

Hi all

I hope I have covered everything on the agenda. The final wording has just been agreed by the PAG.

There maybe residents wishing to speak about the Old Worcester Road application during questions.

Here are our recommendations.

Planning Advisory Group

Minutes

Thursday 26th March 2026

Hartlebury Parish Hall Committee Room

7.00p.m.

1.) Apologies.....None

2.) Matters arising.....difficulty contacting planning officers

3.) Current applications-

Back to a more usual number of applications!

00492/PIP Inn Lane- 7dwellings

Considerable discussion took place. PIP is always a difficult process to engage with and especially in this case due to lack of detail and clarity.

There were many concerns about this application.

PAG recommends a strong objection to this proposal which lacks detail and is full of assertions that we challenge with the following observations.

1. Loss of green space which is essential to the health and well being of parishioners. The site is not infill and is outside the settlement boundary. SWDP2 only supports infill within the boundary.
2. Highways and access. The visibility claim is not proved due to the curve in the lane and the vehicular speeds. Considerable extra traffic would be generated. Additional turning movements increase risks on a narrow lane. Construction traffic will cause safety and disruption issues.
3. Sustainability. Inn Lane has limited pedestrian infrastructure (narrow pavements and no continuous footway). Walking routes to services are not safe for all users, especially older residents or children. Public transport frequency is limited – the NPPF requires genuine alternatives to the car.
4. Landscape and character impact. The site borders open land and therefore contributes to the rural setting of this part of the village. The SHELLA notes (CFS0371) refer to a new access adversely affecting the character of Inn Lane
5. Twice in this application Hartlebury is referred to as a town. The number of dwellings proposed seems to be overdevelopment in this part of the village. Quality of design has not been evidenced as there is no design in the application.

02579/FUL Charlton Mill -Commercial Vehicle hardstanding etc.

The site is partially within the conservation area of Hartlebury village and castle. PAG thinks this should be protected from development. The Mill itself is an historic feature dwelling of unusual construction the view of which should not be obstructed by commercial activity. The PAG therefore recommends objection to this application on the following grounds-

1. The activity on site is too visually imposing for the Conservation Area.
2. The maintenance of the motor homes will involve pollution through cleaning, disposal of effluent, etc. with no adequate provision proposed for these activities.
3. The application does not limit the number of motorhomes to be accommodated or the number of clients vehicles to be parked on site whilst they are away.
4. The application confuses the use of outbuildings between purely domestic use and commercial use such as offices, storage of materials, storage of gas cylinders etc..
5. No vehicle washing space has been identified with the appropriate drainage

6. The site has been purely domestic for a considerable time and can therefore not be considered as 'grey'.

00484/FUL Moors Farm -Day Nursery Retrospective

The PAG looked carefully at this application and have no objection

00528/FUL Perry Farm Dog Barn

The PAG has no objection to repurposing of the barn

00569/HP School Lodge, Wilson Road –Extensions

The PAG has no objection

00558/HP Parkfield Place – Inn Lane – single storey side extension

The plans are a little confusing due to unusual access and restricted space.

The PAG recommend that we ask Planning to request an access statement to be prepared for the works needed due to the narrow lane, the joint access and limited parking so that disruption can be minimised. Otherwise no objection

00453/HP 1 New Park House – demolish wooden garage and outbuilding to replace with new garage and gym/games room.

This is in the Hartlebury Village conservation area.

The PAG think this is an overdevelopment in terms of size and the style of building with large windows on 3 sides that doesn't really fit in with its surrounding buildings.

00631/FUL Land off Old Worcester Road – 41 dwellings

This is a major development and combined with others applications coming through would make a vast difference to our community.

Our main objection is the lack of infrastructure development for Hartlebury. The argument that we are a CATEGORY 1 village, largely because of the outlying station, is being used to justify the development without a joined up plan to ensure the sustainability of services the increased population should demand.

## Ref-Hartlebury Parish Plan and village design statement.

1.2 It is important to retain a suitable village boundary to protect against sprawl.

A section provides - Recommendations for developers

2.5 Any development that needs landscaping to disguise or hide it, is not worthy of being in Hartlebury

2.12 It is recommended that the cartilage of dwellings within the village should be spacious. Hartlebury distinctively does not have higher density housing at the heart of the village- this sense of space and openness needs to be maintained.

2.13 Further re-inforcing the 'hard edge' (A449) to the village by permitting high density housing on the outskirts should be avoided. Any further housing development on the edge of the villageshould not create enclosed housing estates.

2.16 The village has never had street lighting and maintaining this policy has been part of developments to date and this should be retained.

## The proposed Travel Plan

This describes good practice over and over, but is light on delivery and is extremely misleading. It relies on potential site developments and infrastructure provided by other organisations. Experience shows this is not happening in Hartlebury. In fact amenities continue to decline. For a cat1 village we have no doctors or dentists surgeries, or indeed any other NHS presence. The station is not staffed, there is already inadequate parking with cars parked on Station Road and no provision for bicycles. The status of the proposed Travel Plan Co-ordinator is not clear! Is it a full time post? Where will they be based? The Travel Plan seems to be no more than signposting. The Travel Plan suggests working from home will reduce car journeys. Is that even possible with the poor mobile and broadband provision? Monitoring of the TP is unlikely to be effective, with no consequences if it fails.

The affordable housing need for Hartlebury has not been satisfactorily demonstrated though there are District and County pressures to meet targets. Historically affordable housing appears to have been allocated to people from outside the parish, mostly from the neighbouring district of Wyre Forest where there is much more demand for affordable housing. The age distribution of Hartlebury and its character are being altered by high density developments such as this.

The figures quoted for affordable demand are conflated and apply to District and County overall totals rather than Hartlebury local demand. The consultation survey revealed a rejection of some of the sites design aspiration with current residents opposed to the density of affordable housing on an estate based footprint. New build in Hartlebury should have variety of style rather than conformity and blandness.

Solar panels should be fitted to every dwelling and heatpumps should be the standard heating method.

## Summary

The PAG objects to these proposals for the following reasons

1. there is no visitor parking and the basic minimum allowable per household will not meet residents needs resulting in off road parking and a car dominated landscape
2. Local facilities are inadequate for the increase in population, specifically NHS provision amongst others.
3. Public transport is inadequate especially in the evenings and on Sundays.
4. The density of the building is deemed overdevelopment for its village location.

## 00414/FUL Sandall Cottage

This is being proposed via an amendment to condition 2 and involves a complete revision of the main design. The original plan was for a domestic dwelling and garden curtilage with the remaining land returned to horticultural use, maintaining protection for the green belt. See the latest adopted SDWP policies. The approved plan in 2021 increased the size of the original house (yet to be demolished), by approximately 50%. Now this new proposal increases the size by a further 43%. A total of at least 219% larger than the original house. PAG consider this to be over development from the original proposal.

The changes should have been subject to the usual negotiation with the planning office about what was acceptable and whether or not further permissions should be sought prior to building. Before this new application is considered the status of the other conditions of the 2021 approval should be checked and up to date surveys for the 2026 application should be sought.

The PAG recommends an objection to this application.

A.O.B.

Date and time of next meeting.....Thursday 23rd April 2025 7.00p.m.

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

