

Planning Advisory Group

Provisional notes

Thursday 20th. November 2025

Hartlebury Parish Hall Committee Room

Meeting 7.0p.m.

1.) Apologies.....None....

2.) Matters arising.....Enforcement request sent via clerk re Sandalls Cottage. Reply indicates planning have asked for a new application to cover the changes from the approved application. Yet to send Shorthill Caravan Site observations.

3.) Current applications-

W/25/02531/NMA re W/24/01707/FUL

Titton Farm

W/25/02383/OUT

Argate Farm- Parsons Lane

Permanent Rural worker dwelling – self build

PAG recommend Approval – supporting a local business

W/25/02304/LB

Waresley Grange, Worcester Road – Roof repair and tile replacement

PAG recommend Approval – LB maintenance

W/25/00597/OUT

Station Park (20 dwellings)

PAG has nothing add as a result of this update.

W/25/01088/OUT

De Beers (24 dwellings)

Hartlebury Parish Council has objected to these proposals. The latest changes are a slight improvement but we still have serious problems with this application. PAG would like the Council to add the following observations.

The recognition that this site is 'free-standing' – a stand alone development in a rural setting is important. The Highway Authority therefore considers that the proposed development would be car dependant will make it challenging to make sustainable in Highway and Transport terms. The fact that the application used 'edge of town' and 'suburban' to calculate car flows is indicative of the way that biased information is included to promote the application. We have already pointed out that the impact on car flows will be far greater than implied in the application documents.

The idea of a pedestrian crossing on a busy, fast flowing 'A' road is in itself problematic as it is on a bend. The single lane each way is already making the junction confusing. The Traffic Authority seems to be in two minds about the necessity for a pedestrian crossing should the proposal go ahead.

School transport is impossible on foot. The T.A. ask for contributions. What is this for? Creating and maintaining footpaths to Hartlebury Primary School/ Stourport High School. Can't be done without materially affecting the area. Is there a guarantee from W.C.C. to provide transport for prospective pupils to and from this development and what form would it take? £83K goes where? As for a £4.7K contribution to on demand transport to work?! How would that work?

Drainage has been an issue at the Charlton Lane and A449 junction at the bottom of the slope from De Beers as seen on Tuesday the 18th November with a flood depth of nearly 6" on the main road. Fordbrook Cottage is an appropriate name. In the now added Meridian report dense sandstone prevented one of the bore holes going to the required depth and none were drilled at the base of the slope.

The bat survey is limited to what looks like the bungalow rather than the whole site so is not considered by as a complete site survey.

With regard to the new proposed layout, it creates it's own problems. There are driveways almost directly onto the junctions of a fast major arterial road. The units that are practically on the junction (4,5,6&7) are dangerously close. Units 14,15&16 are on the service road bend and units 19-24 close to Summerway Lane junction. These new proposals will now need to be re-evaluated by Highways.

Hartlebury has no street lights and is a dark sky area by design. There are few exceptions to this mostly along the A449 south of Hartlebury on the dual carriageway sections.

The suggested ghost island would involve widening the A449 for a central lane. It is also noted that the turn into Charlton Lane looks like it has been widened to take up land from Fordbrook Cottage's garden.

The footpath between Kidderminster and Hartlebury has not been adequately maintained by W.C.C. for some time. Currently there are trees across the path in 4 places. There is no way residents will walk from this site.

Due to the layout changes some of the other reports are now out of date or no longer appropriate.

Much of the report is about noise and the effect on proposed residents. The revised plans require acoustic fencing, because the buildings are so close to the main road. There is no assessment of the noise likely to be generated on site by the proposed development residents (100 approximately) on the existing immediate and close current residents and the local wildlife. There must be research available to enable planners to assess this as part of the proposal. Why is this not demanded and included.

To summarise, to drop an urban style high density development into a rural setting without infrastructure to support it is a bad idea and we strongly oppose this application. A better solution would be 3 or 4 larger self build houses and a couple of smaller cottages with access as far from the junction as possible.

4.) A.O.B.

Proposed Delegation Policy and how it affects Planning.

Updated planning framework training report

Date and time of next meeting.....Thursday 22nd January 2026 7.00p.m.

(4th Thursday due to the way the dates fall)

Please check and add comments