

UPDATE REPORTS

Planning Committee

Wed 11 Mar
2015
7.00 pm

Council Chamber
Town Hall
Redditch



www.redditchbc.gov.uk

Access to Information - Your Rights

The Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 widened the rights of press and public to attend Local Authority meetings and to see certain documents. Recently the Freedom of Information Act 2000, has further broadened these rights, and limited exemptions under the 1985 Act.

Your main rights are set out below:-

- Automatic right to attend all formal Council and Committee meetings unless the business would disclose confidential or “exempt” information.
 - Automatic right to inspect agendas and public reports at least five days before the date of the meeting.
 - Automatic right to inspect minutes of the Council and its Committees
- (or summaries of business undertaken in private) for up to six years following a meeting.
- Automatic right to inspect lists of background papers used in the preparation of public reports.
 - Access, on request, to the background papers on which reports are based for a period of up to four years from the date of the meeting.
 - Access to a public register stating the names and addresses and electoral areas of all Councillors with details of the membership of all Committees etc.
- A reasonable number of copies of agendas and reports relating to items to be considered in public must be made available to the public attending meetings of the Council and its Committees etc.
- Access to a list specifying those powers which the Council has delegated to its Officers indicating also the titles of the Officers concerned.
 - Access to a summary of the rights of the public to attend meetings of the Council and its Committees etc. and to inspect and copy documents.
 - In addition, the public now has a right to be present when the Council determines “Key Decisions” unless the business would disclose confidential or “exempt” information.
 - Unless otherwise stated, most items of business before the Executive Committee are Key Decisions.
 - Copies of Agenda Lists are published in advance of the meetings on the Council’s Website:

www.redditchbc.gov.uk

If you have any queries on this Agenda or any of the decisions taken or wish to exercise any of the above rights of access to information, please contact the following:

Janice Smyth
Democratic Services Officer
Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH
Tel: (01527) 64252 Ext. 3266 Fax: (01527) 65216
e.mail: janice.smyth@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk



PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 11 March 2015

7.00 pm

Council Chamber Town Hall

Agenda

Membership:

Cllrs: Andrew Fry (Chair) Wanda King
 Alan Mason (Vice-Chair) Yvonne Smith
 Joe Baker David Thain
 Roger Bennett Nina Wood-Ford
 Andrew Brazier

4. Update Reports

(Pages 1 - 2)

To note Update Reports (if any) for the Planning Applications to be considered at the meeting (circulated prior to the commencement of the meeting).

(Update Report 1 attached)

9. Article 4(1) Removal of Permitted Development Rights to Demolish (Part 31) - Confirmation - Chapel at the junction of Birchfield Road and Chapel Street, Headless Cross, Redditch

(Pages 3 - 12)

Head of Planning and Regeneration

To consider a report proposing the long term protection of a locally listed building considered to be of positive benefit to public amenity and a heritage asset in the wider public interest and therefore worthy of control in order to aim to achieve its retention in the longer term.

(Update Report 2 attached)

(Headless Cross & Oakenshaw Ward)

Redditch Borough Council
Planning Committee

Committee Updates
11th March 2015

2014/337/FUL Parklands Care Home , Callow Hill Lane

No Update

2014/368/FUL Ipsley Court, Berrington Close

No Update

2014/369/FUL Ipsley Court, Berrington Close

Public Consultations
Responses against

One further letter received in objection to the application. Comments received are covered by the summary within the main report

2015/003/FUL 324 Evesham Road, Redditch

No Update

Redditch Borough Council**Planning Committee – 11th March 2015****UPDATE REPORT (2)****Agenda Item 9 – Article 4(1) – Removal of Permitted Development Rights to Demolish (Part 31) – Confirmation****Chapel at Junction of Birchfield Road and Chapel Street, Headless Cross, Redditch**

The following comments and accompanying photographs were received by Officers from the owners of the property, as described above.

“Dear Sirs

I would like to make the following comments with respect to the report that has been prepared by Redditch Borough Council officers.

Point 3.1 “...although the potential liability is limited ...”

The statement is correct when referencing the timescale but should not be interpreted that either the likely hood or the size of a claim is limited; indeed the cost of a potential claim is substantial.

Point 3.4 “...It should be done in the public interest...”

When making the application to action the prior approval, a site notice was displayed. Our understanding was that there were no representations made to the council. We, as the owners, were approached by several local residents asking about our intentions. All the local residents were glad to see that finally something was being done with the local eyesore.

3.8 Working with the owners.

There was a meeting on the 30th Jan 2015, but we are still awaiting responses to questions that were raised.

Point 3.9 Summary of representation.

The public notice Redditch Borough Council issued, stated comments should be made by the 9th January 2015. There had been two representations submitted by the 9th January 2015, not three which has been indicated by the officers. There had been our justification of why this prior approval should be allowed, along with justification identifying that we had considered all possible alternative uses. The second representation was an objection.

“Potential harm to roosting bats”. *There are no bats roosting in the chapel or any history of such. As the proposed demolition is to be a manual hand by hand operation, if any bats were identified, we would have to take the appropriate action to protect the protected species.*

“Loss of a church for developer profit”. *There is a long history of the chapel failing to work and no demand for the chapel.*

“Congestion and noise to existing residents ...” *As the proposed demolition is to be a manual hand by hand operation, there should be minimal effect on the local residents.*

“Difficulty of parking on future developments.” *If the current use of the chapel was fully utilised, the potential of parking issues would be massive, as there is currently no parking. Any future use as residential would be a reduction in potential car movements.*

“Threats to board up...” *This was not a threat. As owners we are trying to reduce the potential liability as landlords.*

“No market demand...” *it is not to say that there is no demand, but a local estate agent was concerned with regards to the factors such as, unusual design, poor window areas and lack of outside space, as well as the inability to secure new home warranties. They did not think that we would be able to achieve a viable sale price.*

3.10 **Building control advice.**

There has been no mention of the joint meeting held on the 30th Jan 2015, where the Building Control Officer from Redditch was shown internal photographs. He was in agreement that the photographs showed signs of movement around the window and the large roof trusses, in addition to the end gable.

The Building Control Officer went on to comment that the current window would discount conversion to flats and that due to the height from the floor to the windows, would cause compliance issues with building control and fire regulations.

“Development plan. ...” *A report is scheduled to be considered at a forthcoming executive committee meeting.*

Redditch has a history of allowing building on the local listing to be demolished. Boxwood House, Park House and Headless Cross Methodist Church are all examples of this. The process that the Council has employed for the first time is against the previous policy of the council.

3.11 ...**“the response should be proportionate to the significance of the asset...”**

The permitted development rights have been allowed on more significant buildings as detailed above. During the consultation period there have been no significant complaints about the loss of the asset. If you look at the objection that came in, the resident was a local person that did not want further building in the area and had issues around parking. They did not talk in terms of saving an asset, concerns they had or the effect on the loss of the asset.

3.14

We believe that the usual Council procedure should have applied and the permitted development rights allowed. This system, that will cost the Council thousands in compensation, has not been published or even considered in public domain by the Council Committee. For the Council to change the historic approach, we believe a policy change should be required. The process should have been established and agreed by committee with a time line for publication and implementation; in order to give fair warning to property owners. The way that the council has blocked our permitted rights is unfair. There have clearly been other assets in the town that are of greater impact, which have not attracted this level of objection by officers. It is unclear why this chapel, one that has not been used for years and is far from unique; has justified the council to deploy such an unfair and costly response. “



Image 1: Shows the window height from the floor.



Image 2: Shows gable end wall cracking.




Image 3: Shows cracking on ceiling and wall.



Image 4: Joist showing signs of movement and spread.



Image 5: Shows wall cracking under weight of roof having effect onto windows.



Image 6: Shows cracking in roof joists.



Image 7: Shows roof joist supports cracking.



Image 8: Roof line shows a dip.



Image 9: End gable showing signs of movement.



Image 10: Rear view of chapel.




Image 11: Brick work damage.



Image 12: Brick work pillar.



Image 13: Birchfield Road view.



Image 14: Chapel Street view.