



## Minutes of Planning Committee

7 January 2026 at 5.05pm at Sandwell Council House, Oldbury

**Present:**

| Councillors:   | Councillors: |
|----------------|--------------|
| Millar (Chair) | Loan         |
| Chidley        | Piper        |
| Cotterill      | Tromans      |
| Horton         | Webb         |
| Kaur           | Weston       |

**Apologies:** No apologies received.

**Also present:** Alison Bishop (Development Planning Manager), Simon Smith (Planning Solicitor), Simon Chadwick (Highway Network Development and Road Safety Manager), Andy Thorpe (Healthy Urban Development Officer), William Stevens (Principal Planner), Carl Mercer (Principal Planner) and Anthony Lloyd (Democratic Services Officer).

Meeting ended at 7.08pm

1/26

### Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

2/26

### Minutes

**Resolved** that the minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 2025 are approved as a correct record.

3/26

### Extension to duration of the meeting

**Resolved** that, in accordance with paragraph 8.3.2 of Part 2.7 of the Council's Constitution, the duration of the meeting is extended to allow sufficient time for matters that are required by law to be determined at the meeting to be considered in full.

4/26

**Planning Application DC/25/70672 – Proposed single/ two story side and single storey rear extensions with parking to front to increase from a 3 No. bedroom house in multiple occupation (HMO) to 5 No. bedroom HMO at 110 Ashtree Road Oldbury, B69 2HB.**

The Development Planning Manager highlighted to members that there was an anomaly as to whether the applicant owned part of the land in question. Although applicants were not required to own the land to submit a planning application, they were required to make a correct declaration when submitting their plans. In this instance, it was unclear whether the applicant owned the land and therefore, whether or not they had followed the correct process.

**Resolved** that consideration of Planning Application DC/25/70672 – 110 Ashtree Road Oldbury, B69 2HB (Proposed single/ two story side and single storey rear extensions with parking to front to increase from a 3 No. bedroom house un multiple occupation (HMO) to 5 No. bedroom HMO) is deferred to clarify land ownership.

5/26

**Planning Application DC/25/70770 – Proposed change of use from dwellinghouse (Class C3) to residential home for up to four children (under 18 years of age) (Class C2) and use of the existing lodge for one child (under 18 years of age) for a transition unit in preparation for independent living (Class C2) at The Roundhouse, Reservoir Passage, Wednesbury WS10 9DH.**

In accordance with Section 9.1 of Part 4.5 of the Council's Constitution, only Councillors Millar, Chidley, Cotterill, Horton, Kaur, Piper and Webb could vote on this application.

Neither the applicant nor the objector(s) were at the meeting.

Following a site visit, members were satisfied with the proposals and were minded to approve the application, subject to the conditions recommended by the Executive Director-Place.

**Resolved** that Planning Application DC/25/70770 – The Roundhouse, Reservoir Passage, Wednesbury WS10 9DH (Proposed change of use from dwellinghouse (Class C3) to residential home for up to four children (under 18 years of age) (Class C2) and use of the existing lodge for one child (under 18 years of age) for a transition unit in preparation for independent living (Class C2)) is approved, subject to the following conditions relating to:-

- I) site management scheme;
- II) restrictions of use of the children's home;
- III) details of external lighting;
- IV) cycles storage details;
- V) parking laid out and retained, and
- VI) security plan.

6/26

**Planning Application DC/25/70818 – Retention of two and single storey rear extensions at 7 Limes Avenue Rowley, Rowley Regis B65 8AZ.**

The applicant was not in attendance at the meeting.

Members were advised that the applicant had previously obtained planning permission for ground and first floor extensions across two separate applications but had implemented both consents at the same time.

The single storey extension of 6 metres in projection was deemed permitted development under PD/24/02799 and had been amalgamated with a two-storey extension approved under planning application DC/24/70030.

This action thereby had made both permissions unauthorised. The applicant was now applying to retain the combined extensions. As the two separate elements had previously been approved, it failed to assess the cumulative impact of the development as built. The single storey element would have been ordinarily deemed to impact on the amenity of the adjoining properties; however, the initial permitted development application was not objected to at the time and therefore was classed as permitted development.

Objectors were present at the meeting and raised the following concerns to the Committee;

- the main concern was in relation to the rear extension and not the front extension;
- the structure was out of character for the area; and
- the structure was 400m higher than what had been agreed.

Following further discussions, members were of the opinion that a site visit, to better understand the layout and size of the structure, would be beneficial.

**Resolved** that consideration of Planning Application DC/25/70818 – 7 Limes Avenue Rowley, Rowley Regis B65 8AZ (Retention of two and single storey rear extensions) is deferred to allow members to visit the site.

7/26

**Planning Application DC/25/70997 – Proposed industrial unit (Use Class E(g)(iii) with ancillary offices and associated parking at Land at Summerton Road, Oldbury.**

Neither the applicant nor the objector was in attendance at the meeting.

The Development Planning Manager highlighted that the application had been presented to the Committee because the proposal would be a departure from the Development Plan. The site formed part of a wider residential allocation however, it was highlighted that the proposed

development would not prevent the delivery of the remainder of the residential allocation in the future, subject to limiting the use of the site to Use Class E(g)(iii).

The Health and Safety Executive had not objected to the proposals and the Council's Environmental Health team had recommended conditions, such as a construction management plan, to mitigate concerns. The Canal and River Trust had also been consulted and had not raised any objections subject to conditions.

Members were minded to approve the application, subject to the conditions recommended by the Executive Director-Place. Members were also minded to approve a departure from the Development Plan for this application.

**Resolved:-**

- (1) That Planning Application DC/25/70997 – Land at Summerton Road, Oldbury (Proposed industrial unit (Use Class E(g)(iii) with ancillary offices and associated parking) is approved subject to conditions relating to:-
  - i. external materials;
  - ii. biodiversity net gain credits;
  - iii. contamination;
  - iv. archaeological assessment;
  - v. Japanese Knotweed management plan;
  - vi. boundary treatments;
  - vii. landscaping;
  - viii. drainage;
  - ix. cycle storage;
  - x. waste storage;
  - xi. external lighting;
  - xii. Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP);
  - xiii. ecological enhancement measures;
  - xiv. trees protected/retained in accordance with submitted plan;
  - xv. parking laid out and retained;
  - xvi. dropped kerb;
  - xvii. restriction to minor industrial process uses only
- (2) that approval is given to make an exception to the Development Plan in respect of Planning Application DC/25/70997 for a proposed industrial unit (Class E(g)(iii)) with ancillary offices and associated parking.

**Planning Application DC/25/71049 – Retention of single storey rear extension at 76 Hales Crescent, Smethwick, B67 6QS.**

The Development Planning Manager highlighted that the property was Council-owned and that works had been carried out without the consent of the Planning Department. As such, if the application were to be refused, the Council's Housing Department would be responsible for the removal of the structure.

The applicant's representative was in attendance at the meeting and addressed the Committee with the following:-

- the applicant had extended the property to accommodate their autistic children as it provided a space for therapy, which was something that had been allegedly recommended by CAMHS;
- the applicant was not aware that planning permission was required for the size of the extension that was constructed;
- after legal advice from a planner the applicant had started following the process accordingly.

Objectors were present at the meeting and raised the following concerns to the committee:-

- the constructed wall was dangerous;
- the drainage on the extension flooded into the neighbour's garden;
- the outer wall leaned outwards;
- the outer wall was unsightly and not in keeping with the character of the area.

Members wished to visit the site to appreciate the concerns raised by the objectors.

**Resolved** that consideration of Planning Application DC/25/71049 – 76 Hales Crescent, Smethwick, B67 6QS (Retention of single storey rear extension) is deferred to allow members to visit the site.

**Planning Application DC/25/71073 – Retrospective demolition of building, and proposed erection of 8. no self-contained flats at Doctors Surgery, 33 Newton Road, Great Barr B43 6AA.**

The Development Planning Manager highlighted that Planning permission had historically been granted for proposed change of use to eight self-contained flats, two storey front extension, single and two storey side extension, loft conversion with dormers to front and side in 2024 and that no objections had been received. However, during works at the site, the applicant had demolished the existing building. As such, approval was required and now sought for demolition and construction of a new building to the same footprint and for the same number of flats.

An objector was present at the meeting and raised the following issues to the Committee:-

- parking issues were common in the area and the car park had struggled to accommodate the doctor's surgery when it was in use;
- heavy traffic passed through the area due to the adjacent dual-carriageway;
- residents in the area were worried about crime and that the introduction of 8 self contained flats may increase anti-social behaviour in the area.

In response to questions, it was clarified that the bin storage facilities proposed were sufficient for the number of flats. It was also confirmed that the parking spaces provided were adequate and in-line with the Council's guidelines. The Highways officer stated that there would be a reduction in the amount of traffic entering and leaving the site when compared to what would be expected at a doctor's surgery.

Following further discussions, members wished to visit the site to better understand the concerns around parking and traffic in the area.

**Resolved** that consideration of Planning Application DC/25/71073

– Doctors Surgery, 33 Newton Road, Great Barr B43 AA (Retrospective demolition of building, and proposed erection of 8. no self-contained flats) is deferred to allow members to attend a site visit.

10/26

**Planning Application DC/25/71112 – Proposed change of use from residential dwelling to residential care home for up to 4 No. young people at 84 Gorsty Hill Road, Rowley Regis B65 0HA.**

The Development Planning Manager highlighted that no objections had been received from the relevant consultees however, the Council's Highways Department had requested an additional condition requiring submission of a cross-section plan showing the gradient of the parking area for approval. The condition aimed to provide a safe and accessible parking area in the interests of highway safety.

The applicant was in attendance at the meeting and presented the following to the Committee:-

- the applicant had experience with care homes and had operated a care home which had been rated "Good" by OFSTED;
- adequate parking was available at the site;
- the home would be no different from a normal home and professionals would be in place to ensure that the home operated correctly;
- the care home would provide a safe environment for vulnerable children, particularly those in the local area.

No objectors were present at the meeting.

Members were minded to approve the application, subject to the conditions recommended by the Executive Director-Place.

**Resolved** that Planning Application DC/25/71112 – 84 Gorsty Hill Road, Rowley Regis B65 0HA (proposed change of use from residential dwelling to residential care home for up to 4 No. young people) is approved subject to the conditions relating to:-

- (1) management plan;
- (2) front boundary wall removed, parking laid out and retained;
- (3) vehicle crossover;
- (4) the premises shall be used only as a residential home for four children and for no other purpose (including any other use falling within Class C2 of the Order) but may revert back to C3 (dwellinghouses) on cessation of the C2 use;
- (5) before the development is brought into use a cross-section plan showing the gradient of the parking area shall be submitted and approved in writing by the local highway authority. The parking area shall be constructed in accordance with the approved cross-section plan before the development is brought into use.

11/26

**Planning Application DC/25/71117 – Proposed single storey rear extension, first floor side extension, and loft conversion with dormer to the rear at 120 Scott Road, Great Barr B43 6JU.**

The applicant was not in attendance at the meeting.

Objectors were present at the meeting and raised the following concerns:-

- the scale of the development was too large, and the proposed plans would invade the privacy of neighbours;
- the proposal would result in a loss of light for neighbours;
- the proposal would be out of character for the area which was predominantly populated with bungalows.

The Development Planning Manager highlighted that the separation distance was 34 metres which exceeded the 27-metre requirement. It was noted that one of the windows created would be obscured, with an additional window serving an additional bedroom. This window would not be obscured but would be fitting for the type of development proposed.

Members appreciated the concerns of the objectors however, they considered that there were no material planning concerns to warrant refusal and that the scaled down dormer was appropriate in relation to the size of the roof. As such, members were minded to approve the application, subject to the conditions recommended by the Executive Director-Place.

**Resolved** that Planning Application DC/25/71117 – 120 Scott Road, Great Barr B43 6JU (Proposed single storey rear extension, first floor side extension, and loft conversion with dormer to the rear) is approved subject to approval of external materials.

## Decisions of the Planning Inspectorate

The Committee noted the decisions of the Planning Inspectorate in relation to appeals against refusal of planning permission as follows:-

| Application Ref | Site Address                                | Inspectorate Decision |
|-----------------|---|-----------------------|
| DC/25/70567     | 74 Stanley Road Oldbury<br>B68 0EG          | Dismissed             |
| DC/23/68374     | 134 Franchise Street<br>Wednesbury WS10 9RG | Dismissed             |
| DC/25/70619     | 48 Parsons Hill Oldbury<br>B68 9BS          | Dismissed             |
| DC/25/70456     | 50 Parsons Hill Oldbury<br>B68 9BS          | Dismissed             |

## Applications Determined Under Delegated Powers

The Committee noted the applications determined under delegated powers by the Executive Director – Place, under powers delegated to them, as set out in the Council's Constitution.