

Planning Committee

Wed 31st Jul
2013
7pm

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

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE



GUIDANCE ON PUBLIC
SPEAKING

The process approved by the Council for public speaking at meetings of the Planning Committee is (subject to the discretion and control of the Chair) as summarised below:

in accordance with the running order detailed in this agenda and updated by the separate Update report:

- 1) Introduction of application by Chair
- 2) Officer presentation of the report (as originally printed; updated in the later Update Report; and updated orally by the Planning Officers at the meeting).
- 3) Public Speaking - in the following order:-
 - a) Objectors to speak on the application;
 - b) Supporters to speak on the application;
 - c) Applicant to speak on the application.

Speakers will be called in the order they have notified their interest in speaking to the Committee Services Team (by 12 noon on the day of the meeting) and invited to the table or lectern.

- Each individual speaker will have up to a maximum of 3 minutes to speak, subject to the discretion of the Chair. (Please press button on “conference unit” to activate microphone.)
 - Each group of supporters or objectors with a common interest will have up to a maximum of 10 minutes to speak, subject to the discretion of the Chair.
 - After each of a), b) and c) above, Members may put relevant questions to the speaker, for clarification. (Please remain at the table in case of questions.)
- 4) Members’ questions to the Officers and formal debate / determination.

Notes:

- 1) It should be noted that, in coming to its decision, the Committee can only take into account planning issues, namely policies contained in the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3, the County Structure Plan (comprising the Development Plan) and other material considerations, which include Government Guidance and other relevant policies published since the adoption of the development plan and the “environmental factors” (in the broad sense) which affect the site.
- 2) No audio recording, filming, video recording or photography, etc. of any part of this meeting is permitted without express consent (Section 100A(7) of the Local Government Act 1972).
- 3) Once the formal meeting opens, members of the public are requested to remain within the Public Gallery and may only address Committee Members and Officers via the formal public speaking route.
- 4) Late circulation of additional papers is not advised and is subject to the Chair’s agreement. The submission of any significant new information might lead to a delay in reaching a decision. The deadline for papers to be received by Planning Officers is 4.00 p.m. on the Friday before the meeting.
- 5) Anyone wishing to address the Planning Committee on applications on this agenda must notify the Committee Services Team **by 12 noon on the day of the meeting.**

Further assistance:

If you require any further assistance **prior to the meeting**, please contact the Committee Services Officer (indicated at the foot of the inside front cover), Head of Democratic Services, or Planning Officers, at the same address.

At the meeting, these Officers will normally be seated either side of the Chair.

The Chair’s place is at the front left-hand corner of the Committee table as viewed from the Public Gallery.

Welcome to today's meeting.

Guidance for the Public

Agenda Papers

The **Agenda List** at the front of the Agenda summarises the issues to be discussed and is followed by the Officers' full supporting **Reports**.

Chair

The Chair is responsible for the proper conduct of the meeting. Generally to one side of the Chair is the Committee Support Officer who gives advice on the proper conduct of the meeting and ensures that the debate and the decisions are properly recorded. On the Chair's other side are the relevant Council Officers. The Councillors ("Members") of the Committee occupy the remaining seats around the table.

Running Order

Items will normally be taken in the order printed but, in particular circumstances, the Chair may agree to vary the order.

Refreshments : tea, coffee and water are normally available at meetings - please serve yourself.

Decisions

Decisions at the meeting will be taken by the **Councillors** who are the democratically elected representatives. They are advised by **Officers** who are paid professionals and do not have a vote.

Members of the Public

Members of the public may, by prior arrangement, speak at meetings of the Council or its Committees. Specific procedures exist for Appeals Hearings or for meetings involving Licence or Planning Applications. For further information on this point, please speak to the Committee Support Officer.

Special Arrangements

If you have any particular needs, please contact the Committee Support Officer.

Infra-red devices for the hearing impaired are available on request at the meeting. Other facilities may require prior arrangement.

Further Information

If you require any further information, please contact the Committee Support Officer (see foot of page opposite).

Fire/ Emergency instructions

If the alarm is sounded, please leave the building by the nearest available exit – these are clearly indicated within all the Committee Rooms.

If you discover a fire, inform a member of staff or operate the nearest alarm call point (wall mounted red rectangular box). In the event of the fire alarm sounding, leave the building immediately following the fire exit signs. Officers have been appointed with responsibility to ensure that all visitors are escorted from the building.

Do Not stop to collect personal belongings.

Do Not use lifts.

Do Not re-enter the building until told to do so.

The emergency Assembly Area is on Walter Stranz Square.



PLANNING

Committee

31st July 2013

7pm

Council Chamber Town Hall

Agenda

Membership:

Cllrs: Andrew Fry (Chair) Roger Hill
 Alan Mason (Vice-Chair) Wanda King
 Joe Baker Brenda Quinney
 Roger Bennett Yvonne Smith
 Michael Chalk

<p>1. Apologies</p>	<p>To receive apologies for absence and details of any Councillor nominated to attend the meeting in place of a member of the Committee.</p>
<p>2. Declarations of Interest</p>	<p>To invite Councillors to declare any interest they may have in the items on the Agenda.</p>
<p>3. Confirmation of Minutes (Pages 1 - 4)</p>	<p>To confirm, as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 3rd July 2013. (Minutes attached)</p>
<p>4. Planning Application 2013/094/FUL - Land at The Vicarage, Church Road, Webheath (Pages 5 - 10) Head of Planning and Regeneration</p>	<p>To consider a Planning Application for a residential development of six dwellings. Applicant: Chancery Two Ltd (Report attached – Site Plan under separate cover) (West Ward)</p>
<p>5. Planning Application 2013/127 - 49D Pipers Road, Redditch (Pages 11 - 18) Head of Planning and Regeneration</p>	<p>To consider a Planning Application for the creation of a new B2/B8 Industrial unit with single storey office facilities adjacent 49D Pipers Road and extension incorporating single storey offices to existing unit, together with car parking and associated external works, including new perimeter fence. Applicant: Presstek Ltd (Report attached – Site plan under separate cover) (Greenlands Ward)</p>
<p>6. Planning Application 2013/143 - 272 Evesham Road, Headless Cross (Pages 19 - 24) Head of Planning and Regeneration</p>	<p>To consider a Planning Application for a change of use to provide additional surgery space at first floor and ancillary office / storage space. Applicant : Kingfisher Dental Practice (Report attached – Site Plan under separate cover) (Headless Cross & Oakenshaw Ward)</p>

<p>7. Tree Preservation Order (No.144) 2013 - Trees on land at 27 Avenue Road, Astwood Bank - Confirmation</p> <p>(Pages 25 - 30)</p> <p>Head of Planning and Regeneration</p>	<p>To consider a report which proposes the long term protection of mature and significant trees which are considered to be of positive benefit to public amenity, and their value therefore makes them worthy of retention in the longer term.</p> <p>(Report and Appendix 1 attached – Site Plan under separate cover)</p> <p>(Astwood Bank & Feckenham Ward)</p>
<p>8. Exclusion of the Public</p>	<p>During the course of the meeting it may be necessary, in the opinion of the Chief Executive, to consider excluding the public from the meeting on the grounds that exempt information is likely to be divulged. It may be necessary, therefore, to move the following resolution:</p> <p>“that, under S.100 I of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following matter(s) on the grounds that it/they involve(s) the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the relevant paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) of the said Act, as amended.</p> <p>These paragraphs are as follows:</p> <p>subject to the “public interest” test, information relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Para 1 - <u>any individual;</u>Para 2 - <u>the identity of any individual;</u>Para 3 - <u>financial or business affairs;</u>Para 4 - <u>labour relations matters;</u>Para 5 - <u>legal professional privilege;</u>Para 6 - <u>a notice, order or direction;</u>Para 7 - <u>the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime;</u> <p>may need to be considered as “exempt”.</p>

PLANNING

Committee

31st July 2013

9. Confidential Matters (if any)

To deal with any exceptional matters necessary to consider after the exclusion of the public (none notified to date.)



Planning Committee

3RD July 2013

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Andrew Fry (Chair), Councillor Alan Mason (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Joe Baker, Michael Chalk, Roger Hill, Brenda Quinney and Yvonne Smith

Officers:

A Hussain, H Rajwanshi, A Rutt and S Williams

Committee Services Officer:

J Smyth

14. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was received on behalf of Councillor Wanda King.

15. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Yvonne Smith declared an Other Disclosable Interest in Planning Application 2013/105/FUL (10 Lower Grinsty Lane, Callow Hill) as detailed in Minute 18 below.

16. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Committee held on 22nd May and 5th June 2013 be confirmed as correct records and signed by the Chair.

(The Committee considered two sets of minutes which had been marked to follow in the Agenda and which were issued late under additional papers.)

.....
Chair

**17. PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/078/FUL –
LAND SOUTH OF HARRIS CLOSE**

Erection of 41 dwellings comprising 35 houses and
6 apartments, together with roads and associated works

Applicant: David Wilson Homes

Mr A Rowan, on behalf of the Applicant, addressed the Committee under the Council's public speaking rules.

RESOLVED that

having regard to the Development Plan and to all other material considerations, authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to GRANT Planning Permission, subject to:

- 1) the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation to ensure that:**
 - i) contributions are paid to the Borough Council in respect of off-site open space, pitches and equipped play in accordance with the Council's adopted SPD;**
 - ii) a financial contribution is paid to the Borough Council towards the provision of wheelie bins for the new development;**
 - iii) 40% of the residential units are for the provision of social housing in perpetuity; and**
- 2) the Conditions and Informatives summarised in the main report.**

**18. PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/105/FUL –
10 LOWER GRINSTY LANE, CALLOW HILL**

Garage extension (as amended by Plans received on 14th June 2013).

Applicant: Ms Christine Lloyd

Mrs N Kai, objecting, addressed the Committee under the Council's public speaking rules.

RESOLVED that

having regard to the Development Plan and to all other material considerations, authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to GRANT Planning Permission following the expiry of the public consultation period (8th July 2013), subject to the conditions and informatives summarised in the report.

(Prior to consideration of this item, Councillor Yvonne Smith declared an other disclosable interest in view of the fact that she was personally acquainted with the registered speaker objecting to the application. Councillor Smith withdrew from the meeting and took no part in its consideration or voting thereon.)

**19. PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/119/FUL –
MAGNA EXTERIORS AND INTERIORS, MERSE ROAD**

Extension of existing factory, relocation of existing bund to increase site parking, additional concrete yard space; mezzanine floor and new site entrance off Winyates Way

Applicant: Mr C Walton

Mr J Edwards, the Agent for the Applicant, addressed the Committee under the Council's public speaking rules.

RESOLVED that

having regard to the Development Plan and to all other material considerations, Planning Permission be GRANTED, subject to the conditions and informatives summarised in the main report.

**20. PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/130/RC3 –
GRASSED AREA NEXT TO REDDITCH TOWN HALL,
WALTER STRANZ SQUARE**

Public art piece to celebrate the Redditch springs and wireform Industry

Applicant: Leisure and Culture, Redditch Borough Council

Mr J Cochrane, on behalf of the Applicant, addressed the Committee under the Council's public speaking rules.

RESOLVED that

a decision on this matter be deferred to allow the Committee to receive further information on the size of the artwork in relation to the existing building.

21. APPEAL OUTCOME - CONVERSION OF OFFICE SPACE INTO RESIDENTIAL UNITS - NEWTON HOUSE, HEWELL ROAD

The Committee received an item of information in relation to the outcome of an appeal against a refusal of Planning Permission, made by Officers under delegated authority, namely:

Planning Application 2012/128/COU
Conversion of First Floor Office Space (Use Class B1)
Into 4 no. residential units

Members noted the Inspector's decision to dismiss the appeal on the basis that the proposed conversion to residential units would have a detrimental impact on employment land availability and was incompatible with the surrounding employment area.

RESOLVED that

the item of information be noted.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 8.25 pm

.....
CHAIR

PLANNING COMMITTEE

31st July 2013

PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/094/FUL

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF 6 DWELLINGS

LAND AT THE VICARAGE, CHURCH ROAD, WEBHEATH, REDDITCH

APPLICANT: CHANCERY TWO LTD

EXPIRY DATE: 13th JUNE 2013

WARD: WEST

(See additional papers for Site Plan)

The author of this report is Sharron Williams, Planning Officer (DC), who can be contacted on extension 3372 (e-mail: sharron.williams@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) for more information.

Site Description

The site was part of the rear garden area of the former Vicarage that has been redeveloped and subdivided from this site. The site is mainly overgrown with mature tree planting around the north and western boundaries of the site. A vehicular access exists to the west of the site off Church Road.

Proposal Description

Full planning permission is sought for the erection of 6 dwellings. The dwellings consist of varying house types although they are similar in appearance but generally comprise of 4-5 bedrooms, en-suites, with double garages, kitchen, dining room, living room and kitchen/ breakfast room. Access to the site is the same as that on previously approved applications off Church Road.

The application is supported by a Design & Access Statement, a Community Involvement Statement, Climate Change Statement, Tree Survey, Ecological Survey, and Ground Investigation Report.

All planning applications must be considered in terms of the planning policy framework and all other relevant material considerations (as set out in the legislative framework). The planning policies noted below can be found on the following websites:

www.communities.gov.uk

www.redditchbc.gov.uk

National planning policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

31st July 2013

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3

CS.7	The sustainable location of development.
S.1	Designing out crime.
B(HSG).6	Development within or adjacent to the curtilage of an existing building.
B(BE).13	Qualities of good design.
B(NE).1a	Trees, woodland and hedgerows.
B(NE).3	Wildlife corridors.
L.2	Education provision.
C(T).2	Road hierarchy.
C(T).12	Parking standards.
R.3	Provision of Informal unrestricted open space.
R.4	Provision and location of children's play areas.
R.5	Playing pitch provision.

Supplementary Planning Guidance / Supplementary Planning Documents

Encouraging Good Design.
 Planning Obligations for Education Facilities.
 Designing for Community Safety.
 Open Space Provision

Other relevant plans and strategies

Worcestershire Community Strategy (WCS)
 Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy

Relevant Site planning History

Appn. no	Proposal	Decision	Date
2003/607	Outline application: residential development including a new vicarage	Withdrawn	20.1.05
2005/154	Resubmission of 03/607	Outline approval	25.5.06
2007/496	Demolition of existing vicarage and erection of residential development of 6 dwellings	Withdrawn	18.2.08
2008/255	Demolition of existing vicarage and erection of residential development of 6 dwellings	Approval	10.9.08
2009/100	Proposed new zero carbon eco vicarage	Approval	7.7.09

Public Consultation Responses

No comments received.

Consultee Responses***County Highway Network Control***

The access proposal as submitted on the plan does not meet all of the

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**31st July 2013

necessary criteria for adoption as highway maintainable at public expense in that inadequate service margins and turning facilities are proposed, and therefore will constitute a private road. The County Council offers no objection to the proposal, but recommends that any permission which the District Planning Authority may wish to give include highway conditions and informatives.

Worcestershire Regulatory Services

No adverse comments to make in relation to the application however, due to the close proximity of existing residential properties to the proposed development care should be taken during the demolition and construction phase to reduce any adverse impacts caused to local residents. Recommend that the applicant follow Worcestershire Regulatory Service's Code of Best Practice for Demolition and Construction Sites.

County Education Services

Due to the proposed number of dwellings, there will be a need for a financial contribution towards local education facilities in accordance with the Supplementary Planning Document on Planning Obligations for Education Facilities.

Crime Risk Manager

No comments submitted.

Community Safety

No comments submitted.

Worcestershire Wildlife Trust

Recommend that a condition be imposed regarding ecological mitigation and enhancement.

Severn Trent Water

No objection subject to a condition regarding drainage details.

North Worcestershire Water Management

Recommend that a condition be imposed in respect to drainage details.

Arboricultural Officer

Note the minor adjustment to the layout with plot 4 moved forward a fraction so the footprint is outside the Root Protection Area (RPA) which is fine, however still believe this development in its current form is going to result in pressure for works to the boundary trees as the garden spaces of plots 1, 3 & 4 are so dominated by these large mature trees, and even with a canopy lift as proposed the gardens will still be beneath the upper canopies and subject to shade.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

31st July 2013

Assessment of Proposal

The key issues for consideration in this case are

Principle

The application is a resubmission of a similar proposal that was granted planning permission in 2008. The permission has lapsed, and this application shows a housing layout similar to that previously approved albeit with different house types. The site is within the urban area and is undesignated in the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 3. The area is predominantly residential; therefore, the provision of residential development in this locality is acceptable in principle. Policy B(BE).13 of the Local Plan would apply and relates to the scale and character of potential residential development in relation to properties and its impact on neighbouring properties.

Design and layout

The house types submitted are slightly different to those previously approved, with some of the house types being slightly smaller in footprint. The house types are of a similar design to those previously approved and therefore would be in keeping with the area, complying with Policy B(BE).13 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3. In addition, the garden areas for the plots comply with the Council's SPG on Encouraging Good Design.

Landscaping and trees

This site is covered by a TPO which protects all the major trees within and around the site. The proposed layout indicates that two of these protected trees will be removed to facilitate the new entrance drive. Although their removal will have a negative impact on the local street scene, the loss can be mitigated by replacement planting along this boundary using trees of an acceptable size and species. Landscaping proposals will need to address this issue.

Several other fruit/ornamental trees within the site are also proposed for removal. These are not covered by the TPO and are not significant features; however suitable replacements should be provided within a landscaping scheme to be imposed as a condition.

A couple of the dwellings are located in close proximity to trees that border the application site boundary. The arboricultural officer has made comments on this matter expressing concerns that there could be more pressure for work to be carried out on the trees concerned when the occupiers move in. The applicant has tried to improve the spacing between the proposed dwellings and the trees concerned; however, generally the positioning of the dwellings is similar to those previously approved. Some arboricultural work is intended for the trees concerned as a result of the proposed development to reduce the possibility of this issue arising in the future.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

31st July 2013

Highways and access

A new access is proposed to serve the development and would be to the south of the existing access off Church Road. Another vehicular access exists to the south of the application site and serves the new Vicarage.

Newt wildlife corridor

A newt corridor has been provided on the north-west boundary of the site. The corridor is intended to ensure that any newts from the newt habitat on land off Grazing Lane stay within the corridor (which has a newt barrier – currently supplied on site at present) and do not stray into the rear gardens of the proposed dwellings. Officers have negotiated with the agent for this area to be transferred for the Council to maintain. However, there may be a possibility of the applicant remaining responsible for the maintenance of this aspect of the development. More information will be available in the update report.

Conclusion

The application is considered acceptable and is of a similar layout to previous applications that have been approved on this site. The proposal complies with Council planning policies.

Recommendation

That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, authority be delegated to the head of Planning and Regeneration to GRANT planning permission subject to:-

a) The satisfactory completion of a S106 planning obligation ensuring that:

- Contributions are paid to the Borough Council in respect to off-site open space, pitches and equipped play in accordance with the Council's adopted SPD on Open Space Provision, and
- A financial contribution is paid to the Borough Council towards the provision of wheelie bins for the new development, and
- A financial contribution is paid to the County Council in respect to education provision, and
- A financial contribution to be paid to the Borough Council towards the future maintenance of the wildlife corridor, and the land transferred, or other suitable maintenance arrangements as agreed;

and

b) Conditions and informatives as summarised below:-

Conditions

1. Development to commence within three years.
2. Materials to be submitted and agreed.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

31st July 2013

3. Landscape scheme to be submitted to LPA including replacement planting.
4. Approved landscaping scheme to be implemented in accordance with details agreed.
5. Limited working hours during construction.
6. Development in accordance with plans listed.
7. Access, turning and parking.
8. Drainage details to be submitted.
9. Ecological mitigation and enhancement scheme to be submitted and implemented.

Informatives

1. Reason for approval.
2. LPA acted in a positive and proactive manner.
3. Private apparatus within the highway.
4. Alteration of highway to provide new or amend vehicle crossover.
5. Worcestershire Regulatory Service's Code of Best Practice for Demolition and Construction Sites.

Procedural matters

This application is being reported to the Planning Committee because the application requires a S106 Agreement. As such the application falls outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

31st July 2013

PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/127/FUL

CREATION OF A NEW B2/B8 INDUSTRIAL UNIT WITH SINGLE STOREY OFFICE FACILITIES, ADJACENT 49D PIPERS ROAD AND EXTENSION INCORPORATING SINGLE STOREY OFFICES TO EXISTING UNIT TOGETHER WITH CAR PARKING AND ASSOCIATED EXTERNAL WORKS INCLUDING NEW PERIMETER FENCE

PRESSTEK LIMITED, 49D PIPERS ROAD, REDDITCH

APPLICANT: PRESSTEK LIMITED

EXPIRY DATE: 22ND AUGUST 2013

WARD: GREENLANDS

The author of this report is Steven Edden, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on extension 3206
(e-mail: steve.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) for more information.

(See additional papers for Site Plan)

Site Description

The site, which measures 5,740m² lies within an established industrial area inside the Park Farm Industrial Estate. The site has been occupied up until recently by A E Oscroft & Sons Ltd. The site has been vacant since this company have re-located to Heming Road in the Washford Industrial Estate.

The existing building is a single span metal clad portal framed structure, used for general industrial and warehousing purposes. Single storey buff brickwork offices form extensions to the western side of the portal framed building. The combined area of the buildings is approximately 1650m². Further to the west are grassed landscaped areas. Access and existing forecourt parking is provided to the southern side of the building from Pipers Road. To the south-west of the site, and at a higher level on top of a bank are two residential properties which front on to Studley Road.

Access to the site is via Pipers Road to the east.

The site is situated within a Primarily Employment Area as designated on the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3 Proposals Map.

Proposal Description

Permission is sought for the creation of a B2 (general industrial) and B8 (storage and distribution) extension of circa 1330m² (665m² B2 and 665m² B8) with an additional 344m² of purpose built single storey office accommodation. The proposed portal framed extension would be located to

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**31st July 2013

the western elevation of the existing portal frame. In order to accommodate the new portal frame, the existing buff brickwork office extensions as referred to above are to be demolished.

The portal framed building would measure 43.5m in length and 30.5m in width. Its height to eaves would measure 5.1m and height to ridge would be 8m (mirroring the height of the existing portal framed building). The extension would have a brick plinth to match the existing building with metal cladding (colour Black RAL 9005) above. The proposed roof would be constructed in corrugated roofing sheet (colour Goosewing Grey BS00A05).

All elevations of the existing portal framed building (to the east of the site and to be retained), which is currently clad in light grey coloured sheeting, would be re-clad in Black RAL 9005 coloured prefabricated insulated panels to match the appearance of the proposed (extended) building and to enhance the visual appearance of the building when seen from Pipers Road. The roof of the existing portal framed building would be re-clad in Goosewing Grey coloured corrugated sheet to match the proposed extension.

Two proposed brickwork and glazed office extensions would be attached to the front of the existing and extended portal frame. These would be rectangular in footprint, flat roofed and single storey, each measuring 20m in length and 9m in width.

The application includes the proposed erection of a new perimeter fence (green powder coated steel weld mesh construction) to a height of 2.4 metres. This would be located to the sites western boundary, covering a length of approximately 80 metres.

28 car parking spaces currently exist at the site. 22 additional spaces are proposed to be created in addition to 2 new disabled car parking spaces and 12 new cycle spaces. These would be located to the front of the building near to the entrance to the site off Pipers Road.

The site is proposed to operate between the hours of:
0700 to 1800 hrs Monday to Friday and
0700 to 1300 hrs on Saturday

The site would not be in operation on Sundays and Public Holidays.

The site has recently been purchased by Presstek Ltd who are moving from their current site at the Moons Moat Industrial Estate which is too small to meet their future requirements. The company would continue to manufacture and store bespoke architectural curtain walling and windows. The manufacturing process involves the bending and pressing of powder coated, pre-formed aluminium backed insulation board. The application site provides the space to potentially double the company's turnover which would lead to the creation of an additional 10 full time jobs (minimum). In addition to the

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

31st July 2013

creation of the new posts, 15 full time equivalent posts would transfer to the new site from Presstek Ltd's former location at the Moons Moat Industrial Estate.

Relevant Key Policies:

All planning applications must be considered in terms of the planning policy framework and all other relevant material considerations (as set out in the legislative framework). The planning policies noted below can be found on the following websites:

www.communities.gov.uk

www.redditchbc.gov.uk

National Planning Policy

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The NPPF supports existing business sectors, taking account of them expanding or contracting in order to encourage sustainable development and building a strong and competitive economy. The proposal would contribute towards economic prosperity as it involves the expansion of an existing business and as such will assist towards building a strong, responsive, sustainable and competitive economy. Therefore, the proposal would comply with the relevant aims of the NPPF.

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3

B(BE).13	Qualities of Good Design
E(EMP).2	Design of Employment Development
E(EMP).3	Primarily Employment Areas
C(T).12	Parking Standards
S.1	Designing Out Crime

Supplementary Planning Guidance /Supplementary Planning Documents

Encouraging Good Design
Designing for Community Safety

Constraints

New Town TPO 25

Relevant Site Planning History

2009/038/FUL	Demolition of existing single storey offices; extension to and re-cladding of existing building for B2 and B8 use; new B1 Office extension; erection of new perimeter fencing and creation of additional car parking area	Granted 20.05.2009
--------------	---	--------------------

PLANNING COMMITTEE

31st July 2013

Public Consultation Responses

The application has been advertised by writing to neighbouring properties within the vicinity of the application site, by display of public notice on site, and by press notice.

Responses against

One letter received raising concerns which are summarised below:
Restrictive conditions attached to an earlier consent for extension of the existing premises (not implemented) should be attached to any consent here in order to safeguard residential amenities. General concerns that noise emanating from the site would result in disturbance to and loss of amenity to occupiers of nearby properties.

Consultee Responses

County Highway Network Control

Comments that the proposed development is acceptable in highway terms and therefore raises no objection subject to the inclusion of a condition covering access turning and parking, together with standard informatives

Worcestershire Regulatory Services (Environmental Health)

No objection

Police Crime Risk Manager

No objection

Severn Trent Water

No objection. Drainage details to be subject to agreement with Severn Trent

Economic Development Unit

No objection

RBC Arboricultural Officer

Comments summarised as follows:

Although the proposal would result in the loss of seven small trees, no objections are raised as the current trees are only of limited amenity value due to their form and location. The site is well screened from the main roads by an external belt of trees and hedgerow which would remain.

Background

Planning permission was granted on 20.05.2009 under 2009/038/FUL for a very similar form of development to that proposed under this application. This also proposed the demolition of the existing single storey extensions to the building and the erection of a new portal framed building. The former occupier, AE Oscroft submitted the application, although the consent was not implemented. That permission expired on 20.05.2012.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

31st July 2013

Assessment of Proposal

The key issues for consideration in this case are as follows:-

Principle

The site is within an established employment area that is zoned for Primarily Employment Uses in the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3. Therefore, the proposed development would be acceptable, complying with policy E(EMP).3 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3, in addition to core planning principles identified in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Design of development / fencing proposed

The proposed extensions, which are significant in scale, can easily be accommodated within the site without undue harm to the visual amenities of the area. The footprint of the proposed portal frame would mirror that of the existing portal framed structure. The proposed cladding colour (black for walls), (light grey for roof) would complement the adjacent, extended 'Tamlite' Industrial building at 49C Pipers Road which is blue in colour. The proposed portal framed extension would be approximately 8 metres in height to the ridge (2.8 metres lower than that of the extension referred to above at 49C Pipers Road, which was granted by the Planning Committee in April 2008 – application 2008/081/FUL refers). The new, primarily glazed office building to the frontage of the site would be contemporary in appearance and would significantly improve the appearance of this part of the site.

Officers are therefore satisfied that the proposed development would not be overly dominating in appearance and would comply with Policies B(BE).13 and E(EMP). 2 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 3.

The proposed use of a 2.4 metre high, steel weld mesh fence with a dark green powder coated finish is considered to be a wholly acceptable means of securing the site. The Police Architectural Liaison / Crime Risk Manager has raised no objection to the application. The design and security elements of this proposal are therefore considered to comply with policy.

Impact on surrounding amenities

Your Officers are satisfied that the proposed works would have no impact upon nearby residential amenity by virtue of an overbearing or overshadowing impact. A separation distance in excess of 22m would exist between the extension and the dwellings nearest to the site. The difference in levels is also key, in that the proposed extension's finished floor level would be significantly lower than that of the dwellings which face on to Studley Road. One of these properties includes Orchard Cottage where a letter of representation raising concerns has been received.

The issue of noise disturbance has been carefully considered by Officers in Worcestershire Regulatory Services who consider that the building and site could operate in accordance with the proposed hours of use as stated earlier

PLANNING COMMITTEE

31st July 2013

in this report without detriment to nearby residential amenities. A condition to this effect is recommended to be imposed in the case of permission being granted. The previous user (A E Oscroft) used heavy pressing equipment, the source of the noise disturbance. Although the new user would not use such equipment, because the extension would be nearer to the residential properties adjacent to the site than that of the existing building, a condition restricting the use of heavy pressing machinery within the buildings is recommended. The applicant has confirmed their willingness for such a condition to be imposed.

Landscaping

The proposal would result in the loss of part of a landscaping strip to the side of the site including the loss of a small number of trees, adjacent to a footpath. However, this area is of little amenity value. The footpath is well lit and its quality would not be reduced. The proposed works would accord with landscaping and security policy criteria.

Access, parking, loading and highway safety

The proposed development would accord with current parking standards based on the floorspace of B1, B2 and B8 uses to be accommodated at the site. The proposal would utilise the existing access point off Pipers Road and loading/unloading facilities would not be affected. These elements of the proposal are therefore considered to be acceptable.

Conclusion

The proposals would represent an acceptable use in this location given that the site is within a Primarily Employment Area. The development would comply with the relevant policies of Local Plan No.3 together with those of the National Planning Policy Framework. The design of the extension would respect that of the existing building and its surroundings and car parking and access arrangements would be satisfactory. The proposals would not give rise to detriment to residential amenity. As such, the application is considered to be acceptable and can be recommended for approval.

Recommendation

That having regarded to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions and informatives as summarised below:

- 1 Development to commence within 3 years.
- 2 Materials to be used as per details given within submission (Q9 on planning application form)
- 3 Plans approved specified
- 4 H13: Access, turning and parking
- 5 Hours of use limitation (operations) to protect residential amenity:
(restriction between 0700 to 1800 hrs Monday to Friday and

PLANNING COMMITTEE

31st July 2013

- 0700 to 1300 hrs on Saturday with no operations on Sundays and Public Holidays)
- 6 Construction / demolition work on site to be time limited to protect residential amenity
 - 7 Any tannoy equipment to be restricted to internal use only
 - 8 Buildings on site not to house any heavy pressing equipment
 - 9 Perimeter fence to be of steel weld mesh construction with a green powder coated finish

Informatives

- 1 Reason for approval
- 2 Drainage details to be in agreement with Severn Trent Water
- 3 Positive and proactive informative
- 4 Highway Note No. 4
- 5 Highway Note No. 5

Procedural matters

This application is reported to Planning Committee for determination because the application is for major development (more than 1000 sq metres of new commercial / Industrial floorspace), and as such the application falls outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

31st July 2013

PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/143/COU

CHANGE OF USE TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL SURGERY SPACE AT FIRST FLOOR AND ANCILLARY OFFICE/STORAGE SPACE

272 EVESHAM ROAD, REDDITCH

**APPLICANT: KINGFISHER DENTAL PRACTICE
EXPIRY DATE: 5TH AUGUST 2013**

WARD: HEADLESS CROSS & OAKENSHAW

The author of this report is Steven Edden, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on extension 3206
(e-mail: steve.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) for more information.

(See additional papers for Site Plan)

Site Description

The application site consists of a relatively large two storey building, originally constructed as a dwelling, now operating as a dental practice. The building accommodates three surgeries, a reception area, waiting room and ancillary facilities such as kitchen and toilets at ground floor. At first floor, the building accommodates storage and office space together with a larger staff kitchen.

The building has a car park to the frontage containing space for 12 no. cars. The practice has a large rear garden which is bounded by mature trees and hedges, particularly on the southern and western boundaries.

Access to the site is via Evesham Road to the east.

The surrounding area is residential in character.

Proposal Description

Permission is sought for additional surgery space within the existing building used as a dental surgery. No extensions or external alterations are proposed. It is proposed to rationalise the first floor space to provide two surgeries which would allow for the employment of a trainee dentist and a hygienist.

The applicant states that the application is made to secure the future of this dental practice as result of further changes in NHS funding due to come in during 2014.

Relevant Key Policies:

All planning applications must be considered in terms of the planning policy framework and all other relevant material considerations (as set out in the

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

31st July 2013

legislative framework). The planning policies noted below can be found on the following websites:

www.communities.gov.uk

www.redditchbc.gov.uk

National Planning Policy

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The NPPF supports existing business sectors, taking account of them expanding or contracting in order to encourage sustainable development and building a strong and competitive economy. The proposal would contribute towards economic prosperity as it involves the expansion of an existing business and as such will assist towards building a strong, responsive, sustainable and competitive economy. Therefore, the proposal would comply with the relevant aims of the NPPF.

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3

B(BE).13 Qualities of Good Design

C(T).12 Parking Standards (Appendix H)

Relevant Site Planning History

Application no	Proposal	Decision	Date
1992/238/FUL	Conversion of property to dental surgery (two surgeries) and self contained flat	Approved	03.09.1992
2000/154/FUL	Additional dental treatment room	Approved	07.06.2000
2006/547/FUL	Expansion of existing dental practice (from three to six treatment rooms)	Refused	12.01.2007
2007/124/FUL	Re-submission of application 2006/547/FUL (increase in number of treatment rooms from three to five)	Refused	26.04.2007
2007/303/FUL	Extension of dental practice by refurbishment of existing building and construction of single storey ground floor rear extension	Approved	07.09.2007

Public Consultation Responses**Responses against**

3 letters received. Comments are summarised as follows:

- Upper floor is accessed via an external staircase. Any increase in its use would be detrimental to residential amenity

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

31st July 2013

- Cars belonging to both staff and patients of the practice already fill the existing on-site car park in addition to the five available spaces on the road outside whenever the surgery is in full use. The regularity of use already results in highway safety problems
- Whilst most users park their cars without actually blocking the driveways of the three houses affected, cars are regularly parked half on and half off the pavement on both sides of residents drives, significantly reducing visibility for the emerging vehicles of residents and of users of the on-site car park. Parking on the pavement is also a significant inconvenience to pedestrians
- Evesham Road is a busy road and bus route whose width is constrained just north of the application site by bollards in the middle of the road
- The existing level of use of the dental practice already causes a high level of on-street parking in this location which is a significant danger to road users and residents alike
- The proposal would represent a 33% increase in the use of the premises which would not be matched by an equivalent increase in car parking
- The Councils standards should require 20 spaces on site for the proposed use. There are only 12 provided
- Patient numbers have increased significantly since the original consent. The proposals would suggest that patient numbers would rise again

Consultee Responses***County Highway Network Control***

Comments as follows:

The applicant has provided information as requested to show patient location.

A considerable number of patients live either within reasonable walking distance of the practice or near to a regular bus route. Given the above, it is considered that, for the usual patient base, the practice is in a sustainable location.

Similarly, as there are other travel methods open to patients, the parking facilities situated within the application site are considered adequate.

The County Council as Highway Authority therefore considers that the traffic generation from the proposal has negligible effect on the surrounding Highway Network and therefore has no objection to the grant of permission.

Worcestershire Regulatory Services (Environmental Health)

No objection

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**31st July 2013

Background

The planning history related to the site is as set out above. The single storey extensions to the rear, approved under application 2007/303/FUL were not implemented, and this consent has now expired. This application essentially sought to provide the practice with more usable circulation space including a larger waiting area, but unlike the earlier applications, did not propose to increase the number of treatment rooms. Because this permission has expired, a new planning application would need to be submitted for further such extensions to the building in the future. The applicant has however stated that they would not wish to extend the premises in the future in a similar manner to that scheme submitted under application 2007/303/FUL. The premises remain as a dental practice containing three treatment rooms / surgeries.

Assessment of Proposal

Under the consideration of earlier, (refused) planning applications, as set out above, Officers considered that the expansion of the practice by increasing the number of surgeries without commensurate in-curtilage parking facilities would be likely to lead to a danger to highway safety as a result of additional vehicles being parked 'on-street' along Evesham Road.

A detailed statement has been submitted by the applicant's agent in support of the application. It states that although two rooms are proposed as surgeries, the additional hours worked would only be by one full time equivalent (FTE). The existing practice operates having three FTE dental practitioners. If permission were to be granted under this consent, the additional one FTE post would be split between that of a trainee dentist (4 days a week) and a dental hygienist (1 day a week). The applicant would be willing for a condition to be attached to any consent restricting the use of the existing and additional surgeries granted such that they could be used by a maximum of three FTE dentists and a trainee dentist and hygienist only.

The applicant states that the proposal is required because of changes to NHS dental care and associated targets set by Government for dental practitioners.

With respect to the perceived detrimental impact upon nearby residential amenity regarding the location and use of the existing external staircase (located on the south facing gable, facing towards number 274 Evesham Road), there is already internal access to the existing stairway to the first floor through the reception area serving the dental surgery. The external access was primarily used by occupiers of a first floor flat (which is now vacant) and has not been used for some time. Thus the existing use of the doorway on the Southern elevation has reduced and the proposal would not intensify this use. It is primarily a means of escape or used very occasionally by staff using the rear garden.

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**31st July 2013

The applicant states that the amount of on street car parking varies during the day and that not all is by visitors to the Dental practice. The applicant states that neighbours opposite are noted to regularly park their vehicles on Evesham Road. However, where there are no restrictions it is lawful to park on the road and this is the case here. The on-street parking situation which occurs at present is not considered to be of detriment to highway safety. If it were to be, it is likely that yellow lines would have been introduced along this particular stretch to prevent on-street parking.

It is stated that the hygienist would generally see patients at the same time as they have a routine dental appointment and as such it is considered unlikely that a material increase in car journeys would be generated. The proposal also includes plans for a trainee. The applicant explains that the speed at which a trainee works (under supervision) means that they see far fewer patients than a fully trained and experienced dentist.

Detailed information submitted by the applicant has demonstrated to your officers and County Highway Network Control that the proposed development would indeed be unlikely to cause increased pressure on car parking that cannot be met in both the on site car park and off site on the adjacent road.

The view expressed in the objections that the 33% increase in use of the premises is not matched by an equivalent increase in car parking is questioned as a 33% increase refers to the proposed increase in surgery numbers, not by a 33% increase in patients.

Officers consider that the use of planning conditions in this case could address the increase in surgery space whilst safeguarding nearby residential amenities. By attaching such conditions, Officers do not consider that harm to highway safety or amenity could be demonstrated, also having regard to the context of the benefit of retaining this dental practice in this part of Redditch to serve local need, thus being sustainably located.

As far as patient numbers are concerned, the application submission shows that existing patients over the last few years average 8,704 per year. This figure is around 300 less than the 9000 patients projected in the documents produced in 2000 when permission was granted for an increase to 3 surgeries under reference 2000/154/FUL. A trainee working a 4 day week is anticipated to result in little increase over the patient base of 9000 that was projected and considered acceptable in the year 2000. It is also noted that the practice is now more 'child friendly' and that children are likely to attend in family groups not individually and thus share transport. Further, no significant change to the existing patient base is anticipated as Redditch is well served by existing established dental practices. The proposal is not therefore considered to warrant the provision of additional car parking on site. Further, on street parking is lawfully available and public transport (having regard to

PLANNING COMMITTEE

31st July 2013

Evesham Road being a bus route with frequent services) and walking realistic are alternative transport options.

Conclusion

The benefit of maintaining this local NHS dentist as a viable business serving the local community should be carefully considered and weighed against the alleged car parking problems. On street parking is not entirely due to patients and the level of increase of demand for car parking when considered objectively is likely to be very small and so would not cause any demonstrable additional harm to local residents. Notwithstanding nearby residents concerns over the proposed new development, the proposals are considered to accord with national and local policy criteria. On balance, it is considered that the proposals would not prejudice highway safety or residential amenities. As such, the application is recommended for approval.

Recommendation

That having regarded to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions and informatives as summarised below:

- 1 Development to commence within 3 years.
- 2 Plans approved specified
- 3 Staff and patients to use internal staircase and not external staircase
- 4 The existing and additional surgeries as granted by this permission shall be used by staff comprising 3 FTE dentists and a trainee dentist and hygienist only

Informatives

- 1 Reason for approval
- 2 Positive and proactive informative

Procedural matters

This application is being reported to the Planning Committee because two (or more) objections have been received.

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

31st July 2013

**TREE PRESERVATION ORDER (No. 144) 2013, Trees on land at 27
Avenue Road, Astwood Bank - CONFIRMATION**

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Cllr Greg Chance
Portfolio Holder Consulted	No
Relevant Head of Service	Ruth Bamford, Head of Planning and Regeneration Guy Revans, Head of Environment
Wards Affected	Astwood Bank & Feckenham Ward
Ward Councillor Consulted	No
Non-Key Decision	

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- 1.1 This report proposes the long term protection of mature and significant trees which are considered to be of positive benefit to public amenity, and their value therefore makes them worthy of retention in the longer term.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee is asked to RESOLVE that:

Tree Preservation Order (No. 144) 2013, as detailed in the Schedule attached at Appendix 1 and Plan at Appendix 2 be confirmed without modification.

3. KEY ISSUES

Financial Implications

- 3.1 The costs of the administrative and technical processes associated with this matter may be met from within existing budgets, and the financial aspects are not a matter for the Planning Committee to consider.

Legal Implications

- 3.2 These matters are completed in line with the provisions of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
- 3.3 The Legal Services Manager has been consulted with regard to the legal implications.

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**31st July 2013**Service/Operational Implications**

- 3.4 Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) are made to protect trees (individuals, groups, areas, or entire woodlands) that contribute significantly to their local environment and to its enjoyment by the public. This is known as the public amenity value of trees. When suitable trees/woodlands are identified, and when it is considered expedient to do so, a provisional TPO is made which comes into effect immediately and remains in force for a period of six months. During this time there is a consultation period where interested parties can make representations against or in favour of the TPO.
- 3.5 Following the consultation period a decision must be made to either confirm (*i.e.* make permanent) the TPO or not. If representations are received then the matter is considered by the Planning Committee, and generally if no representations are received then the TPO is confirmed by Officers of the Council under Delegated Powers.
- 3.6 On 20th March 2013 a provisional TPO was made on a group of trees on land at 27 Avenue Road, Astwood Bank. This followed information being received which suggested that at least one of the prominent trees within the group may be felled in the near future. As such the trees were visually assessed and it was deemed appropriate to protect the group as a whole by creating a new TPO.
- 3.7 The trees subject to this TPO form a prominent linear group located in the rear garden of 27 Avenue Road, Astwood Bank. They are in a north-south line adjacent to New Road, approximately 12m away from the roadside and separated by the side/rear gardens of neighbouring properties. They are a mixed group of eight trees, identified as G1 in the First Schedule of the Order.
- 3.8 Although situated within a rear garden, the trees are fully visible from public viewpoints nearby, and also act as a notable landscape feature from surrounding roads on all sides. They are predominantly large mature specimens which add greatly to the visual character of the area, being an attractive feature of the established urban street scene. As such they are deemed to have a significant public amenity value, and so a TPO was made to protect the future contribution that the trees will make to public amenity and quality of the local landscape.
- 3.9 Notification of this Order was then served on all persons that could be affected by the making of the TPO, and the consultation period for representations ran until 1st May 2013. During this period one objection was received from a neighbouring property to the land on which the trees are located. The temporary Order will remain in force until 20th September 2013, or until it is decided whether to make the Order permanent or not, whichever occurs first.

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**31st July 2013

3.10 The objection comprises the following main points:

- i. The pine trees are in close proximity to the dwelling, they have damaged the fence and dropped branches and needles. They are a safety threat to adjacent residents.
- ii. The TPO was made without first clarifying the circumstances of the situation. The resident only wishes to carry out limited works and there is no threat of premature removal.
- iii. The trees have only limited public amenity value due to their position in a rear garden.
- iv. A permanent TPO would only serve to add unnecessary bureaucracy to normal tree management works.

3.11 The Tree Officer responds as follows:

- i. The pine trees are mature specimens that have grown in relatively close proximity to this property for probably in excess of 100 years, with no lower branches that restrict access and no branches are within touching distance of the house. The damage to the fence is due to it having been constructed immediately adjacent to the tree stem, meaning that the natural movement of the tree will exert pressure against the fence, resulting in this minor damage. The damage is easily repairable and also avoidable by moving the fence line further away, or having a different boundary construction. I am not aware of any significant branches falling from this tree, and it is most likely that they consist of small dead branches due to the tree being in need of routine management to remove deadwood from the canopy. The needle drop issue would also be limited by routine deadwood management, although as with all trees the issue of falling needles/leaves is part of normal household maintenance and not considered a reason to remove mature trees. There is no current evidence to suggest that any of the trees constitute a safety threat to surrounding properties, although they would all benefit from management to remove dead and weak branches. The imposition of a TPO would not stand in the way of any works deemed necessary to address safety concerns, should these be raised at any time.
- ii. This TPO was made following information being received that specifically related to the potential removal of one of the trees, which contradicts the statement in the objection letter that no such intention exists. Once the trees had been assessed and considered worthy of retention we had no choice but to create an

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**31st July 2013

immediate Order as a precaution. This type of scenario is a common occurrence for the making of TPOs, and is necessary to remove any risk of premature removal of significant trees. The consultation period following the making of the Order provides opportunity to clarify the circumstances that exist. I undertook to visit the residents to which this objection relates immediately after the TPO was issued. I advised them that a certain level of works would be appropriate and invited them to submit an application to carry this out, which they appeared satisfied with. I emphasised that the TPO would not prevent the carrying out of an appropriate level of works to address their concerns. The works that I described as being appropriate are the same as was later listed on the supporting letter attached to the objection. Therefore, a permanent TPO would not prevent the resident carrying out the works proposed in the objection letter.

- iii. Please see section 3.7 and 3.8 regarding the description of visual amenity of this group of trees, as although they are rear garden trees, they are clearly visible from various public viewpoints and many local properties. The photo sheet shows their prominence, both as immediate street features and also as a backdrop to the urban landscape. This will be available at the meeting.
- iv. Tree Preservation Orders are designed to be administered with the minimum of imposition on anyone wishing to carry out works to protected trees, and with no extra cost burden to the applicant. TPOs also enable us to offer our advice to an applicant on the type of works that would be appropriate. The purpose of having a TPO in place is not to prevent any tree works, but to ensure that the trees are not prematurely removed or excessively pruned so as to negatively affect the health or amenity value of the tree(s). I feel that a permanent TPO on these valuable trees is an appropriate measure to ensure that they are protected and reasonably managed in the long term.

3.12

- i. Policy implications – none.
- ii. HR implications – none.
- iii. Climate change/biodiversity implications – the long term protection offered by making the TPO permanent would be considered a positive impact on the environment.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

31st July 2013

Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 3.13 The customers have been provided with the relevant notification, and will receive a postal notification of the committee decision.
- 3.14 Equalities and Diversity implications – none.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

The risk of not protecting the trees is that in the long term they may be felled or inappropriately pruned such that their significance and contribution to the wider area would be diminished, causing a loss to the amenity of the area.

5. APPENDICES

- Appendix 1 - Proposed TPO schedule for confirmation.
Appendix 2 - TPO Plan identifying location of trees
(under separate cover in the Site Plan Pack).

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Relevant documentation on file.

7. Key

TPO = Tree Preservation Order.

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: Andrew Southcott, Tree Officer
E Mail: andrew.southcott@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk
Tel: (01527) 64252 ext 3735

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**31st July 2013**APPENDIX ONE****First Schedule****Trees specified individually**

(encircled in black on the attached map)

NONE

Trees specified by reference to an area

(within a dotted black line on the map)

NONE

Groups of Trees

(within a broken black line on the map)

<u>No. on Map</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>NGR</u>	<u>Situation</u>
G1	2 x beech 2 x lime 2 x pine 1 x cedar 1 x sycamore	404254, 261977	Rear garden of 27 Avenue Road, Astwood Bank B96 6AQ

Woodlands

(within a continuous black line on the map)

NONE