrading of their value will cause harm to the area. In terms of siting, the position of Plots 1-3 are too close to the boundary of the properties on Castle Road. As the properties are stated as being three-four bedrooms, at least a two-storey build is anticipated. Such a height of dwelling in close proximity to the boundary is likely to cause overlooking and loss of amenity, especially due to the difference in levels between the site and neighbouring properties. Although boundary treatment is proposed, it is not felt to overcome the harm that would be caused.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** In view of the above, I recommend **REFUSAL** for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed access arrangements where visibility is restricted is likely to compromise the safe movements of pedestrians and vehicles both entering and exiting the site and using Lea Lane. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy TR.9 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.
2. The position of the amenity area of Plot 6 is likely to put undue pressure of the Tree Preservation Order trees that bound the site, to be felled or severely pruned. Such action will cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to Policy D.4 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan
3. The position of the dwellings on Plots 1-3 are considered to be too close to rear boundaries of neighbouring properties on Castle Road causing loss of amenity by virtue of potential overlooking and dominance to the residential dwellings to the rear. In addition, due to the close proximity of the amenity space for Plot 6 to Tree Preservation Order trees, it is considered that this plot would have insufficient amenity space to serve that dwelling. The proposal is thus contrary to Policies D.1 and D.10 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

<b>WF.809/05</b>		Proposal:	Full General Regulations (Regulation 4): <b>Change of use from veterinary surgery (sui generis) to Training Centre (Class D1) at 14 Comberton Place, Kidderminster</b>
Date Received:	4.08.05		
Agent:	-		
Ord. Sheet:	8376 SE		
Policy:	RT.6, D.1, TR.17 (AWFDLP)		
Case Officer:	J. McKenzie-Watts	Applicant:	Mr G Kelly
Ward:	Greenhill		

**Site Location and Description:** No. 14 Comberton Place is the end unit in a terrace of shops closest to the Magistrates Court. It is proposed to change the use of the property from its former use as a veterinary surgery (sui generis not D1 as referred to in the Planning History) to a Training Centre (Class D1).

**Planning History** WF.194/05 – Change of use from vets surgery (D1) to financial and professional services : Approved

WF 696/05 – Change of use from vets surgery (sui generis) to shop (A1) : Approved

**Consultations and Representations:** Highway Authority – Comments awaiting  
Disability Action Wyre Forest – We do not accept the reasons stated by the applicant to justify this site as a suitable location for the training centre. We do not consider that the site is 'close to the town centre and bus station'. Although parking is available close-by access is by no means easy particularly in regard to crossing the access road to reach the building. We also do not consider that it has 'good disability access' given the awkward arrangement of steps in front of the building. Details of the building's entrance and facilities also need to be examined to justify this statement.

Neighbours/Site Notice – No representations received

**Officer Comments:** Although the applicant is not the Council the premises are owned by Wyre Forest District Council and as such this proposal needs to be reported to Committee for consideration. The property lies within the Comberton Hill local shopping centre where Policy RT.6 of the adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan applies. This policy allows A1 uses and other retail uses (A2 and A3) subject to certain criteria. However it also states that proposals for other land uses at ground floor will not normally be allowed. The reasoned justification to this policy states that such local centres perform a vital role for local communities and can reduce the need to travel. It states that proposals must offer a clear community benefit by serving identifiable local needs. The applicant has confirmed that the proposed training centre would be used to deliver a range of educational online learning programmes for the benefit of the local community throughout the District. It will also be linked to the Learndirect Hereford and Worcestershire Hub operator. The applicant has also provided reasons for why the site was selected for the training centre: ease of parking; close to town centre and bus station, next to railway station, well known location; good disability access; good local facilities and to employ three staff who were made redundant when Kidderminster College terminated the provision of the training service. Despite the comments from Disability Action Wyre Forest it is felt that the site is in a sustainable location and would provide a beneficial service to Kidderminster. The previous use of the premises as a veterinary surgery provided a community service and it is considered that the proposal would also provide a community service, albeit of a different nature. With respect to the access arrangements to the premises an Access Statement has been requested.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** In view of the above, I recommend that the application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters); 2. A11 (Approved Plans); 3. Restriction of use to Training centre; Note SN5 (No advertisements)

Reason for Approval

The proposed development is compatible with Policy RT.6 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan in that it provides a community service and would not result in loss of amenity or car parking/highway safety related problems.

**WF.813 /05**  
Date Received: 4.8.05  
Agent: Lambert Smith Hampton  
Ord. Sheet: 8077 SE  
Policy: D4, D5, GB1, GB2, GB6, LA2,  
TR20 (AWFDLP) : CTC4,  
D39, D44 (WCSP) : QE1,  
QE6, RSS : PPG2, PPS7 and  
PPG8  
Case Officer: P. Round  
Ward: Wribbenhall

Proposal: Full : **Erection of 15m telecommunications monopole with associated antennae and cabinets on site in Farmer's Field, High Habberley, Kidderminster**  
Applicant: 02 (UK) Ltd.

**Site Location and Description:** The site is located within an agricultural field accessed from Habberley Road along a single track which serves the High Habberley Nursing Home and some residential properties. The application is submitted in full and seeks consent for the erection of a 15m high telecommunications mast with associated cabinets and compound. The site is within the West Midlands Green Belt, Landscape Protection Area and an Area of Great Landscape Value.

**Consultations and Representations:** Kidderminster Foreign Parish Council – Awaiting comments  
Highway Authority – Views awaited. Environmental Health – No objection  
Arboricultural Officer – Object due to close proximity of equipment to mature Lime tree which will cause harm to root system and cause damage to the tree. The Lime tree is considered to provide significant amenity to the area.

Ramblers Association - The access is a Bridleway. Care should be taken to avoid conflict with users.  
Neighbour : 24 letters of objection and a 277 signatory petition objecting to the proposal on the following grounds – Close proximity to schools and houses; other masts have already been refused; health issues; cause visual harm to the landscape; highway safety; loss of grade 2 agricultural land; Green Belt; too close to nursing home

**Officer Comments:** Telecommunication development constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt if it fails to maintain openness. PPG8 states that there may be very special circumstances to allow telecommunication development, which may include lack of alternative sites. The applicants have investigated 10 other sites outside the Green Belt, which have been discounted for technical or planning issues. They state that this site is suitable as it is *“sited as far from residential and educational properties as is possible, given the sites available”* and is *“located in a position where minimal impact will be made. The structure will have a backdrop of mature natural vegetation and will not have a detrimental impact visually”* The surrounding area is of particular importance in terms of landscape value. When considering the recent appeal for a mast at Low Habberley, the Inspector noted that *“this area of farmland is a pleasant and attractive stretch of open countryside that separates Habberley and Kidderminster. Its openness has been recognised by its designation as Green Belt.”* The erection of a mast in this location would cause significant harm to the character and amenity of this area and the openness of the Green Belt. The mast and associated equipment would be readily visible from many vantage points, many of which are public rights of way. The position of the equipment is also in close proximity to a mature Lime tree. The Arboricultural Officer feels that this tree is of importance and that the development proposed will adversely affect its health and stability. The arguments expressed by the Applicant in favour of the development have been carefully considered however it is felt that they do not outweigh the harm that would be caused by this development. In terms of health issues the Applicants have confirmed that the apparatus complies with the ICNIRP guidelines. In view of the advice in PPG8 and the recent appeal decision at the Stourport Working Men's Club, it is felt that although health issues are a material consideration that they should not form a separate reason for refusal on this occasion.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** In view of the above, I recommend **REFUSAL** for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed development is in an area designated as part of the West Midlands Green Belt, Landscape Protection Area, and an Area of Great Landscape Value. The siting and design of the mast with its associated cabinets and compound will constitute inappropriate development being unduly prominent and would detract from the function of these designations. As such the proposal would be contrary to Policies TR20, GB1, GB2, GB6, LA2, D5 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan; D39, D44 and CTC4 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan; QE1 and Q6 of the Regional Spatial Strategy; and Government advice in PPG2, PPS7 and PPG8.
2. The development would be in close proximity and cause harm to the health and stability of a mature Lime tree. The tree contributes significantly to the amenity of the area and its loss would cause harm to the character of this area, which is an important by virtue of its landscape designations. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies D4, LA2 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan; CTC4 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan; and QE1 and QE6 of the Regional Spatial Strategy.

<b>WF.815/05</b>		Proposal:	Full: <b>Erection of a first floor extension to form bedroom and dressing room over (resubmission of WF.568/05) at 130 Linnet Rise, Kidderminster</b>
Date Received:	4.8.05		
Agent:	Central Building Design		
Ord. Sheet:	8374SE		
Policy:	D.1, D.3, D.17, TR.9, TR.17		
Case Officer:	S. Allum		
Ward:	Aggborough and Spennells	Applicant:	Mr. D. Jones

**Site Location and Description:** 130 Linnet Rise is a detached dwelling located on the Spennells estate to the South East of Kidderminster town centre. The property has been previously extended (see below). There is a substantial protected tree within the curtilage of the dwelling (not affected by this application). The proposal is to erect a first floor extension over the existing original and extended garage to form a bedroom/dressing room. This is a resubmission following an approval under WF.568/05, in which the original scheme had been reduced, in line with officer advice, to omit the 'dressing room' element and to improve the visual subservience of the extension relative to the original building. The current proposal returns almost to the original volume of the extensions, with the exception of the 'half hip' end detail to replace the gable end. The applicant on this occasion has submitted a 'statement of support' which questions the validity of the Council's response to the previous application:- *The removal of the whole of the upper floor Dressing Rooms seems a somewhat dramatic means of reducing the mass of the proposed extension. Furthermore it results in an incongruous relationship of roofs to ground floor features, as the "step down" occurs halfway across the existing double garage doors and as such does not express itself through to ground level. The other result is the loss of the proposed valuable first floor living space, to be replaced by barren empty roof space over half of the existing double garage. I suggest that an alternative, more modest, revision be explored with the Planning Officer, namely the introduction of a half-hip to the upper gable end. The result would be that*

- *The end wall of the upper floor living area would express itself through to ground floor level, rather than arbitrarily stop halfway across the existing double garage.*
- *The mass/bulk of the proposed extension would be visually reduced without the loss of living space, namely the Dressing Room.*

*Additionally, it is recommended that an additional dormer feature be introduced over the existing bedroom window so as to introduce a consistent visual rhythm across all upper floor windows. This would go further to meeting the requirement of Policy D17 item (1) "to be in keeping with the form, materials, architectural characteristic and detailing of the original building." Furthermore, this would remove any "differences" between the original building and the proposed extension, so as to negate the issues of subservience/visual dominance of one element over the other, as raised in Policy D.17 item (3). This is considered to be a just compromise, reconciling the complete removal of the Dressing Room, which is not acceptable to the client, with the Planning Officer's desire to reduce the visual bulk of the proposed extension and ensure visual harmony between the existing and the proposed.*

*(Note – If, in discussion with the Planning Officer, it should appear that this preferred alternative revision is not acceptable, an appraisal by a qualified Council Architect should be requested on the grounds that the client is minded to appeal any refusal of Planning Permission).*

**Planning History:** WF.519/05 – Change of use from amenity land to private garden and erection of a fence (Amendment to previous application WF.1006/04) – Approved.

WF.568/05 – Erection of a first floor extension – Approved.

**Consultations and Representations:** Highway Authority – Views awaited.

Neighbour – No representations received.

**Officer Comments:** The objective in determining this scheme has been, and remains, to ensure visual subservience of the extensions to the form of the original building in accordance with Policy D.17. In that context, and having carefully considered the further issues raised by the applicant, I feel that the original advice offered remains valid. The offer of a half hipped roof to reduce the massing of the original scheme, is, in my opinion insufficient to overcome my original objection. With respect to the applicant's final point, there is no 'in house' Architect available within the Council.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** The resubmitted scheme fails to meet the requirements of Design Policy in the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan. I therefore recommend **REFUSAL** for the following reasons, and in consideration of Articles 1 and 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998:-

1. The proposed extension, in association with the previous garage extension, is not considered to be visually subservient to the original building, as required by Policy D.17 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

**WF.818/05**  
Date Received: 5.8.05  
Agent: Engineering & Building Design  
Ord. Sheet: 7880 7980  
Policy: D1, D3, D17, GB1, GB2, GB6  
(AWFDLP); D39, CTC4 (WCSP)  
PPG2 – Green Belts  
Case Officer: P. Round  
Ward: Wribbenhall

Proposal: Full : **Two storey extensions at Upper Birch Farm, Shatterford**

Applicant: Mr. C. Bagnall

**Site Location and Description:** Upper Birch Farm is a traditional detached farmhouse located within the area of Shatterford. The property has been previously extended on two occasions and has an extant permission for a further extension. The property is located within the West Midlands Green, Landscape Protection Area and an Area of Great Landscape Value. The proposal is for a two storey extension to the property.

**Planning History:** KR.0105/54 – Extensions : Approved. WF.0787/99 – Walls and gates : Approved  
WF.0335/03 – Two storey extension : Approved  
WF.0276/04 – Two storey extension : Approved (not implemented)

**Consultations and Representations:** Kidderminster Foreign Parish Council – Views awaited  
Highway Authority – No objection. Conservation Officer – No comments received  
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust – No objection in principle subject to a bat survey being completed prior to development commencing; Neighbours – No comments received

**Officer Comments:** The existing property has already been extended by approximately 45%, with a further 20% unimplemented. The current application now proposes a further 55% increase to the original, taking the total increase of extensions to 100% (excluding the unimplemented extension). Green Belt policy allows domestic extensions on the provision that they do not result in disproportionate additions over and above the original dwelling. It is considered that a 100% increase in floor area is disproportionate and as such constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt that causes harm by definition. In addition the design of the extension continues the main ridge a further 11.2 metres and is not set back from the original main wall of the property. The design also includes a projecting gable similar to that of the entrance. The design does not allow a visually subservient extension, resulting in the original frontage losing its dominance and presence. The proposed projecting gable competing with the existing entrance gable further compounds this effect, destroying the building's legibility and identity. In these two aspects the proposal fails to conform to Local Plan policy and would result in harm being caused. The Applicant has submitted a letter of support and justification with the application. The applicant has calculated that the property will only have been extended by 88%, however they have included the cellar as part of the original dwelling, which is not considered to form part of the original property. The main points of justification are summarised as follows: *"a) The proposed extension takes up a length equal to 60% of the existing frontage length; b) The proposed extension is set back from the major part of the frontage by at least 1.65m, well in excess of the usual requested 0.75m; c) the proposed extension is entirely sympathetic and in character to the existing house; d) the house lies within 15 acres of land and is therefore not intrusive to any neighbouring properties; e) the two neighbours have been consulted and both have supported our application; f) a roof line would seriously ruin the aesthetics of this beautiful house giving the appearance of a granny flat stuck on its side. This would almost certainly reduce the value of the property; g) alternative suggestions of reducing the frontage and increasing the extensions depth would be totally impractical as it would butt up against an adjacent elevation of the existing house; h) Upper Birch is not a typical house and requires careful consideration to ensure its continued attractive appearance."* These points have been careful consideration, however it is not felt that they are sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** In view of the above and in consideration of Articles 1 & 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998, I recommend **REFUSAL** for the following reasons

1. The application site lies within an area designated as part of the West Midlands Green Belt; the development proposed is considered inappropriate in this location as it would harm the Green Belt by virtue of the previous, proposed and unimplemented extensions represent disproportionate additions over and above the original dwelling. The proposal is thus considered contrary to Policies GB.1, GB.2 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan (2004); Policy D.39 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan, and Government advice in PPG2 - Green Belts. 2. The design of the proposed extension would not be visually subservient to the original dwelling and would compete with the existing frontage and entrance. This would cause harm to the existing frontage by losing its dominance, legibility and identity. In addition the cumulative effect of the existing, proposed and unimplemented extensions result in the original dwelling being overwhelmed by additions causing further harm to its scale and character. As such the proposal would be contrary to Policies D.1 and D.17 of the AWFDLP

**WF.822/05** Proposal: Full : **Erection of a two bedroom dwelling at 3 Long Acre, Kidderminster**  
Date Received: 8.8.05  
Agent: Mr. I. A. Savage  
Ord. Sheet: 8377 SE  
Policy: H.2,D.1,D.3,TR.9,TR.17 (AWFDLP)  
Case Officer: P. Wigglesworth  
Ward: Broadwaters Applicant: Mr. N. Balu

---

**Site Location and Description:** Number 3 Long Acre is an end of terrace property situated at the Hurcott Road end of Long Acre in Kidderminster. It is proposed to construct a two bedroomed property at the side of this existing dwelling. There is no car parking to serve the development (see below)

**Planning History:** WF.48/05 – Erection of a detached three storey two-bedroomed dwelling : Refused 8<sup>th</sup> March 2005

**Consultations and Representations:** Highway Authority – Views awaited

Environment Agency – Views awaited

Severn Trent Water Ltd. – Views awaited

Disability Action Wyre Forest – Development should accord with Part M of the Building Regulations

Neighbour/Site Notice : No representations received to date

**Officer Comments:** A previous application was refused on visual grounds because the house design was judged to be out of keeping with the street scene due principally to the fact that the ground floor front elevation comprised of a double carport. The current application avoids such off street car parking and consequently the design of the dwelling is in keeping with the property it is attached to. Its design is also complementary to the street scene which is in the main comprised of Victorian terraced properties with no off street car parking facilities. At the time of writing the views of the Highway Authority have not been received but it is anticipated that a recommendation of refusal will follow on the basis of the absence of off street parking for both the existing and proposed property. The Council's Design Quality Supplementary Planning Guidance however provides direction on the course the Council should take when there is conflict between design issues and car parking. Paragraph 3.33 (ii) of this document states that 'there will be a general presumption in favour of a continuation of existing car parking arrangements – where there is a tradition of back of footway development or on street parking and where access/courtyard parking arrangements are not practical in physical or design terms, the design imperative will take precedence over Local Plan Policy TR.17'. In view of this, because there is insufficient room for courtyard parking and because on street car parking is typical for this area it is recommended that design should prevail over car parking in this instance. In other respects the application is considered to be acceptable in terms of impact on neighbouring property and provision of amenity space albeit that this is limited in scope

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** In view of the above, I recommend **delegated** authority be given to **APPROVE** this application on completion of the neighbour consultation exercise and subject to the following conditions:

1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters);
2. A11 (Approved plans);
3. Materials;
4. J1 (Removal of permitted development rights - residential);
5. Levels
6. Fencing/retaining wall;
7. F5 (Construction site noise/vibration)

Reason for Approval

The proposed dwellings are well designed and will have an acceptable appearance in the street scene. The scheme is also acceptable in terms of highway safety. The impact of the dwellings upon neighbouring properties has been carefully assessed and it is considered that there will be no undue impact upon their amenity. The on street car parking in this particular case accords with the Council's Design Quality - Supplementary Planning Guidance and the development accords with the policies contained in the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan

**WF. 823/05** Proposal: Tree Preservation Order :  
Date Received: 8.8.05 **Fell a Sequoia (Coastal**  
Agent: - **Redwood) at 64 Broomfield**  
Ord. Sheet: 8177 SE **Road, Kidderminster**  
Policy: D.4, NC.6 (AWFDLP)  
Case Officer: A. Needham  
Ward: Habberley and Blakebrook Applicant: Mr. H. Lewis

---

**Site Location and Description:** The tree is a maturing Coastal Redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*), situated within the front garden of the property, 64 Broomfield Road, Kidderminster. The tree provides significant amenity to the locality and is a prominent feature.

**Planning History:** None relevant

**Consultations and Representations:**

Highway Authority – No representation received

Ward Members – No representations received

Neighbour – No representation received

**Officer Comments:** The tree is a maturing, healthy specimen, situated within the front garden of the property, within a lawn area. The tree provides significant amenity to the locality and is a prominent feature. It is of a fairly uncommon species, (*Sequoia sempervirens*), within Wyre Forest District and almost certainly one of the original remaining trees from the gardens of the nearby property 'Coombe House'.

Coastal Redwoods are the tallest living conifers in the world (110m +), and originate on the western coast of USA, unfortunately 95% of the native Redwood forests have been lost in the last 200 years. A number of Coastal Redwood trees are known to be in excess of 2000 years old, in their native habitat, but have only been present in Europe for the past 200 years.

The applicant has indicated that they have cared for the tree for 40 years and it is only now that it is causing them problems. The reasons given to justify the tree's removal are the debris it drops, specifically the seeds that cause staining, the proximity of the tree to the house and the potential for it to interfere with a nearby soak-away drain.

While I sympathise with the owner of the tree in terms of the debris it drops, I feel that it is insufficient reason to allow its removal. Most protected trees are in close proximity to residential properties and cause some inconvenience in terms of the debris they drop. The proximity of the tree to the property is not considered unduly close or different from many other protected trees within the district. With respect to assertions of the tree causing damage to a drainage system, I would not doubt that the tree's roots may indeed have proliferated in a nearby soak-away. However I would suggest that other nearby vegetation may also have rooted into the soak-away and it might be more reasonable to renew or clear any blockages rather than remove all vegetation within the garden.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** I recommend that the application to fell the Sequoia be **REFUSED**, for the following reasons:

1. The tree is a maturing healthy Coastal Redwood, *Sequoia sempervirens*, situated to the front of the property, 64 Broomfield Road, Kidderminster. It is a prominent feature of the street scene and provides significant amenity for the enjoyment of the public. The fact that the tree causes inconvenience through the loss of debris and its potential to root into nearby soak-way drains are not considered sufficient to justify its removal.