

Planning and Highways Meeting
Tuesday 4 August 2026
Trinity Centre
6pm

PRESENT:

Cllrs: L. Allen, Auton, Briggs (Chairman), and Griffiths – Hughes.

IN ATTENDANCE:

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

One member of the public was in attendance.

The resident had submitted an objection for planning application 2026/03231/PA, 2 Stanley Avenue, in advance of the meeting and asked JL to read out on their behalf.

The resident's concerns are not about the need for children's residential care or the future residents themselves. They relate to the suitability of this particular small semi-detached property and the impact the proposed use could have on neighbouring residential amenity.

In particular, they were concerned that:

- No acoustic or party-wall assessment had been submitted, despite the property being attached directly to their home.
- The applicant's supporting documents contain significant inconsistencies regarding staffing, visitor arrangements, emergency admissions and the day-to-day operation of the home.
- The evidence relating to vehicle movements and parking is incomplete and, in the resident's view, does not demonstrate that the proposal would avoid increased pressure on Stanley Avenue.
- The applicant has not demonstrated that the scale and intensity of the proposed use is appropriate for this small semi-detached dwelling, as required by Birmingham's planning policies.

The resident requested that Committee considers their objection when discussing the planning application, that Committee submits an objection to Birmingham City Council (BCC) and supports referral of the application to BCC's Planning Committee for consideration.

JL advised that this application would be discussed during the formal part of the meeting and that the resident should submit comments to BCC as the local authority and decision maker. Regarding supporting referral of the application to BCC's Planning Committee, JL explained that BCC has a Local Scheme of Delegation which sets out when applications are determined by Committee as opposed to delegated to Planning Officers. This would dictate how the application will be determined.

27 Apologies for Absence

Apologies received from Cllrs Parmar and Roberts.

Resolved to accept the apologies.

28 Declarations of Interest

None.

29 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of Planning and Highways Committee held on 7th July 2026 be signed as a true record.

30 Matters Arising

JL advised that BCC failed to include the Town Council's objection to application [2026/01789/PA](#) (Telecommunications proposal at Walmley Social Club) which was subsequently determined as not requiring prior approval to proceed. JL did submit a complaint to senior planning officers at BCC and an apology has been received for the unintentional omission.

JL made Committee aware of an update received to the Town Council from West Midlands Combined Authority on the West Midlands Spatial Development Strategy advising that they had set up a residents assembly which are meeting regularly and that there will be a formal consultation of the next stage of the development in early 2027.

The Chairman asked if JL could respond to clarify the makeup of the residents assembly.

Lastly, JL reported that following the issues reported to the July Committee, Town Council Officers met with BCC Officers to try and resolve the issues with BCC's updated Planning Portal. It became apparent that the discrepancies may continue until BCC clear their backlog of registered applications. In the meantime, it was agreed that BCC would look at interim measures to ensure the Town Council receives a full list of received applications and regular meetings are now scheduled with RSCTC officers.

31 Questions from Members

None.

32 Royal Sutton Coldfield Town Council Updated Planning Principles

JL summarised his report highlighting the proposed changes to the Principles which included amending the Principle relating to the conversion of family housing, the insertion of an additional Principle stating a preference that telecommunications related wires are placed underground with above ground poles only installed where it can be demonstrated that there would be no negative visual impact on the street scene and changes to the protecting our Environment Principles to reflect the Town Council's adopted Tree Policy.

Cllr Auton asked if there could be an amendment to the wording of the existing Renewable Principle to give preference for retrofitting and new housing and/or commercial developments that include energy saving and renewable energy generation features to achieve Birmingham's Net Zero ambition and respect the 2019 Climate Emergency Declaration.

JL advised that the principles are intended to align with BCC existing policies as much as possible as they have no statutory status on their own and that the existing, adopted BCC Development Plan has only very limited retrofitting policies. JL advised against using terms such as 'give preference' as the Town Council is not the determining authority and each application would need to be assessed on its own merits.

JL also advised that the majority of retrofitting interventions do not require planning permission and that some retrofitting may result in negative impacts whilst not be appropriate for heritage buildings.

The Chairman asked if a caveat could be added to address any negative impacts on neighbours.

Resolved to approve the revised wording: *"Welcome new housing and other development that include energy saving and renewable energy generation features which have minimal impacts on surrounding neighbours and appropriate to the individual property and immediate setting."*

Resolved to recommend the suggested revised Royal Sutton Coldfield planning principles as set out in the Officer's report to Full Council for approval.

Resolved that Committee will revisit the planning principles at regular intervals to reflect local and national planning changes.

33 **Planning Application 26/0560 Land at Queslett Road between Aldridge Road and Doe Bank Lane, Walsall**

JL summarised his report on an outline planning application submitted to Walsall Council proposing a major housing led development on land currently forming part of the West Midlands Greenbelt.

Resolved to object to the application as follows:

(a) The application is considered contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework in that it results in the loss of an important strategic area of Greenbelt which it is considered makes a strong contribution to the Greenbelt Purposes A,B & C and, as such, constitutes inappropriate development which should be refused.

(b) Furthermore, the application is considered to be premature on the basis that the Walsall Local Plan is yet to be submitted for examination and adopted and the sub regional apportionment of housing need is yet to be decided through the Spatial Development Strategy process.

(c) The argument that the 'tilted balance applies' is considered incorrect and that the permanent loss of openness arising from the application overrides the need to provide for housing at this location.

(d) The location of the proposal would result in adverse impacts on the Royal Town of Sutton Coldfield's infrastructure including highways, schools and healthcare facilities; an impact likely to be exacerbated by the location's close proximity to the Royal Town of Sutton Coldfield. Moreover, it can be reasonably concluded that the comparable distance to Walsall's centres would not necessarily encourage future residents to travel there and improve their vitality and therefore fail to deliver one of the Walsall Local Plan Preferred Option's strategic priority of creating 'vibrant towns'.

34 Pre-App Consultation for a new broadband base station consisting of a 20m high Pole with headframe, hosting telecommunication equipment and other ancillary development at land off Thimble End Road, Sutton Coldfield, B76 2SD

JL advised that there had been member representation from Cllr Perks who would prefer that proposal was moved roadside to be by Thimble End Rd.

There was a discussion around the positioning of the proposal and Committee agreed they would prefer it was relocated towards the highway.

Resolved that JL would forward Committee's response to Causeway Telecoms Planning.

35 Planning Applications

(i) Schedules of Planning Applications for Sutton Coldfield Town Council Area registered between 7th July - 30th July 2026

Four Oaks Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/03385/PA	129 Lichfield Road, Birmingham, B74 2RX Subdivision and change of use of part of existing dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a children's care home (Use Class C2) for up to 4no. children with special needs and learning disabilities	Representation received from Cllrs Simon Ward & Roberts objecting to this application <u>Objection</u>

The applicant, within their Combined Planning, Design & Access Statement & Heritage Assessment attempts to suggest that a couple of 1960s planning applications establish the use of the property as a care facility up to 2017. However, BCC's Planning Officer in their report accompanying the 2025 application confirmed the existing lawful use of the property is a C3 dwelling, which is the last known use of the property and there is no planning history to suggest otherwise. Therefore concerns regarding the loss of a dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) remain valid in assessing this application.

The BCC officer in justifying the reasons for refusal for the 2025 application stated that the proposed change of use of the property would result in the loss of an existing family dwelling house (Use Class C3) of which there is an undersupply and an evidenced demand for within the city. Insufficient justification has been provided to demonstrate that the need for a care home in this location, outweighs the important contribution this dwelling makes to the Council's objectives, strategies and policies relating to the provision of family housing.

Whilst accepting there is a need for specialist residential care facilities for young people, the Town Council remains concerned that the current proposal would result in a loss of another family home, which BCC's Housing Needs Assessment indicates are in high demand, as evidenced by the Birmingham Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) (2022) which shows that the City's housing needs are not currently being met, particularly in relation to 3 (16.4%) and 4+bed (13.3%) family properties. This application relates to what appears to be a 4/5 (depending on how the existing floor plans are interpreted)-bedroom property which falls into the 4+ bed category for which there is a significant demand as per the HEDNA. Therefore, the loss of this substantial dwelling house would be significantly harmful in terms of meeting wider strategic needs of meeting family accommodation in Sutton Coldfield and Birmingham which it is considered to outweigh the benefits of the Change of Use to a care home.

Policy DM12 (Residential conversions and specialist accommodation) and DM2 (Amenity) of BCC's Development Management DPD 2021 require that all development will need to be appropriate to its location and not result in unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of the occupiers and neighbours.

The applicant states that the children's care home will be staffed 24 hours a day, seven days a week offering a ratio of 1:1 care. This would result in between 4-5 care staff on site during the day and night. The applicant also references around 7 specific additional external care/support staff who may be required to visit the property. This is likely to result in significant additional car borne traffic movements compared to what would be expected of a dwelling house.

The application could also be considered inconsistent about the characteristics of the intended occupiers of the care home. Whilst the description states 'children with special needs and learning disabilities', the Combined Planning, Design & Access Statement & Heritage Assessment references that the occupiers could have more 'significant and complex care needs' and switches terminology from learning difficulties to having 'complex care requirements' and also 'trauma led requirements'. This could result in additional support being required with the associated further intensification of car borne usage. It is therefore requested that clarification is sought on the characteristics of the proposed occupiers prior to the application being determined.

The Town Council is therefore concerned about 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, visits from specialist support staff and the potential for noise and disturbance from the occupiers of the proposed use itself. This cannot be considered to be the same as it would be expected with the current, authorised residential use. Therefore, there would be a greater level of harm to the residential amenity and inconvenience of the occupants of the adjacent dwellings whilst negatively impacting the character of the existing residential area due to the intensification of traffic movements.

Noting the reference by the applicant to an impending application for a similar use at the adjoining property (No.129A), the Town Council considers that the impacts of both uses should be assessed simultaneously and therefore it would be premature to determine the current application until the one for 129A is submitted. This would ensure the cumulative impacts arising from combined traffic movements are assessed, both in terms of impacts on adjoining residential properties, the Four Oaks Conservation Area and potential highway safety impacts on the busy Lichfield Road.

Paragraph 4.33 of the Development Management in Birmingham DPD 2021 acknowledges that 'the conversion of a single dwelling house into several separate units may result in an increased intensity of use and possible adverse effects on the adjacent properties'. The Town Council, without seeing the outcome of the proposed subdivision for 129A, is concerned that the impacts of having two such adjacent uses could be intensified resulting in significant harmful impacts. Fundamentally, having two adjoining uses would result in an over-concentration of non-residential dwelling houses at this location which could also set a precedent for other changes of uses. This would consequently alter the character of the area and make it potentially less balanced and sustainable and therefore should be considered contrary to Policies TP27, TP30 and TP35 of the Birmingham Development Plan.

To conclude, for the reasons set out above, the Town Council considers the proposal is unacceptable in its own right, and if approved, could set a precedent for future uses, including that proposed for the adjoining property 129A. The application is contrary to Policy TP35 of the Birmingham Development Plan 2017, Policies DM2 and DM12 of the Development Management in Birmingham DPD 2021 and therefore should be refused.

2026/02212/PA	11 Stoneleigh Close, Birmingham, B74 2QS Erection of two storey dwelling.	The Town Council considers the application lacks appropriate plans and supporting documentation to enable a proper assessment to be made. Based on what has been submitted, and given the apparent scale and bulk of the proposal, there may be cause for concern in relation to the impact on the street scene, character and amenity of the surrounding area. Additional and amended plans are therefore requested to allow a full assessment to be made prior to determination.
2026/03180/PA	50 Streetly Crescent, Birmingham, B74 4PZ Demolition of the existing garage, porch and rear conservatory. Erection of two storey front extension and single storey rear extension.	No Objection
2026/03448/PA	72 Russell Bank Road, Birmingham, B74 4RJ Erection of single storey rear and first floor side extensions	No Objection
2026/03427/PA	28 Vernon Close Sutton Coldfield B74 4EA Installation of loft conversion with dormer windows to rear and roof lights to front and rear and larger standalone garage	Objection: Committee considers the increase in roof height to accommodate the loft conversion would result in an incongruous feature on the street scene and therefore should be reduced. Furthermore, increasing the size of the detached garage would result in an over dominant feature and should be refused.

Mere Green Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/02989/PA	Former Four Oaks Boys Club Wilmsote Drive Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B75 Erection of infill extension to create a plant room and alterations to existing façade	No Objection
2026/03115/PA	19 Bradgate Drive, Birmingham, B74 4XG Erection of single storey rear and front extension	No Objection

Reddicap Ward

2026/03231/PA	2 Stanley Avenue Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B75 7EQ Change of use of a dwelling house (Use Class C3a) to a children's residential care home for a maximum of two children aged 5 to 17, with up to two carers on the premises at any one time, one of whom will sleep overnight	Representation received from Cllr Parkin objecting to this application Objection: The Town Council is concerned about 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 any additional visits from specialist support staff. It is considered that the impacts on neighbouring properties associated with the proposed use would be exacerbated by it being located within one half of a pair of semi detached properties. 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 and Policy TP35 of the Birmingham Development Plan 2017.
--------------------------------------	--	---

Roughley Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/03004/PA	86 Ashfurlong Crescent, Birmingham, B75 6EN Erection of single storey side and rear extension and porch to front elevation	No Objection
2026/02881/PA	181 Harvest Fields Way, Birmingham, B75 5TJ Erection of single storey rear extension	No Objection

2026/03052/PA	62 Lindridge Road, Birmingham, B75 6HJ Erection of first floor rear extension	No Objection
2026/03262/PA	69 Whitehouse Crescent, Birmingham, B75 6ES Retrospective application for the erection of a single storey side extension and conversion of garage to habitable room	No Objection

Trinity Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/03126/PA	58 Anchorage Road, Birmingham, B74 2PL Erection of single storey side and rear extension with two storey lift shaft housing extension	No Objection

2026/03811/PA	Opposite 40-42 Queen Street Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B72 1RT Application for a prior notification for the installation of 20m high telecommunications mast with associated antennas, transmission dishes, equipment cabinets and ancillary development works	Objection: 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. If erected, it is the Town Council's understanding that costs associated with any future relocation would be charged back to the Scheme and therefore potentially increase its overall delivery costs. Finally, Committee raised concerns regarding the visual impact of the proposal on the character of the immediate area and on nearby residential properties; in particular those properties located opposite the proposed location. Therefore, an alternative location should be sought for such significant structures which would not generate such negative impacts.
2026/03020/PA	KFC 1 Lower Parade The Parade Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B72 1XX Application for variation of condition no.4 (hours of operation) attached to planning approval 2022/04127/PA to allow opening 0800 - 0400	Representation received from Cllr Pears who will be submitting his own comment to BCC opposing the 4am closure as it's too late and sets a precedent. Objection

Despite reports to the contrary on social media there is nothing in the application, including the applicant's supporting statement to suggest that the unit would only operate for takeaways only. The application is to vary Condition 4 of the existing approval so that it reads '*that the premises shall only be open for customers between the hours of 0800-0400*'. If approved, there would be no opportunity to distinguish and restrict the collection of food or the sitting in and consumption of food and drink.

The applicant's supporting statement contains a number of inaccuracies regarding references to the opening hours of nearby units. For example, it references the opening times attached to the condition for an approval of a kiosk which was, in fact, never constructed and was superseded by the yet to be completed structure that can be seen today. The commercial activity referenced has therefore never operated.

Likewise, the application references extinct businesses and/or fails to accurately reflect the opening times of existing operators. For example, the adjacent Ka Pur takeaway appears to close between 1900-2100 each day. The former Subway unit referenced is now a Tea Sup tea café and closes each day at 18:00. There is therefore no comparable late-night opening currently located immediately close to this application site to draw comparisons from.

If correct, the applicant's reference to the Sutton Pizza and Grill's opening hours until 0400 only on a Saturday as a comparison is not relevant as its location on South Parade is a significant distance from both this application site and any residential development.

Regarding the location of the nearest residential receptor, the supporting statement starts that the nearest lies 70m away. This totally ignores the high-density residential block of apartments at Knights House located off The Parade immediately to the north-west of the application site.

The unit has no dedicated car spaces for patrons arriving by car. There are few, if any buses or trains past midnight serving the town centre and therefore notwithstanding a decreasing number of pedestrians it can be assumed that patrons would tend to be arriving by car between midnight and 04.00. There is already an issue of unauthorised car parking to the north of the unit in the space located off the junction of The Parade with Mill Street/Brassington Avenue opposite Natwest and Infront of Knights House. This is likely to be exacerbated should this application be allowed.

Committee takes the view that the proposed extension of opening times is excessive in a location where there is no comparable restaurants/takeaways currently operating past midnight. In addition, the impacts of such a use 7 days a week on the residents of the apartments in the nearby Knights House should also be considered in terms of extended noise impacts from patrons of KFC; especially car borne users and the associated probability of increased frequency of delivery vehicles arising from its extended use.

Furthermore, Committee understands there have been issues relating to anti-social behaviour in the town centre, particularly during late evening. Allowing a unit to operate until 0400, 7 days a week could intensify the issue of noise nuisance, congregation of crowds, litter, intimidation and therefore impact on the perception of Sutton Coldfield town centre as a safe place to live and visit.

Extending the hours of opening is likely to result in an increase in car borne patrons and delivery vehicles and therefore exacerbate the existing unauthorised car parking issue at the space located to the north of the unit. This could result in highway safety issues at the Brassington Avenue/Mill St/Victoria Rd junction created by cars turning in and out of this space.

If allowed, the application could set a precedent for other uses in this part of the town centre and result in an over-intensification of such impacts.

2026/02312/PA	35 Gleneagles Drive, Birmingham, B75 6UN Erection of two storey side extension	Objection: Committee considers the proposed extension projects too far towards the highway which would result in an incongruous feature on the streetscape which is currently characterised by spacious corner plots. The extension's projection should be reduced to protect the character of the area.
2026/03155/PA	20 Tudor Road, Birmingham, B73 6BA Installation of loft conversion with roof lights to rear	No Objection
2026/03305/PA	67 Birmingham Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B72 1QF Change of use of existing office space into 3no.residential apartments	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
2026/00680/PA	48 Stirling Road, Birmingham, B73 6PS Erection of single storey rear extension, first floor side extension and garage conversion to habitable space	Representative received from Cllr Cooper objecting to this application No Objection

2026/03318/PA	5 Windsor Road, Birmingham, B73 5AL Change of use from dwelling house (Use Class C3) to Children's care home (Use Class C2) for up to 3 children.	Representative received from Cllr Cooper objecting to this application. Objection: The Town Council is concerned about 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 visits from specialist support staff. 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 and Policy TP35 of the Birmingham Development Plan 2017.
2026/03000/PA	20 Rowton Drive, Birmingham, B74 2AG Erection of first floor side extension	No Objection
2025/05478/PA	Ashleigh House, 2 Stonehouse Road, Birmingham, B73 6LR Conversion of the existing ancillary outbuilding to provide office space and additional living space in connection with the existing care home (Use Class C2).	Representative received from Cllr Cooper objecting to this application Objection: In the absence of correct 'proposed elevations' to be able to confirm, it appears that the conversion involves a possible increase in height which it is considered would result in adverse visual impacts on neighbouring properties. Moreover, no supporting information has been supplied to explain the proposed meeting room use and therefore Committee is concerned about the impacts on neighbouring properties and on highway safety should this meeting space be open to the public and generate a substantial increase in vehicular movements at this location.
2026/03610/PA	5 Sheffield Road, Birmingham, B73 5HA Erection of single storey rear extension	No Objection
2026/03156/PA	33 Western Road, Birmingham, B73 5SP Erection of single storey rear extension	No Objection

2026/03187/PA	28 Cofield Road, Birmingham, B73 5SD Installation of ramp to front entrance	No Objection
2026/03112/PA	32 Rowton Drive, Birmingham, B74 2AG Erection of single and two storey rear extensions and new pitched roof over existing rear extension	No Objection
2026/03495/PA	229 Monmouth Drive, Birmingham, B73 6JS Erection of single storey rear extension and conversion of garage to habitable space	No Objection

Walmley & Minworth Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/02990/PA	8 Bovey Croft, Birmingham, B76 1YN Erection of single storey rear extension	No Objection
2026/03029/PA	40 Penns Lake Road, Birmingham, B76 1LL Replacement roof and installation of solar panels with alterations to chimney	No Objection

Wylde Green Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/02825/PA	303 Orphanage Road, Birmingham, B72 1BE Outline planning application for the erection of 1no. dwelling	No Objection

	house and new external garage with some matters reserved	
2026/02960/PA	359 Birmingham Road, Birmingham, B72 1DL Change of use from dwelling house (Use Class C3) to Children's care home (Use Class C2) for up to 4 children.	Objection: The Town Council is concerned about 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 any additional visits from specialist support staff. 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 and Policy TP35 of the Birmingham Development Plan 2017.
2026/03219/PA	74 Pilkington Avenue, Birmingham, B72 1LQ Erection of single storey rear extension and two storey front extension. Installation of dormer windows to the front and rear and conversion existing hip roof to gable end and new facing brickwork	Objection: Committee is concerned that the proposed increase in roof height and 2 storey front glass extension would result in an incongruous feature on the streetscene and should be refused.
2026/03240/PA	23 Wylde Green Road, Birmingham, B72 1HD Variation of condition number 1 (approved plans) attached to planning approval 2026/01855/PA for incorporation of gablets, design changes to porch and bay windows and alterations to games room including its extension	No Objection
2026/03321/PA	59 Brooks Road, Birmingham, B72 1HR Creation of first floor and roof replacement. Erection of single storey front extension and single storey rear extension	Objection: Whilst Committee does not object to the proposed extensions and remodelling, it is considered that the proposed extended area of front paving should be reduced in size and/or constructed out of permeable material to reduce surface water run off and retain the character of the street.

Resolved to submit comments and objections to Birmingham City Council.

(ii) **Schedules of Additional Planning Applications for Sutton Coldfield Town Council
Area registered between 30th July - 4th August 2026**

Four Oaks Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/03396/PA	17 Meadowside Road, Birmingham, B74 4SL Erection of two story side extension, enlarged dropped kerb and relocation of lamppost	Whilst Committee has no objection to the proposed extension, clarification is required on the air source heat pump which appears to be shown on the plans. In particular whether the proposal falls within permitted development or will require a future planning application.

Reddicap Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/03436/PA	5 Granary Lane, Birmingham, B76 1SW Erection of single storey rear extension, porch extension to front and garage conversion to habitable room	No Objection

Vesey Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/03411/PA	Sutton Coldfield Sea Cadets, Stonehouse Road, Birmingham, B73 6LH Removal of Conditions 3 (Surface Water Drainage) and 4 (Operation and Maintenance of Sustainable Drainage System) and variation of Condition 2 (Approved Plans) attached to planning permission 2023/05518/PA, approved on 12/02/2024, for the demolition of	No Objection

existing shipbuilding and temporary buildings and the construction of a new land-based shipbuilding facility together with site-wide external works

Resolved to submit comments and objections to Birmingham City Council.

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

36 Date of Next Meeting

Tuesday 1st September 2026, 6pm Trinity Centre.

Meeting closed: 19:35

Signed:

Date: