

Planning and Highways Meeting
Tuesday 3rd December 2024
Trinity Centre
6pm

Present

Cllrs L. Allen, Briggs, Cooper, Hatton, Millichope, Perks, Roberts, Scott and Wood.

In Attendance

Olive O'Sullivan - Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Becky Oldham - Project Manager Communications and Events.

Town Council's consultant advisors Andrew Tucker, Keith Neill-Smith and John Myatt were in attendance to deliver a presentation on planning application, 2023/04517/PA Langley Sustainable Urban Extension.

Two residents were in attendance.

A representative from Eco Sutton spoke in reference to item 61 - the report and Appendix on the Langley Sustainable Urban Extension Planning Application, and referred to paragraphs 4.21, 4.22 & 4.22 on the issue of sustainable transport provision. They felt that there was no impediment preventing new residents from choosing sustainable travel options. They asked if Committee would accept an addition to their recommendation at para 5.1 (b), to add 'for sustainable travel' between the words 'supporting infrastructure' and 'will be'.

The CEO responded that the reference in para 5.1 (b) relates to all infrastructure including necessary highway junction mitigation works so it would not be appropriate to just single out "sustainable travel" in this context.

The CEO read out questions from a representative of Our Town campaign group. Question 1 related to item paragraphs 4.2-4.5 in the report on the Langley Sustainable Urban Extension Planning Application. The representative said that according to the Walmley Residents Association (WRA) this issue is unresolved. They said BCC Highways appear to be taking an inflexible position on Webster Way prioritising a cycle route at the expense of other issues. Reportedly the Consortia is itself concerned at the excessive engineering led approach. For example the doubling in size of the roundabout at the junction of Webster Way and Fox Hollies Road.

They said that the BCC Planning Case Officer commented to their email as follows:

"Notwithstanding, the Langley SPD does promote and prioritise a network of walking and cycling routes within the site, as well as in the wider area, to encourage sustainable movement and integrate the development with the existing settlement. This aim will need to be weighed against any negative aspects of implementing these routes, such as the removal of any trees/hedgerows."

The key word here is "weighted."

Our Town and Eco Sutton considers that more sensitive design solutions should be considered to over-engineered highways under design by BCC. This to resolve cycleway, heritage (200 year old hedgerows), carbon sequestration, screening and landscape amenity, any perceived inflexibility is unhelpful and will fundamentally change the character of this part of the Town.

They asked if the Town Council could provide assurance that the necessary liaison with all relevant stakeholders together with an appraisal of impacts, also with RSCTC expert design input, be carefully considered and reported back.

The CEO responded that as indicated in the report the Town Council will continue to seek to hold Birmingham City Council, as the local planning authority, to account in relation to the high standards of sustainability and place-making envisioned in the Langley SUE SPD. In so doing the Town Council will take professional advice and have regard to the views of local residents at the appropriate stages. Whilst we will continue seeking to positively influence the development BCC, as the decision maker, has the ultimate responsibility for ensuring the high standards set out in the adopted SPD are met.

Question 2 asked if the Town Council were aware of any potential adverse health impacts in reference to the proposed Rockwool Factory at Peddimore industry which is coming to the Royal Town.

The CEO responded that the Town Council is unaware of any potential adverse health impacts associated with the Rockwool development at Peddimore.

The CEO read out a question from a resident who commented that social housing has proved to be the most effective method of improving the quality and affordability of rented accommodation. They asked what provisions are being put in place for social housing inclusion in the plans for Langley development and Town centre redevelopment.

The CEO responded that the current application for the Langley SUE is concerned solely with the proposed strategic infrastructure for the site. Further details in relation to housing provision will be submitted in due course. Affordable housing, in a variety of different forms, will be sought by the City Council as the local planning authority in line with its relevant policies both in Langley and the town centre.

56 Apologies for Absence

The CEO reported apologies received from Cllrs Allan and Parmar. For this meeting Cllr Cooper would be substituting for Cllr D. Allan with voting rights and Cllr Wood would be substituting for Cllr Parmar with voting rights.

Resolved to accept the apologies received.

57 Declarations of Interest

Cllr Cooper declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 63 on the Agenda

58 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of Planning and Highways Committee held on 5th November 2024 be signed as a true record.

59 Matters Arising

No matters were raised.

60 Questions from Members

No questions were received

61 Langley Sustainable Urban Extension

Andrew Tucker outlined that despite some improvements being made by the developers in the revised submission, there are still issues regarding loss of environmental assets, transport, street layout/design code and the absence of a detailed Delivery and Infrastructure Phasing plan which is needed to provide reassurance that infrastructure and services will be provided on and off site at the appropriate time to mitigate the impacts of the development.

He said that the following presentation would set out the main issues that are covered in the proposed Town Council consultation response, however as the phasing plan has not yet emerged, Committee is not able to scrutinise or comment on the Phasing of the proposal, so the Town Council should ask BCC to consider these matters in more detail before making a decision.

He pointed out that the Town Council would also like to continue to have positive dialogue with the Consortium and BCC to help shape and improve the scheme based on the consultation response.

A presentation was then made, with the following questions from Councillors and answers given by the Town Council Technical Advisory Team

Cllr Wood asked, "Which party is asking for the cycle lane to be adjacent to the highway, which is leading to loss of trees and hedges? The Langley Consortium and BCC have blamed each other".

John Myatt responded, to say that we are unable to confirm where the requirement came from. We want to clarify the varying positions with Birmingham City Council (BCC) and the Consortium to agree a compromise position. We do not believe that there is a technical reason that the cycle lane could not go 'behind' the hedge as long as the internal housing plots are designed so that it is overlooked, which you would expect them to be anyway rather than face their back onto the existing highway network. It would also require regular gaps through the hedge to provide access to the route from the highway network, but again this would already be required to provide access to the housing.

Cllr Perks commented, "Some sections of the cycle way are wider than others. If this is the case, could the cycle lane be narrower all around"?

John Myatt responded, As an exemplar sustainable development on greenbelt land the development should be providing cycling infrastructure that adheres to the national guidance set out in LTN 1/20. This includes segregated cycling infrastructure where required, which is based on traffic flows, speeds and street layouts. Taking these factors into account, and the proposed phasing of the site which delivers housing on the western side first, the cycle route was proposed to run along the western edge so that current and new residents have access to high quality facilities that will encourage them to cycle if they are able rather than add to congestion on an already congested network.

A shared facility does provide some protection from traffic, but can lead to conflicts with pedestrians, and therefore does not provide as attractive a facility as a segregated route. The revised proposals do retain more hedgerow and trees, but also reduce a significant length of cycle way from segregated to shared use. We would like to suggest to BCC that we would get a better facility and be able to retain more hedgerow/trees, if the cycle lane were to be positioned behind the existing hedgerow where required by space constraints.

Cllr Allen asked, "Have the Langley Consortium tree and hedge experts personally been to the areas addressed and taken photographs of these areas? IT looks like they are referring instead to Google Maps as elements are missing on their site plan."

Keith Neill-Smith responded, "We are unaware of how the Consortium's consultants have obtained their information. The arboricultural map is quite detailed and comprehensive. These are normally done in situ. We would like to open up a dialogue with BCC and the Consortium to discuss why there are some abnormalities and why some elements are not featured in the map."

Cllr Wood said, "The last full traffic survey was carried out in 2017. Can we suggest that a new traffic survey is carried out for the whole of Reddicap, Minworth and Walmley area?" He then thanked and commended Town Council advisors on the level of detail shown in their report.

CEO read out Cllr Parkin's questions.

John Myatt responded, "We note Cllr Parkin's comments that the one-way system in the vicinity of New Hall Cemetery is already in place as required and feel that this reinforces the point we are making in the report regarding residents and Councillors' requests for northern slip roads to be reconsidered."

Andrew Tucker responded "We can also re-emphasise the point made by the Town Council in previous consultation responses about northern slip roads being required from early in the development. This issue is covered within the report in paragraph 4.19. We can give this issue greater prominence and include a specific recommendation if requested, so the point is reinforced. We can also request that as a minimum that the internal infrastructure to enable north facing slips is future-proofed. We can add this to paragraph 5 of the report."

Cllr Millichope said, “Can you weave in a section about revisiting the traffic plan and acknowledge that the previous one is now quite old?”

John Myatt responded (also responding to Cllr Woods previous remarks), “The Transport Strategy for the site was approved as part of the Birmingham Development Plan in 2017. Since then both the Peddimore and Langley Developers have produced a number of Transport Assessments, and updates to Transport Assessments which have included transport modelling based on new surveys. In addition, since Peddimore was approved they have conducted traffic surveys at key junctions related to the sites, and regular monitoring reports including new surveys. These are reported to the Sutton Connect Green Travel District (GTD) Board, alongside wider resident and business surveys conducted by the GTD. These surveys feed into the ‘Monitor and Manage’ approach being used on both developments, where S106 funding will be targeted at locations where issues are developing, rather than simply following a preordained list of schemes developed at the start of a 10-15 year delivery programme for the development.

Resolved to submit the report (with the addition regarding north facing slip roads to the A38 referred to above) and appendix from the Town Council’s consultant advisors be forwarded to Birmingham City Council in full as constituting the Town Council’s formal response to the consultation on this application.

62 Water Orton Lane and Cottage Lane

Cllr Wood commented that if Cottage Lane were closed, vehicles would only have two access points to the Lindridge Estate. He also said that getting out of the estate is already difficult because of congestion on Minworth Island, and that forcing residents to use Minworth Island rather than Cottage Lane would make this worse. Cllr Wood added that he didn’t think closing Cottage Lane would be possible and that if it were closed, it would cause more traffic problems. Regarding Water Orton Road, Cllr Wood asked if residents could be issued with permits to access Water Orton if it were closed apart from access for buses.

Cllr Perks commented on the heavy traffic on Kingsbury Road as it gets caught at the Water Orton Lane Junction trying to turn right, and trying to turn right into Minworth Parkway, particularly mid-week, and that in his view, if all the right turning traffic were to be diverted onto Minworth Parkway, there would be a large backup of traffic all the way to Minworth Island.

Cllr Allen asked about the frequency of buses on Cottage Lane and commented that the proposal was to make Water Orton Lane a bus only route, but how would this impact car drivers?

John Myatt responded that although there have been concerns about HGV’s on Water Orton Lane for a long time, the proposed scheme has been designed as a S106 mitigation for the Peddimore and Langley developments. Transport modelling showed that junctions on Kingsbury Road would go over capacity once the developments were delivered, as commuters and freight will need to access the M42 at J9. To enable this a number of options were developed, which aimed to increase traffic flow through the junctions by removing conflicting turning movements at the Water Orton Lane/Kingsbury Road junction. In the preferred option presented for consultation this is why Water Orton Lane and Cottage Lane are proposed to be closed. Buses are still proposed to be able to use Water Orton Lane to ensure sustainable transport options to the school and residents are still available, and the bus gate enables this. As well as the capacity improvements at the junction, the

potential benefits of the scheme include a reduction in HGV's and through traffic using Water Orton Lane which will make it safer for residents and school children, and a safer link across Cottage Lane bridge for pedestrians and cyclists.

John commented that the concerns raised were addressed in the report, and that the comments were all valid points to make to Birmingham City Council both in the Councils response and also in individual responses to consultation. Birmingham will then need to review the comments and suggest amendments to the schemes if required. This could include remodelling the junction to see if maintaining access to cottage lane is possible for example.

Resolved that the that the report on the Proposed Water Orton Lane Bus Gate and Removal of Vehicular Access on Cottage Lane be forwarded in full to BCC with a request for residents to be issued with permits to access Water Orton Lane if it were closed apart from access for buses.

63 Falcon Lodge Hardstanding area

Resolved to recommend to Full Council approval of £3,172.73 CIL funding and approved £4,260.55 from the Clean and Green Improvement Budget towards the costs of installing two hard standing area bays for wheelie bins at the flats on Stone Avenue, Falcon Lodge.

64 Committee Budget 2025/26

Committee reviewed the 2024/25 budget and 2025/26 indicative budget and discussed potential increases in the below budgets for site improvements if the assets requested in the Devo Deal were transferred from Birmingham City Council:

- Environmental Enhancements
- Signage Replacement
- Clean and Green Improvements
- Traffic Island Improvements

Committee agreed to consider road safety projects or activities on a case-by case basis during 2025/26 and to further review the budget requirement for future years in autumn 2025.

Committee made amendments to the indicative budget for 2025/26 to be recommended Strategy and Resources Committee as this Committees future budget requirement – [attached](#).

Resolved to note the 2024/25 spend against budget and commitments to date.

Resolved to recommend the future budget requirements of the Planning & Highways Committee to the Strategy and Resources Committee.

65 Planning Applications

(i) Schedule of Planning Applications for the Sutton Coldfield Town Council Area

Four Oaks Ward 5th November - 27th November 2024

	Application Number	Site Address	Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
1	2024/07416/PA	19 Ladywood Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 2SW	Listed building consent for the erection of first floor accommodation including the erection of dormer windows to rear and side elevations, rooflights to front and side elevations, internal alterations including new staircase and doors	Objection
Objection - Visual Impact - Committee feel that the proposal is out of keeping with the existing property as this is a listed building and the proposed design has modern features. As such this would result in the introduction of an incongruous and discordant built form into the street scene and result in adverse visual impact.				
2	2024/07347/PA	19 Ladywood Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 2SW	Erection of first floor accommodation including the erection of dormer windows to rear and side elevations, rooflights to front and side elevations, internal alterations including new staircase and doors	Objection
Objection - Visual Impact - Committee feel that the proposal is out of keeping with the existing property as this is a listed building and the proposed design has modern features. As such this would result in the introduction of an incongruous and discordant built form into the street scene and result in adverse visual impact.				
3	2024/06665/PA	14 Streetly Crescent Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 4PX	Application for a non-material amendment to planning approval 2021/09765/PA for increase in size of office room	No objection

4	2024/06750/PA	29 Park View Road Sutton Four Oaks Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 4PR	Single and two storey rear and side extensions	No objection
5	2024/07179/PA	Four Oaks Junior And Infant School Edge Hill Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 4PA	Application to determine the details for condition numbers 3 (external materials) 4 (level details) 5 (landscape) 6 (hard surfacing materials) 7 (earthworks details) 8 (boundary treatment) 9 (landscape management plan) 13 (bird/bat boxes) attached to approval 2024/03683/PA	No objection
6	2024/05902/PA	30A Hartopp Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 2QX	Erection of two storey forward, side and rear extensions, increase in roof height and design of main roof, alterations to existing garage and installation of dormer windows to front and rear as part of loft conversion, first floor rear balcony and alterations to driveway to form in and out drive.	Approve subject to Conditions 03-12- 2024
7	2024/05843/PA	18 Hartopp Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 2RE	Installation of solar panels to front, side and rear elevations and gates to front.	No objection

Mere Green Ward 5th November - 27th November 2024

Application Number	Site Address	Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
8 2024/07113/PA	Oak Cottage Hillwood Road Sutton Four Oaks Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B75 5QN	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for the proposed erection of two storey rear extension.	No objection
9 2024/07269/PA	Oak Cottage Hillwood Road Sutton Four Oaks Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B75 5QN	Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for the proposed erection of detached garage and gym	No objection
10 2024/07230/PA	89 Mere Green Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B75 5BY	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for a proposed erection of porch and replacement single storey rear extension	No objection

Reddick Ward 5th November - 27th November 2024

	Application Number	Site Address	Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
11	2024/07249/PA	Langley Mill Cottage Lindridge Road Sutton Trinity Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B75 7JB	Application to determine the details for condition number 2 (bird/bat boxes) 3 (mitigation/enhancement plan) 4 (working method statement) attached to approval 2024/05466/PA	No objection
12	2024/06129/PA	48 Coleshill Road Sutton Trinity Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B75 7BA	Erection of single storey rear extension	No objection

Roughley Ward 5th November - 27th November 2024

Reddingley Ward Site November 2024 to November 2024				
	Application Number	Site Address	Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
13	2024/07260/PA	100 Willmott Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B75 5NW	Erection of two and single storey rear extension and conversion of window to garage to front	No objection

Trinity Ward 5th November - 27th November 2024

	Application Number	Site Address	Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
14	2024/06038/PA	14 Ashdene Close Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B73 6HL	Formation of habitable room in roofspace with rear dormer and raised ridge line	Objection
Objection - Mass, Scale and Overdevelopment - Committee object to this application on the basis that the scale and massing of the raised roof height is excessive, is out of keeping with the wider street scene and could also have an unacceptable adverse impact on neighbouring properties.				
15	2024/05949/PA	18 Anchorage Road Sutton Trinity Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 2PL	Erection of two-storey side extension, amendments to existing garage with internal and external alterations to existing dwelling.	No objection
16	2024/06870/PA	Bishop Veseys Academy 36 Lichfield Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 2NH	Application for a non-material amendment to planning approval 2020/06426/PA for minor changes to include removal of glazed link between new extension and Headmasters building, minor re-configuration to the internal layout, amendments to window and additional external doors, changes to brick details, roof level and access re-arrangement	No objection
17	2024/07317/PA	James Preston Health Centre 61 Holland Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B72 1RL	Erection of new bin store	No objection
18	2024/07050/PA	25 Upper Holland Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B72 1SU	Erection of single storey rear extension	No objection

19	2024/05922/PA	50-52 Gracechurch Shopping Centre Sutton Coldfield B72 1PD	Display of two internally illuminated fascia signs.	No objection
20	2024/07066/PA	162 Bedford Road Sutton Trinity Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B75 6AL	Application to determine the details for condition number 5 (sample materials) attached to approval 2024/03205/PA	No objection
21	2024/06436/PA	Good Hope Hospital Rectory Road Sutton Trinity Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B75 7RR	Demolition of the Medical Records building and Plant Room and erection of a single storey modular building for consultation and waiting room	No objection

Vesey Ward 5th November - 27th November 2024

	Application Number	Site Address	Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
22	2024/06059/PA	Homebase store 75 Chester Road The Royal Town of Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B73 5BA	Variation of condition numbers 11 to allow opening hours for customers between the hours of 06:00 - 00:00 Monday to Saturday and 10:00 - 16:00 Sunday and Bank Holidays, 12 to be amended to no deliveries shall be taken at or dispatched from the site outside the hours of 06:00 - 23:00 Monday to Saturday and 07:00 - 18:00 Sunday and Bank Holidays and removal of condition number 15 (excluding the sale of food) attached to planning approval 1996/05043/PA.	Objection

Objection - A review of the planning application for the proposed changes to the Homebase store at 75 Chester Road (planning ref: 2024/06059/PA) has been undertaken from a transport and highways perspective. The application seeks to amend planning conditions on an existing consent to allow the sale of food and other convenience goods, and adjust opening and delivery hours, without any immediate physical alterations to the site.

Limited information has been provided regarding the potential implications of these changes to planning conditions, including potential for increased vehicle trip generation, changes to frequency and size of deliveries and the impact of this at nearby junctions e.g A452/Jockey Road, which already experience congestion during peak periods.

The Town Council object in the absence of a Transport Statement being prepared by the applicant, setting out multi-modal trip generation, alignment with the Birmingham City Council Car Parking standards (including provision of disabled, cycle and electric vehicle parking), potential for off-site highway impact and opportunities to promote use of sustainable travel modes by staff. It is also recommended that details are provided of how servicing and deliveries will be accommodated, and that this will not require changes to the site layout. This information will ensure the impact of the proposals are clearly understood, including the development's potential impact on traffic, parking, and local infrastructure.

	Application Number	Site Address	Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
23	2024/07307/PA	62 Beacon Road Land adjacent Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B73 5SX	Erection of a two storey detached dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) with associated access, parking and landscaping	No objection
24	2024/07384/PA	81 Kings Road Birmingham B73 5AD	Erection of 6 metre deep single storey rear extension. Maximum height 3.9 metres, eaves height 2.8 metres	No objection
25	2024/07193/PA	117 Bakers Lane Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 2BA	Erection of single storey rear single storey extension with replacement pitched roof over existing flat roof and proposed porch to front with hipped roof	No objection
26	2024/07264/PA	63 College Road Sutton Vesey Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B73 5DJ	Erection of two storey side and single storey front and rear extension and installation of roof lights to side and rear	No objection

Walmley & Minworth Ward 5th November - 27th November 2024

	Application Number	Site Address	Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
27	2024/07100/PA	Outside 171 Springfield Road Sutton Coldfield B76 2SX	Telecomms Advisory application for the installation of a fixed line broadband apparatus.	No objection
28	2024/07099/PA	Outside 177 and 179 Springfield Road Sutton Coldfield B76 2SX	Telecoms licence advisory for the installation of fixed line broadband apparatus.	No objection
29	2024/06741/PA	3 Lawnswood Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B76 1TW	Non material amendment to Planning Approval 2022/04576/PA for addition of utility space with associated external side door, existing garage door retained, rear ground floor roof changed from hipped to lean-to pitched	No objection
30	2024/06481/PA	29 Ebrook Way Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B76 2BU	Erection of two storey side and single storey rear extensions	No objection
31	2024/07130/PA	Peddimore Land north of Minworth east of A38 and west of Wiggins Hill Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham	Display of non-illuminated freestanding timber sign board.	No objection

32	2024/06495/PA	Ox Leys Farm Ox Leys Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B76 9PA	Replacement of flat roof of agricultural building with new gable roof including increase in height by 3m	No objection
----	-------------------------------	--	--	--------------

Wylde Green Ward 5th November - 27th November 2024

	Application Number	Site Address	Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
33	2024/07145/PA	99 Holifast Road Birmingham B72 1AE	Erection of 8 metre deep single storey rear extension. Maximum height 3 metres, eaves height 2.65 metres	No objection
34	2024/05970/PA	76 Brooks Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B72 1HR	Erection of two storey side and single storey rear extension.	No objection
35	2024/07343/PA	188 Penns Lane Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B76 1JT	Erection of single storey rear and first floor rear extensions, single storey forward porch extension and garage conversion	No objection
36	2024/07153/PA	99 Holifast Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B72 1AE	Erection of two storey front, side and rear and single storey rear extension, roof over side passage and installation of rear dormer window	No objection
37	2024/06119/PA	56 Emmanuel Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B73 5LZ	Erection of single storey rear extension	No objection

Resolved to forward the Committee's recommendations to Birmingham City Council.

(ii) Other Planning Applications for Sutton Coldfield Town Council Area

To consider submitting comments and/or objections on applications for the planning consent registered on the Birmingham City Council Planning Portal after circulation of the agenda and schedules.

Four Oaks Ward 27th November - 3rd December 2024

	Application Number	Site Address	Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
1	2024/07542/PA	38 Rosemary Hill Road Birmingham B74 4HL	Erection of 6 metre deep single storey rear extension. Maximum height 3 metres, eaves height 2.65 metres	No objection
2	2024/07446/PA	17 Luttrell Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 2SP	Erection of replacement dwellinghouse	Comment
Comment – Committee expressed the view that Birmingham City Council should review if there are any significant trees on the site and if there are they should be taken in consideration when reviewing the application as this application is in the conservation area.				

Mere Green Ward 27th November - 3rd December 2024

	Application Number	Site Address	Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
3	2024/06125/PA	135 Mere Green Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B75 5DD	Demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey side extension to form an annexe	No objection
4	2024/07585/PA	144 Hill Village Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B75 5HX	Erection of first floor side extension, alteration to front dormer window, forward porch canopy, conversion of garage to habitable room and also include increase to roof height.	Objection
Objection - Mass, Scale and Overdevelopment - Committee object to this application on the basis that the scale and massing of the raised roof height is excessive, out of keeping with the wider street scene and could also have an unacceptable adverse impact on neighbouring properties.				

Reddicap Ward 27th November - 3rd December 2024

	Application Number	Site Address	Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
5	2024/07609/PA	27 Churchill Road Birmingham B75 7LG	Erection of 3.9 metre deep single storey rear extension. Maximum height 3 metres, eaves height 3 metres	No objection

Trinity Ward 27th November - 3rd December 2024

	Application Number	Site Address	Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
6	2024/07502/PA	Holland Road Car Park Holland Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B72 1RQ	Application to determine the details for condition number 21 (contaminated land verification report) attached to approval 2021/10265/PA	No objection

Vesey Ward 27th November - 3rd December 2024

	Application Number	Site Address	Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
7	2024/07392/PA	3 Highfield Drive Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B73 5HR	Erection of two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension and rendering.	No objection

Resolved to forward the Committee's recommendations to Birmingham City Council.

(iii) Schedule of Planning Applications and Decisions Made

Resolved to note the schedule

(iv) Schedule of Amended Decisions

None to date to report.

(v) Schedule of Planning Applications Decisions

Fifteen applications were either approved or refused by Birmingham City Council, contrary to observations made by Royal Sutton Coldfield Town Council.

Resolved to note the schedule.

41 Date of Next Meeting

Tuesday 7th January 2025, 6pm at The Trinity Centre.

The meeting closed at 7.49pm.

Signed as a correct record:

Signed:

Date:

DRAFT