

Planning and Highways Meeting

Tuesday 7 July 2026

Trinity Centre

6pm

PRESENT:

Cllrs: L. Allen, Auton, Briggs (Chairman) and Parmar

IN ATTENDANCE:

Jon Lord	(JL)	Head of Regeneration and Sustainability
Natalia Gorman	(NG)	Project Manager

No press or public were in attendance.

16 Apologies for Absence

Apologies received from Cllrs Griffiths – Hughes, Roberts and Singla.

Resolved to accept the apologies.

17 Declarations of Interest

None.

18 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of Planning and Highways Committee held on 2nd June 2026 be signed as a true record.

19 Matters Arising

JL advised that Mott MacDonald, the consultants appointed to progress the Royal Sutton Coldfield Gateway scheme are currently progressing the Outline Business Case and a consultation is scheduled to commence early Autumn. In addition, JL reported the Mott's have confirmed that they are considering improvements to the following remote junctions – Upper Holland Rd/ Coleshill Rd, Riland Rd/Coleshill, Tamworth/ Lichfield Rd and Monmouth/ Somerville as part of the delivery of the scheme.

JL reported that the latest version of the pedestrian access and landscape plan for Aldi now includes pedestrian access from Park Rd to the Aldi carpark following a request for its incorporation to increase pedestrian linkages to the railway station.

JL noted that despite the Town Council submitting an objection following consideration at June's Committee, Openreach has confirmed they will be proceeding with plans to install telecommunication poles and associated infrastructure on Oaklands Road.

Lastly, JL explained that the Town Council is receiving an increase in the number of pre-application consultations from telecommunication companies seeking an opinion on their proposals in advance of submitting a formal application. However, there was a limited time to respond, usually between 10-14 days, which often falls outside of Committee cycles and therefore responses had to be agreed between the CEO and the Chair of Planning & Highways Committee. This included a pre-application consultation from WHP Telecoms Ltd who are proposing to upgrade the base station installation at Walsall Road, with equipment similar to previous plans submitted by Openreach. As the 14 day response deadline fell outside of Committee's timeframe, the objection below was submitted on behalf of the Town Council:

The Town Council is concerned that substituting the existing much shorter pole with a 20m high pole at such an exposed location with very little natural screening would result in an adverse visual impact for neighbouring properties and for users of the Walsall Road.

Furthermore, the Town Council considers the substitution of the existing 2no. equipment cabinets with 5no. equipment cabinets would result in a plethora of structures clustered together at a very prominent location on one of the key routes into the town.

It is therefore considered that both these aspects of the proposal would result in an incongruous feature at this location. Therefore, this proposal would not be supported, and an alternative location should be sought for such significant structures which would not generate such negative visual impacts.

Please note this response is given without prejudice to the Town Council's formal consideration of any subsequent application.

20 Questions from Members

None.

21 Proposed new Vehicle - Activated sign (VAS) on Four Oaks Road

JL summarised his report.

Cllr Allen feels there is a safety issue at this location and it would benefit from a VAS.

Resolved to recommend to Full Council approval of the allocation of £5,500 from the Four Oaks Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to install the VAS on Four Oaks Road.

22 Proposed double kerbing of section of the grass verge on Tamworth Road

JL summarised his report. This is to address issue of unauthorised parking on the existing grass verge which is generating highway safety issues and is of significant concern to local residents.

Cllr Auton supported the proposal and suggested that planting a hawthorn hedge on the grass verge is explored.

Resolved to recommend to Full Council approval of £34,000 from the Trinity Ward Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to install and maintain the double kerbs on the Tamworth Road.

23 Update from the Birmingham Airport Consultative Committee

Following his appointment to the Birmingham Airport Consultative Committee, Cllr Briggs advised that he attended his first meeting of the noise sub-committee last month. Discussions at the Consultative Committee focused around flight related noise mitigations whilst receiving an update from Birmingham Airport regarding their planned improvements to passenger facilities.

The committee agreed to meet four times a year and Cllr Briggs will report back to the Planning & Highways committee in due course.

Resolved to note the update.

24 Town Council's Response to Planning Application [2026/02073/PA](#) , 81 Hollyfield Road, B75

Resolved to note the Town Council response to Birmingham City Council following the receipt of additional information as follows:

Unfortunately, the amended plans are still considered deficient and inaccurate and therefore fail to constitute an appropriate basis upon which to assess the application. Therefore, the Town Council contends that the application in its current form should either be withdrawn or refused.

For instance, a comparison between the front elevation drawing with the view in Google, reveals that the front gable actually projects, yet there is no sign of this on the drawing. The gable has projecting eaves and a brick verge, yet it is shown to have a fascia board. The front elevation fails to show the chimney or indicate the position of the downpipes, and the front door is incorrectly drawn both in its arch and the arrangement of the doors.

Furthermore, a comparison of each proposed elevation with the others, and with the plans, highlights that there appear to be many missing lines, some of the window positions don't match those shown on the plan, the ridge heights are not consistent, and the chimney seems to be located on both sides of the rear gable. The difference in projection of the rear extensions is not visible; the second-floor bedrooms look as though they will be lacking in daylight and ventilation as they only have one set of relatively small windows.

The Google aerial view of the property appears to show some planting immediately behind the existing building which will be lost due to the proposed extension, yet the application form says no trees will be affected. The application form also says that parking will not be affected, yet the proposal removes the existing garage, and it claims that new materials will match the existing, yet the existing clay roof tiles appear to be replaced with something that is grey, and there are many masonry elements shown bright yellow, which one assumes must be some form of fake stone.

If the Case Officer is minded to determine the current application, the Town Council considers that based on the plans submitted, from a design perspective, the composition

and proportions of the proposed elevations are considered to be ill conceived, and the style seems to be an uncomfortable blend of neo-classicism and modernity which is considered incongruous compared to the design of existing surrounding properties. On this basis, this application is considered to fail to comply with BCC's Design Guide SPD in particular: Design Principles 2 (Character Assessment), Design Principles 3, as it fails to positively acknowledge and enhance the urban realm, whilst considered contrary to 14 (Architectural cohesion and quality).

25 Planning Applications

(i) Schedules of Planning Applications for Sutton Coldfield Town Council Area registered between 2nd June - 2nd July

It was noted that Birmingham City Council has made significant changes to the database that hosts the Planning Portal. Officers identified that, when downloading the June planning applications in preparation for this committee meeting, several applications were missing and the portal was generally operating much more slowly than previously. In addition, Birmingham City Council had not published its weekly planning list, making it difficult for officers to verify that all relevant applications had been recorded ahead of the meeting. These issues have been reported to Birmingham City Council, but no response has yet been received. On this basis, Town Council officers noted there could be applications which have been omitted and resolved that if any were subsequently identified a request would be made to BCC for an extension to submit any representations.

The Chairman thanked NG for her thorough checks and diligence in navigating the new system and ensuring that applications were identified and making them available for Committee to review.

Four Oaks Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/02500/PA	6D Hartopp Road, Birmingham, B74 2RH Variation of condition 1 (approved plans) attached to planning approval 2023/01585/PA to include material colour changes, changes to design of single storey rear extensions, roof-lights to side roof and roof alterations	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/03024/PA	108 Streetly Lane, Sutton Coldfield, Birmingham, B74 4TB Variation of condition 1 (approved plans) of Planning Approval 2025/02723/PA to increase the size of single storey rear extension	<u>No Objection</u>

2026/02426/PA	133 Russell Bank Road, Birmingham, B74 4RJ Garage conversion to habitable room, single storey rear extension and first floor side extension above garage	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/02436/PA	16 Wyvern Road, Birmingham, B74 2PT Erection of two storey rear extension, garage conversion to habitable room, new detached garage and new sliding gate access.	<u>Objection:</u>
No. 16 Wyvern Road is an attractive, early/mid-20th Century house in an equally attractive street. Although the neighbouring houses have many variations, they appear generally to be of a similar period and style, and the front boundaries are low-key, defined either by planting or very low walls. Whilst much of the proposed alterations are considered to be acceptable, there are some uncomfortable elements which should be amended or removed. In relation to the garage conversion element, the proposal is to have almost completely glazed ground to ceiling windows to what is proposed to be a bedroom and bathroom. It would look more appropriate, if the window cill levels are raised to make them similar in style to the other windows. The proposed timber front Portch is considered an incongruous feature and is both inconsistent with the style and materials of the front elevation and will visually feel cluttered in relation to the nearby curved bay windows. In addition, the proposed rather standard timber-framed garage - although not unattractive in its own right - does not feel as though it will fit in with the style of the existing building and should be either omitted or a more appropriate design be found. Finally, the small-scale and oddly located Street Scene drawing shows some rather insensitive and out-of-keeping taller front garden walls and sliding gates and omits the important element of the relationship to the adjoining buildings. This would result in an incongruous feature on the street scene and should be removed. For the reasons listed above the proposal is therefore considered contrary to Design Principles 14 (Architectural cohesion and quality) and 16 (Residential Extensions) of The Birmingham Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).		
2026/02461/PA	2 Bracebridge Road, Birmingham, B74 2SB Listed building consent for erection of single storey rear extension	<u>Objection:</u>

As context, 2 Bracebridge Road is a Grade II listed property, located in the Four Oaks Estate and Conservation Area, and a notable example of late nineteenth-century Arts and Crafts domestic architecture.

The proposal is to erect a glazed single storey extension at the rear of the property. Whilst a rear glazed extension is acceptable in principle, it should either be of a convincing Arts and Crafts style, or completely modern. The proposal appears to be neither. The heritage statement contains a photograph of a rear glass-house from 1922. This was much smaller than the proposed extension and, principally due to its gabled form, it did sit somewhat more comfortably with the rest of the building. It also states that, although arguably of lesser importance, the back of the building does still follow the character of the more visually important front. The design of the extension is therefore still a critical factor. The other concerning element about the proposal is that it fills in the rear recess therefore masking much of the stair tower and fundamentally changes the look and form of the back of the building

There are more sensitive layout options that should be considered: for instance, an extension of the existing kitchen. Although not quite as convenient in terms of access from the main hall, this would leave the general three-dimensional aspect of the rear elevation more visible than the proposed courtyard infilling. Although they don't seem to mention it in the Heritage Statement or application, it appears that the owner is also rebuilding the ground floor wall of the eastern, two-storey gable in order to make it thinner.

The final and important point is that there needs to be a full listing of the proposed materials for any proposal. The application form says that the drawings give details of the materials for the proposed extension. They do not, and neither does the Heritage Statement. On this basis the applications should not be determined until this information has been provided and assessed.

Based on what has been supplied in the applications, the proposal is therefore considered not to comply with 3.5 (b & c) of the Birmingham Four Oaks Estate Development Guidelines SPD (1993) whilst not complying with BCC's Design Guide SPD in particular: Design Principles 2 (Character Assessment), and Design Principles 14 (Architectural cohesion and quality).

	2 Bracebridge Road, Birmingham, B74 2SB	Objection:
2026/02419/PA	Erection of single storey rear extension	

As context, 2 Bracebridge Road is a Grade II listed property, located in the Four Oaks Estate and Conservation Area, and a notable example of late nineteenth-century Arts and Crafts domestic architecture.

The proposal is to erect a glazed single storey extension at the rear of the property. Whilst a rear glazed extension is acceptable in principle, it should either be of a convincing Arts and Crafts style, or completely modern. The proposal appears to be neither. The heritage statement contains a photograph of a rear glass-house from 1922. This was much smaller than the proposed extension and, principally due to its gabled form, it did sit somewhat more comfortably with the rest of the building. It also states that, although arguably of lesser importance, the back of the building does still follow the character of the more visually important front. The design of the extension is therefore still a critical factor. The other concerning element about the proposal is that it fills in the rear recess therefore masking much of the stair tower and fundamentally changes the look and form of the back of the building

There are more sensitive layout options that should be considered: for instance, an extension of the existing kitchen. Although not quite as convenient in terms of access from the main hall, this would leave the general three-dimensional aspect of the rear elevation more visible than the proposed courtyard infilling. Although they don't seem to mention it in the Heritage Statement or application, it appears that the owner is also rebuilding the ground floor wall of the eastern, two-storey gable in order to make it thinner.

The final and important point is that there needs to be a full listing of the proposed materials for any proposal. The application form says that the drawings give details of the materials for the proposed extension. They do not, and neither does the Heritage Statement. On this basis the applications should not be determined until this information has been provided and assessed.

Based on what has been supplied in the applications, the proposal is therefore considered not to comply with 3.5 (b & c) of the Birmingham Four Oaks Estate Development Guidelines SPD (1993) whilst not complying with BCC's Design Guide SPD in particular: Design Principles 2 (Character Assessment), and Design Principles 14 (Architectural cohesion and quality).

2026/02370/PA	37a Edge Hill Road Birmingham B74 4PD Erection of single storey rear extension and rendered finish to all elevations	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/02777/PA	9 Clarry Drive, Birmingham, B74 2RA Erection of two storey forward extension, single storey side extension, new front dormer windows and alterations to rear elevation	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/02725/PA	23 Le More, Birmingham, B74 2XY Erection of detached garage to front elevation	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/02742/PA	21 Edge Hill Road, Birmingham, B74 4PA Erection of two storey rear, single storey side and single storey rear extensions	<u>No Objection</u>

Mere Green Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/02478/PA	12 Beech Close, Birmingham, B75 5GA Erection of single storey side and rear extension	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/02209/PA	14 Hill Village Road, Birmingham, B75 5BA Application for variation of condition number 2 (approved plans) attached to planning approval 2025/05805/PA for extension to porch and removal of piers to allow alterations to staircase	<u>No Objection</u>

2026/02546/PA	17 Hillwood Common Road, Birmingham, B75 5QJ Erection of first floor side, single storey rear and front porch extensions. Installation of dormer windows to front and rear elevations and erection of front railings, entrance gates and gate post	Objection: The erection of front railings, entrance gates and gate posts would represent an incongruous addition to Hillwood Common Road which is characterised, in the main, by open plan frontages with limited boundary treatments evident. Moreover, Committee is concerned that the projection of the rear first floor extension is excessive and results in an unfortunate adverse impact on the amenity of the adjoining property (Number 19). Therefore, its projection should be reduced to reduce its impact.
2026/02675/PA	121 Hill Village Road, Birmingham, B75 5HU Erection of first floor side and single storey rear extensions and detached outbuilding to rear	No objections per se but Committee respectfully request that a no habitation clause is applied if approved.
2026/02612/PA	210 Hill Village Road, Birmingham, B75 5JN Variation of condition 1 (approved plans) attached to planning approval 2025/04843/PA for reduction in size of design	No Objection

Reddicap Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/02550/PA	29 Seal Close, Birmingham, B76 1FJ Application for lawful development certificate for proposed front porch and replacement conservatory roof with flat roof including roof-lights	No Objection
2026/02073/PA	81 Hollyfield Road, Birmingham, B75 7SE Erection of single storey rear and two storey rear extensions to include Juliette balconies, conversion of existing garage into habitable space, installation of 2no. bay windows and canopy feature with pillars to front elevation, raising of the roof height of the existing two storey forward gable feature, window alterations to the property, and dormer windows to front and rear in association with a loft conversion.	Objection:

Unfortunately, the amended plans are still considered deficient and inaccurate and therefore fail to constitute an appropriate basis upon which to assess the application. Therefore the Town Council contends that the application in its current form should either be withdrawn or refused.

For instance, a comparison between the front elevation drawing with the view in Google, reveals that the front gable actually projects, yet there is no sign of this on the drawing. The gable has projecting eaves and a brick verge, yet it is shown to have a fascia board. The front elevation fails to show the chimney or indicate the position of the downpipes, and the front door is incorrectly drawn both in its arch and the arrangement of the doors.

Furthermore, a comparison of each proposed elevation with the others, and with the plans, highlights that there appear to be many missing lines, some of the window positions don't match those shown on the plan, the ridge heights are not consistent, and the chimney seems to be located on both sides of the rear gable. The difference in projection of the rear extensions is not visible; the second-floor bedrooms look as though they will be lacking in daylight and ventilation as they only have one set of relatively small windows.

The Google aerial view of the property appears to show some planting immediately behind the existing building which will be lost due to the proposed extension, yet the application form says no trees will be affected. The application form also says that parking will not be affected, yet the proposal removes the existing garage, and it claims that new materials will match the existing, yet the existing clay roof tiles appear to be replaced with something that is grey, and there are many masonry elements shown bright yellow, which one assumes must be some form of fake stone.

If the Case Officer is minded to determine the current application, the Town Council considers that based on the plans submitted, from a design perspective, the composition and proportions of the proposed elevations are considered to be ill conceived, and the style seems to be an uncomfortable blend of neo-classicism and modernity which is considered incongruous compared to the design of existing surrounding properties. On this basis, this application is considered to fail to comply with BCC's Design Guide SPD in particular: Design Principles 2 (Character Assessment), Design Principles 3, as it fails to positively acknowledge and enhance the urban realm, whilst considered contrary to 14 (Architectural cohesion and quality).

2026/01326/PA	323 Springfield Road, Birmingham, B75 7JL Erection of single storey side extension and associated steps.	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/02010/PA	15 Homewood Close, Birmingham, B76 1JW (Amended Proposal) - Erection of single storey rear extension and conversion of garage to habitable space	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/03245/PA	Lodge Community Hub, Churchill Road, Birmingham, B75 7LB Application for a prior notification for the proposed demolition of existing buildings	Representation received from Cllr Parkin: "I have no objection to the demolition methodology and add look forward to the submission of the planning application for a new community centre at this location." <u>No Objection</u>

Roughley Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
----------------	--	----------------------

2026/02954/PA	126 Grange Lane, Birmingham, B75 5LL Erection of two storey side and single storey front extensions	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/02440/PA	15 West View Road, Birmingham, B75 6AY Erection of single storey rear and side extension and first floor side and rear extensions and repositioning of garage walls with garage conversion and installation of new roof above.	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/02647/PA	115 Mere Green Road, Birmingham, B75 5BY Erection of single storey rear extension	<u>No Objection</u>

Trinity Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/02134/PA	Land at Brassington Avenue Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B72 1PH Display of 4no. internally illuminated signs and 2no. non illuminated signs	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/03359/PA	Good Hope Hospital, Rectory Road, Birmingham, B75 7RR Notification for Prior Approval for the installation of 1017 no. rooftop PV solar panels	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/02412/PA	52 Anchorage Road, Birmingham, B74 2PL Rebuilding of existing garage wall with alterations to garage roof and rear section. Installation of pitched dormer to rear elevation and roof light to both the dormer and the flat roof behind the garage. A window on the side elevation is to be blocked up. A new door installed to the rear elevation. An EV charging point installed to front elevation.	<u>No Objection</u>

2025/04104/PA	10 Beeches Walk, Birmingham, B73 6HN Erection of single storey front and rear and first floor rear extensions	Objection: Committee is concerned the proposed 2 storey element of the proposal, as a result of its substantial rear projection that would completely fill the remainder of the plot, would create adverse impacts including overlooking and shadowing effects on the two adjacent residential properties
2026/02600/PA	5A Driffold, Birmingham, B73 6HE Erection of an additional floor and creation of front porch.	No Objection
2026/00477/PA	43-45 South Parade Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B72 1QU Variation of condition number 2 (approved plans) attached to planning approval 2024/03948/PA and subsequent non-material amended application 2026/02479/PA to allow the creation of an additional apartment, incorporation of a vehicle lift to provide access to basement parking and cycle storage.	Committee noted concerns about the lack of an updated Flood Risk Assessment and any Flood Risk Attenuation to accompany the proposed creation of a basement at this location. Furthermore, issues regarding the operational impacts of the proposed car lift, in particular potential noise impacts on occupiers of the apartments, and safety issues related to users of the lift facility were identified as requiring further investigation prior to the application being determined.

Vesey Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/01902/PA	30 Hollyhurst Road, Birmingham, B73 6SY Variation of condition 1 (approved plans) of Planning Approval 2025/02297/PA to increase the depth of single storey rear extension	No Objection
2026/02206/PA	Outside 3 Boldmere Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B73 5UY Display of 2no. internally illuminated digital advertisement panels on BT street hub unit	No Objection

2026/02490/PA	41 Falstone Road Birmingham B73 6PJ Erection of single storey rear and single storey front extensions	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/02113/PA	Outside 3 Boldmere Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B73 5UY Installation of 1no. BT street hub unit	<u>Objection:</u> The installation of a hub unit at this location would result in an unacceptable accumulation of street clutter whilst creating an adverse visual impact on users of the adjacent bus stop as it would block their view of approaching buses. Committee also note that, unlike in other proposed locations, the hub does not appear to replace an existing BT facility which could be used to justify the installation of a hub unit in this vicinity. The proposal would also result in an unacceptable amount of street clutter at this location.
2026/02496/PA	1 Coppice View Road, Birmingham, B73 6UE Change of use from dwelling house (Use Class C3) to children's home (Use Class C2)	Committee note that Cllr Cooper supports this <u>Objection</u>
Whilst the Town Council appreciates there is a need for such facilities within Royal Sutton Coldfield, the Town Council is concerned about the cumulative impacts resulting from having two residential homes adjacent to each other at this location. This includes the associated adverse impacts on the amenity of residents in the surrounding properties as a result of an increase in car movements created by staff changing shifts and the potential for a concentration of noise and disturbance. In addition, the proposal would result in a loss of another family home, which BCC's Housing Needs Assessment indicates are in high demand, and could also set a precedent for other changes of uses which would consequently alter the character of the area and make it potentially less balanced and sustainable. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to sub-sections a & e of Policy DM12 (Residential conversions and specialist accommodation) of the Development Management in Birmingham DPD. It is also contrary to the Town Council's Planning & Highways Committee Planning Principle which states that Committee would not ordinarily support the conversion of dwelling houses, in particular larger family homes, into non-residential uses.		
2026/02136/PA	57 New Church Road, Birmingham, B73 5RP Erection of two storey rear extension	<u>No Objection</u>
2025/07105/PA	203 Boldmere Road, Birmingham, B73 5UJ Conversion of existing detached rear outbuilding to granny-annex accommodation	<u>Objection:</u> <i>Noting this is now submitted as a planning application for the use as a granny annex, Committee is concerned that this could operate as a self-contained residential unit. This would not be supported as it would result in an undesirable form of back land development which would be out of</i>

		keeping and detrimental to the character and amenity of the area.
2026/02722/PA	62 Coppice View Road, Birmingham, B73 6UF Erection of a single storey rear and side extension and detached rear outbuilding	No objections per se but Committee respectfully request that a no habitation clause is applied if approved.
2026/01637/PA	251 Jockey Road, Birmingham, B73 5XE Installation of new aluminium and glass shopfront, new entrance doors and windows	Objection: Whilst Committee raised no objections to the new shopfront and entrance doors and windows, concerns were raised in relation to the internally illuminated 'apple shaped' sign included within the plans. It is unclear from the submitted plans whether this forms part of the current application or whether it would be considered as part of a separate advertisement consent application. Notwithstanding this, the sign is considered to represent an incongruous addition to the street scene and would result in adverse visual impacts for occupiers of the adjacent residential property.

Walmley & Minworth Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/02402/PA	7 Juniper Drive, Birmingham, B76 1GX Erection of first floor side extension and rebuild of existing conservatory	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/02676/PA	9 Malvern Drive Sutton Coldfield West Midlands B76 1PZ Erection of two storey side extension single storey front porch with garage conversion to habitable room	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/01446/PA	5 Springfield Road, Birmingham, B76 2SJ Erection of two storey side extension, porch to front and detached outbuilding to rear	No objections per se but Committee respectfully request that a no habitation clause is applied if approved.

2026/02544/PA	142 Walmley Road, Birmingham, B76 2QA Erection of single storey forward extension and conversion of garage to habitable space	<u>No Objection</u>
-------------------------------	--	----------------------------

Wylde Green Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/01985/PA	Vesey House, Doggy Day Care Wylde Green Road Sutton New Hall Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B76 1QT Application for variation of condition no.1 (hours of operation) attached to planning approval 2017/06656/PA to allow opening Monday to Sunday 7.00am to 18.00pm	Objection: Committee is concerned about the impact on highway safety as a result of the proposed increase in hours of operating of the café element and the potential for a subsequent increase in car borne trips. In addition, the extension of hours would intensify the use of a facility (a café) which the Town Council would prefer to see located within existing centres to support their viability.

Resolved to submit comments and objections to Birmingham City Council.

(ii) Schedules of Additional Planning Applications for Sutton Coldfield Town Council Area registered between 2nd July - 7th July 2026

Four Oaks Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/02854/PA	42 Walsall Road, Birmingham, B74 4QR Erection of single storey rear extension first floor extension to rear and new front porch.	<u>No Objection</u>

Roughley Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/02856/PA	Markeaton, Weeford Road, Birmingham, B75 5RF Erection of single storey rear extension	No Objection

Vesey Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/02884/PA	301 Highbridge Road, Birmingham, B73 5RB Erection of single storey side and rear extension	No Objection

Walmley & Minworth Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/02855/PA	29 Walmley Ash Road, Birmingham, B76 1JA Erection of two storey side and rear extension, two storey front bay extension, new porch and loft conversion.	Objection: Committee considers the rear projection of the proposed two storey rear/side extension to be excessive which would adversely impact the amenity of the neighbouring property and requests it is therefore substantially reduced.

Resolved to submit comments and objections to Birmingham City Council.

PRE APPLICATION

JL made committee aware of a pre application consultation for a proposed base station installation of a new 20m high Orio monopole mast structure and other ancillary equipment on Lower Queen Street, Sutton Coldfield B72 1RT. The following objection was agreed:

The Town Council wishes to reiterate its position that it would not support the proposal. It is important to note that the location proposed for the installation is shared pedestrian space with the National Cycling Network Route 534 which runs between Sutton Coldfield and Castle Vale. At this point the width is currently 2.5m and the installation would reduce this to 1.8m which is considered unacceptable and would negatively impact users including cyclists, pedestrians and those with reduced mobility.

Furthermore, in relation to the proposal impacting the delivery of the Royal Sutton Coldfield Gateway Scheme, it is considered that its proposed location could compromise the delivery of planned highway improvements. Noting the applicant's statement that the proposed equipment could be 'relocated' if this was determined to be the case, it is the Town Council's understanding that costs associated with such a relocation would be charged back to the Scheme and therefore increase its overall delivery costs.

Cllr Auton also requested that a reference to the proposal's adverse impact on the character of Lower Queen Street is included which was accepted by Committee as follows:

Finally, concerns were raised regarding the visual impact of the proposal on the character of the immediate area and on nearby residential properties; in particular the row of Victorian/Edwardian terraced properties arranged in a curve formation opposite the proposed location.

Therefore, an alternative location should be sought for such significant structures which would not generate such negative impacts.

- (iii) **Schedules of Planning Applications and Decisions Made**
None.
- (iv) **Schedules of Planning Decisions**
Resolved to note the schedule of decisions.

26 Date of Next Meeting

Tuesday 4th August 2026, 6pm Trinity Centre.

Meeting closed: 19:30

Signed:

Date: