

# Update Report 2



## Planning Committee

Wed 19 Feb  
2020  
7.00 pm

Council Chamber  
Town Hall  
Redditch

**REDDITCH** BOROUGH COUNCIL

*making  
a  
difference*

[www.redditchbc.gov.uk](http://www.redditchbc.gov.uk)

If you have any queries on this agenda please contact  
Sarah Sellers  
Town Hall Walter Stranz Square Redditch B98 8AH  
Tel : 01527 64252 (Ext 2884)



# Planning

Wednesday, 19th February,  
2020

7.00 pm

**Town Hall Redditch**

---

## Agenda

### Membership:

Cllrs:

Salman Akbar (Chair)  
Gemma Monaco (Vice-Chair)  
Brandon Clayton  
Andrew Fry  
Bill Hartnett

Anthony Lovell  
Nyear Nazir  
Gareth Prosser  
Jennifer Wheeler

## 4. Update Reports (Pages 1 - 6)

Please see second Update Report attached.

This page is intentionally left blank

Redditch Borough Council  
Planning Committee  
19th February 2020

Committee Update No.2 issued 19.02.2020

**2016/077/OUT Land To The West Of Foxlydiate Lane And Pumphouse Lane, Bromsgrove Highway**

Information received since the publication of the main Planning Committee report has been addressed by the publication of Update Report 1 on 18<sup>th</sup> February 2020. This Report is Update Report 2 published to address the submission of further information.

Members are again reminded that it is possible to view the details associated with the application by using the Council's public access system <https://publicaccess.bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk/online-applications/> and viewing both application 16/0263 (where the main documentation is contained) and application 2016/077/OUT

**CORRECTION FROM SUBSTANTIVE REPORT**

In mid Page 46 of the substantial report, below the comments from Bentley Paucefoot Parish Council is the following sentence:

*“ Given the late receipt of this representation and absence of the report alluded to, the matters raised will be addressed on the update sheet.”*

The Head of Service would like to make the following statement in relation to this sentence:

It is pointed out that the representation from the parish council is not late. Furthermore the report referred to was made available to the Planning Service on the morning of Tuesday 11<sup>th</sup> February. The Head of Service apologies for any misunderstanding that this sentence may have caused.

**UPDATED RECOMMENDATION (as report and update 1, but with the following text**

(d) And that **DELEGATED POWERS** be granted to the Head of Planning and Regeneration, in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee, to consider any additional representations received following the resolution on the application and prior to the issuing of the Decision.

**REPRESENTATION FROM BENTLEY PAUNCEFOOT PARISH COUNCIL 18-02-2020**

If we understand the conditions correctly, they are as follows:

1. Access on Foxlydiate Lane to be used initially for construction of the main Birchfield Road access and 'haul road' between them ONLY.
2. Once the Birchfield Road access is completed it will be used SOLELY for construction traffic (which will not be allowed to use any other access) until 'prior' to the occupation of the 600th dwelling
3. For the first 399 dwellings occupied the Foxlydiate Lane Access will be the ONLY access.

## 4. The Cur Lane Access :

- is this the roundabout only or both the roundabout and the new connection to the rest of Cur Lane?
- it (they?) have to be completed prior to the occupation of the 400th dwelling.

5. The main Birchfield Road access and Hewell Lane improvement works have to be completed prior to the occupation of the 600th dwelling.

6. If the above is correct it means that Foxlydiat Lane will be supporting all the traffic for the first 399 houses then a portion of 599 houses.

7. From the Construction Access Review Plan it appears that a Road Safety Audit has only been carried out *to ensure the safe operation of the junction for use by construction traffic* (Para 2.3.6)

8. Can Foxlydiat Lane cope with such a large volume of additional traffic?

This does not appear to have been considered in the Plan submitted.

9. The original Transport Assessment for the development appears to show a total of 9 vehicle movements both in and out of the Foxlydiat Lane access during both am and pm peaks.

If the analysis of the safety and junctions have been carried out based on these numbers they would surely need to be re-evaluated prior to approving such conditions?

### **ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS FROM PUBLIC**

**PARKING FOR CONSTRUCTION EMPLOYEES** - Of the 15 – 20 staff working daily on site where will those people park their vehicles. It can only be on Foxlydiat Lane.

**UTILITY SUPPLIES TO SITE COMPOUND** - Those staff require full Welfare facilities onsite i.e. Water for drinking/WC;s etc., electricity all of which need connection off the main utilities supplies situated in Foxlydiat Lane causing more disruption to residents due to excavation of the road for these connections.

**INEFFECTIVE ENFORCEMENT OF CEMP** The (CEMP) states it would limit impact to residents with an opportunity to control the construction phase. This clearly did not work for the residents living near the Church Road Webheath development sites or the Council so why will this be any different? Recent incidents on Church Road don't instil confidence in a CEMP as a means of effectively addressing concerns about highway safety and mud on road.

**OUTDATED TRAFFIC DATA** W.C.C. Highways used the 2011 traffic census data plus a vissum microsimulation model produced by the applicant to review local assignment and traffic capacity – census data totally out of date by 8 years and does not take into account the Church Road Webheath and the Birchfield Road developments sites.

### **FOXLDIAT LANE UNSUITABLE FOR CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC**

At the time of preparing this update a further 9 representations had been received from the public

- only 5 metres wide;
- always a number of vehicles parked, restricting free flow of the traffic.
- Construction vehicles could not pass each other safely.

- already being accessed by the additional residential traffic from the Great Hockings Lane site and the 2 new housing developments on Church Road Webheath.
- only has spasmodic street lighting on one side.
- The undulation makes for limited visibility near the proposed entrance site.
- totally unsuitable for the envisaged 600 new homes and the estimated 1200 + vehicles.
- Road surface already been destroyed and damaged by 20 years of construction traffic leading to church road and beyond with no repair, upgrading or maintenance.
- Conflict of on road parking of visitors or carers at junction of Foxlydiate lane and Curr Lane, with construction traffic.

These proposals will have a severe impact on the residents of Foxlydiate Lane and the local vicinity if approved by the planning committee. Other alternatives should be considered.

**DISRUPTION TO SERVICES** - That to service these residential properties on the periphery of the development site next to Foxlydiate Lane, connections to gas main, water main, sewage system and electricity supply would have to be made by the utility companies digging up the lane, causing further disruption to the local residents and users of Foxlydiate Lane, with temp traffic control or road closures.

**SEQUENCE OF DEVT** For public Health & Safety reasons, the only way a new building site of 2400 houses can go ahead is to build the appropriate spine road first.

**HOSPITAL CAPACITY** Local hospitals are already in special measures as can't cope with amount of people living in Worcestershire now.

#### **OFFICER RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM BPPC QUERIES**

1. Correct
2. Correct
3. Correct
4. Both. Correct
5. Correct
6. Correct
7. There is no objection from the Highway Authority or BDC's Highways Consultant in this respect.
8. There is no objection from the Highway Authority or BDC's Highways Consultant in this respect
9. There is no objection from the Highway Authority or BDC's Highways Consultant in this respect

#### **OFFICER RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS FROM PUBLIC**

Parking for site operatives would be available on-site as soon as the contractors site compound is erected, which precedes any other substantive construction on site.

Connecting to electricity, water gas and telecommunications infrastructure may generate some short-term disruption, but that is an unavoidable consequence of any development proposal. It is not a reason to withhold planning permission.

Permission cannot be reasonably withheld because enforcement of another development in the locality was perceived to be ineffective. However, the Local police have been in contact with your officers to discuss the CEMP in the event Members decide to grant permission in accordance with officer's recommendation which seeks delegated authority to agree the wording of the CEMP condition. As the adverse impacts of a development in terms of issues such as times of deliveries, mud on the road can be mitigated, those issues are not determinative to the grant of permission.

In this case the primary construction traffic route would be created before any construction of dwellings commenced. The only construction traffic using the Foxlydiate Lane access would be to construct that access and the haul road to facilitate construction of the Birchfield Road access. Once the Birchfield Road access is provided for use by construction traffic, then the Foxlydiate Lane access would only be used by traffic arising from the new residential development.

It is not proposed or necessary for the short-term construction traffic associated with the construction of the Birchfield Road ramp and haul road to utilise the whole length of Foxlydiate Lane when using the proposed Foxlydiate Lane access / egress. It would be routed via Birchfield Road / A448.

The applicant has considered alternative options. The proposal has been amended such that a condition would preclude any construction traffic associated with the future construction of dwellings from utilising Foxlydiate Lane. The only construction traffic using Foxlydiate Lane would be to facilitate the construction of the haul road and primary construction access onto Birchfield Road.

Having received further Legal Advice from Counsel, the position of the Local Planning Authority with regard to being able to seek a contribution from the developer sought by Worcestershire Acute Health Trust which would positively assist with the provision of Acute Hospital services has been agreed in principle. The detail associated with this matter is covered in the main report page 74 Section 23.13 – 23.21.

**2016/077 Redditch Gateway Land Adjacent To The A4023, Coventry Highway, Redditch, Worcestershire.**

**Details pursuant to conditions 18 and 31 of 18/01626/S73**

**Condition 18**

**Further Consultee Comments**

***Worcestershire County Highway Authority***

I am satisfied with this CEMP, but the applicant should note the following:

2.5 – The A435 (North bound) is also an acceptable route to the M42 J3 and provides a more direct route. Any directional signage must confirm with the TSRGD and be authorised by the appropriate Highway Authority. There is an approved HGV route associated with the permeant HGV activity, it would make good sense to replicate this route.

2.6 – The condition survey must take place with representatives of the two Local Highway Authorities

Secondary access point 2 as shown in appendix A (Hedera Road) connects to a private road and therefore falls outside the control the Highway Authority.

**Officer Comments**

No objection from WCC Highways, so recommendation in main agenda still stands.

**Condition 31**



**Further Consultee Comments**

***Laura Wood, Senior Ecologist, Worcestershire County Council***

I have no specific comment on discharge of condition 31 (measures to prevent construction materials entering and silting up ditches), I defer to LLFA and EA comments on this condition.

**Officer Comments**

Document referred to in main agenda related to a separate condition, this has been corrected.

**RECOMMENDATION:****1. That the details submitted pursuant to condition 18 being:**

- Highways Construction Environmental Management Plan GP.1006.F03 Rev 2

**be approved as acceptable in so far as they relate to Phase 1 of the development (northern parcel).**

**2. That the details submitted pursuant to condition 31 being:**

- **RGNP-BWB-DGT-XX-DR-D-602 A C01**

**be approved as acceptable in so far as they relate to Phase 1 of the development (northern parcel) under authority delegated to officers on the proviso that the Objection from the Environment Agency is addressed and withdrawn.**

This page is intentionally left blank