



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 2 MARCH 2026 AT
7.30 PM AT KEMPSEY COMMUNITY CENTRE**

PRESENT: Cllr Gardener, Cllr Biddle, Cllr Cooke, Cllr Clamp, Cllr Plummer, Cllr Stevens & Cllr White

IN ATTENDANCE: Claire Witton - Deputy Clerk, Cllr Harrison and one member of the public

The meeting commenced at 7.36pm

1. Apologies None

2. Declarations of Interest

- i. Register of Interests: Councillors were reminded of the need to update their register of interests.
- ii. To declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests in items on the agenda and their nature –
NONE
- iii. To declare any Other Disclosable Interests on items on the agenda and their nature NONE

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Notes from Public Question Time are appended to these minutes.

3. Minutes:

Having been previously circulated, the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 02.02.2025 were signed as a true and accurate record.

Matters Arising: It was noted that Cllr Gardener had submitted comments on the SWDPR Main Modifications consultation.

4. The following planning applications were considered:

Planning Application No: **M/26/00020/LB. Associated Ref:M/26/00021/FUL**

Location: Clerkenleap Farm House, Bath Road, Broomhall, Worcester, WR5 3HR

Proposal: Works to facilitate change of use of offices (Class E) into three dwellings (Class C3)

Comments: In relation to both M/26/00020/LB and M/26/00021/FUL, we have **No Objection** to the principle of the change of use of the farmhouse into three dwellings units or the manner of the sub-division of the building. However, in view of the findings of the Inspector on the recent appeal, notably referring to the lack of clarity and detail in the previous scheme (DL 21–25), there are a number of matters which show either inconsistency or lack of necessary information to allow proper assessment. In particular:

- a. The West Wing dwelling shows Bedrooms 1 and 3 but not 2. It is assumed that this would be the mezzanine floor proposed to be inserted in the ‘barn’. It is not clear what the space under the mezzanine is since it is not shown.
- b. The access to the mezzanine is shown to be a spiral staircase on Dwg 05 P1 and a conventional staircase with winders on Dwg 05 P2.
- c. The relationship of the mezzanine floor with the king post truss is singularly lacking in detail. The floor level is not shown, nor is it apparent whether the form of the truss would be visible from the ground floor should a cross wall be intended to close off the mezzanine. The truss should be exposed as an important companion to the other truss which is shown to remain.
- d. Overall on this insertion, the submitted Heritage Statement refers to the fact that “... any specific impacts on the existing fabric related to this addition is unknown” (p9). That should not be the case.
- e. The Garden Door to the West Wing differs between elevation Dwgs 04 P2 and 04 P3.

- f. The treatment of the cellar floors, walls and ceilings to Bedroom 3 to the West Wing and the cellar Amenity to the East Wing to make them habitable/usable is not shown.
- g. Despite the numerous kitchen, en-suite and wc insertions, there is no indication of how waste water, in particular, is to be disposed of either internally or externally on the proposed elevations.

In relation to M/26/00021/FUL, having noted the comments of the Inspector on the previous scheme for 2 dwellings and the importance he attached to the immediate setting of the listed Farmhouse being retained intact, we nevertheless have **No Objection** to a single new dwelling within the grounds in the position proposed.

However, we **Object** to the extent and proportions of the folding, glazed doors on the north elevation facing the Farmhouse, which are considered inappropriate in this historic setting and have little or no relevance or resonance with the 'converted barn' approach adopted.

In addition, we stress the highly important need for the careful selection of facing, roofing and joinery materials to relation to the nearby listed Farmhouse, a matter also referred to by the Inspector when rejecting the previous scheme. We also noted that the internal staircase would unfortunately span across the glazed, supposed threshing barn feature on the south elevation.

Planning Application No: **M/26/00103/HP**

Location: 1 Centurion Drive, Kempsey, WORCESTER, WR5 3NR

Proposal: Remove section of 2m high Acoustic fence and replace with 2m high close boarded fence (retrospective)

Comments: Objection on the grounds that the proposed revised fence, retrospective in part only and replacement in part, is similarly harmful to the character and appearance of the area as the existing fence which has been found unacceptable and is subject to an extant enforcement notice.

In particular, and collectively:

- a. Both the retained and proposed fence are too high and dominant in the streetscene. They should at least be reduced to 1.8m in height.
- b. The proposed replacement fence projects forward of the main house frontage facing Centurion Drive and would continue to be an overly intrusive feature. It should at least align with the main house frontage.
- c. The retained fence continues to be too close and over-dominant alongside the footway to the A38. It should at least be realigned to be parallel with the back edge of the footway and set sufficiently far back to allow the planting of a meaningful and effective hedgerow to continue the line of the retained hedgerow to the south.

In addition, we continue to be concerned that, despite the proposed partial realignment, the fence would continue to obstruct visibility to and from vehicles and pedestrians emerging from Centurion Drive onto the A38. This has been seen to be hazardous for school children rushing to cross the road to the new bus stop on the opposite side. We consider it imperative that the Highway Authority be consulted to ensure that any fence on this corner plot is sited to ensure adequate and safe visibility for all road users.

Planning Application No: **M/26/00193/FUL**

Location: Malbre House, 3-5 Main Road, Kempsey, Worcester, WR5 3PA

Proposal: Change of use from former B&B into a motor vehicle sales Garage (sui generis) (incorporating office and meeting room with extensions to form workshop and sales room) in association with the adjoining business and 2 bedroom flat at first floor with associated parking.

Comments: The site and adjoining garage, which the proposal would extend and enlarge, are outside the Kempsey Village Development Boundary and in the open countryside for policy purposes. Policy K14 of the Kempsey Neighbourhood Plan generally supports proposals to extend existing employment sites outside the village development boundary. However, such support is subject to there being no significant adverse impact on, for instance, local roads, residential amenity, enjoyment of the countryside and the landscape.

In this instance we **Object** to the proposed change of use and the facilitating works for the following reasons:

- a. The proposal when added to the existing garage complex would create an excessively expansive and intrusive commercial presence further detracting from the rural character of the area. This would be particularly apparent when viewed from the A38, a significant approach to the village of Kempsey.
- b. This effect would be exacerbated by
 - i. the scale and appearance of the proposed showroom addition because of both its built form and overly large and dominating display windows. Neither respect nor accord with the otherwise continued domestic appearance of the former Malbre hotel which has been largely retained in the remainder of the conversion scheme.
 - ii. the added light pollution and intrusion resulting from the proposed lighting columns and inevitable further illumination from the showroom which, from experience of the existing showroom premises, would add to the already excessive level of lighting in this otherwise dark countryside setting.
 - iii. the opening up of the frontage to full view, which is currently comprised of various fencing much of which is overgrown and has the appearance of hedgerow which is complementary of the rural situation and helps screen the site.

Overall, the proposal would have significantly adverse consequences for the enjoyment of the countryside, cause added intrusion into the landscape and, particularly in respect of the resulting additional levels of illumination, loss of amenity for nearby residents. As such, it fails to meet the requirements of Policy K14 and, particularly in respect of the added showroom, the design objectives of SWDP 21.

Planning Application No: **M/26/00226/HP**.

Location: 2 Brook End Cottages, Brookend Lane, Kempsey, Worcester, WR5 3LF

Proposal: Erection of single storey extension and balcony.

Comments: No objection although we note the added window in the south gable which, if it is to facilitate a further bedroom in the roof, may have implications for the number of car parking spaces required.

FOR INFORMATION ONLY:

Planning Application No: **M/25/01663/HP** and associated application **M/25/01662**

Location: Manor House, 32 Old Road North, Kempsey, Worcester, WR5 3JZ

Proposal: Restoration and extension of garage to create a separate annex for the occupant's parent.

Application APPROVED

Planning Application No: **M/25/01778/LB**

Location: Talbot Inn, 87 Main Road, Kempsey, Worcester, WR5 3JA

Proposal: Rebuild boundary wall

Application APPROVED

Planning Application No: **21/01217/FUL**

Location: Broomhall Bath Road Broomhall Worcester WR5 3HS

Proposal: Full planning application for demolition of the existing buildings and the erection of 48 affordable homes, including associated vehicular access, car parking, landscaping and other associated works.

Application APPROVED

5. To consider and comment on updates on the following applications:

Planning Application No: **21/01217/FUL**

Location: Land At (Os 8550 5099) Bath Road Broomhall

Proposal: Proposed construction of 70 dwellings (100% affordable), including a mix of one, two, three and four bedroom properties, and the construction of new internal roads, private drives, parking, SUDs infrastructure and Green Infrastructure (including public open space). The proposal also

includes the proposed construction of a new highway footpath along the A38 to Broomhall Lane and pedestrian crossing on the A38

Description of documents published: Temporary Site Access

Comments: Item reported on as an approved application

Planning Application No: **M/22/00714/FUL**

Location: Broomhall Bath Road Broomhall Worcester WR5 3HS

Proposal: Full planning application for demolition of the existing buildings and the erection of 48 affordable homes, including associated vehicular access, car parking, landscaping and other associated works.

Description of documents published:

-Aidan Smyth – MHDC Archaeology & Planning Advisor

-Urban Design Consultation

-Urban Design Consultation - MHDC & WDC Urban Design

-MHDC Ecology response

Comments: Item not reported on as no significant additional information had been submitted.

6. To discuss any additional plans requiring comment up to the date of this meeting.

None

7. To discuss comments for the Public Consultation for Development at Abbotswood Ridge Neighbourhood (south)(Land at Os 8952 4900, Abbotswood Road, Kempsey

Members received an overview of the proposed development, part of the future Wychavon Town new settlement within the South Worcestershire Development Plan Review's Spatial Strategy. It was noted that:

- a. The proposal lies wholly outside Kempsey Parish, and
- b. It has no direct impact on the parish or its residents beyond that already committed by the SWDPR.

Decision: No formal comments required to be made.

8. For Information – Draft Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule

Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule

The draft schedule had set out increases to the charges in the existing schedule, the charges being made on a variety of proposed development types as contributions towards providing the necessary infrastructure to support the development. The consultation report also summarised the distinction between CIL contributions and development related requirements secured through s106 legal agreements.

The committee was informed that the Consultation had closed at midday but in any event decided that No Further Action was required.

9. For Information and discussion– Proposed reform to the National Planning Policy Framework

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/national-planning-policy-framework-proposed-reforms-and-other-changes-to-the-planning-system>

A report had been circulated before the meeting which outlined some of the changes proposed to the NPPF. The consultation draft is an extensive document which not only sets out and explains the purpose behind the reform but seeks responses to 225 questions.

The committee noted a number of the proposed changes, notably:

- a. A move to National Spatial Development Strategies focused on genuinely strategic, cross-boundary issues, leaving detailed policy to other plans such as Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans.
- b. A significant shift toward National Development Management Policies which would apply everywhere. As such they would not need to be repeated in locally prepared plans but would have to be taken into account when preparing such plans. They would also be highly significant when deciding planning applications. However, the government has decided to not yet make them statutory requirements, although the inference is that is likely if the anticipated improvements to decision making is not forthcoming.

- c. At a more local and direct level, the importance of retaining development boundaries for settlements and thereby distinguishing between ‘town’ and ‘country’ remains, as does the same policy intention that only specified development would normally be permitted in the countryside. However, where there is not a 5-year housing land supply, the presumption in favour of allowing sustainable development even outside development boundaries would continue to apply.

The consultation ends on 16 March 2026. While the emerging new NPPF has potentially significant and far-reaching consequences for both plan making and development application decisions in the future, committee decided that the scale and complexity of the changes are such that a meaningful response could not be made within the remaining available time.

Decision: No formal response to be submitted.

10. Any Other Business.

None

Meeting Closed at 9.57 pm.

Signed Chairman..... Date.....

Standing Orders were adjourned.

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

A member of the public raised a concern regarding fencing works to the north of and near to the village which indicated how close the urban extension would be and consequently the importance of maintaining the “significant gap”. Cllr Gardener pointed out that the gap is to be retained in the SWDP Review and that objections had been made to the Open Barn Farm allocation as apart of KPC’s submitted comments on the Main Modifications.

A request was made for clarity on the exact siting of the proposed pump track in relation to the proposed development of the entire site. Members confirmed that the layout of the whole site, including the land earmarked for the pump track and skate park, is available via the planning application site layout plan and would be displayed at the pump track public consultation on the forthcoming Saturday 7th.

The replacement fence at The Limes was noted and the committee was informed by Cllr Harrison that works had been undertaken by Malvern Hills District Council, who owned the land, because of its poor condition. The opportunity was also taken to clear the undergrowth to help prevent antisocial behaviour concerns.

A resident highlighted that land levels had been raised by approximately 3ft at the Mill Meadows development on Brookend Lane potentially increasing flood risk downstream into the village. Water had also been observed flowing onto the road. Cllr Gardener pointed out that changes in land level were shown for the main spine road and that a condition had also imposed setting minimum ground floor levels for the houses which may have necessitated further localised raising of levels. Cllr Harrison said that the matter had already been reported to MHDC. Cllr Gardener would explore the planning permission further.