

# Planning Committee

Wed 25 Sep  
2013  
7.00 pm

Council Chamber  
Town Hall  
Redditch



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

25th September 2013

7.00 pm

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

<b>1. Apologies</b>	To receive apologies for absence and details of any Councillor nominated to attend the meeting in place of a member of the Committee.
<b>2. Declarations of Interest</b>	To invite Councillors to declare any interest they may have in the items on the Agenda.
<b>3. Confirmation of Minutes</b> (Pages 1 - 4)	To confirm, as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 28 <sup>th</sup> August 2013.  (Minutes attached)
<b>4. Planning Application 2013/130/RC3 - Grassed area next to Redditch Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch</b>  (Pages 5 - 10)  Head of Planning and Regeneration	To consider a Planning application for a public art piece to celebrate the Redditch springs and wireform industry.  Applicant: Leisure and Culture, Redditch Borough Council  (Report attached – Site Plans under separate cover)  <b>(Abbey Ward)</b>
<b>5. Planning Application 2013/145/FUL - Land at Wire Hill Drive, Lodge Park, Redditch</b>  (Pages 11 - 22)  Head of Planning and Regeneration	To consider a Planning Application for a residential development of 12 new detached dwellings with garages.  Applicant: JMH 10 Ltd  (Report attached – Site Plan under separate cover).  <b>(Lodge Park Ward)</b>

# PLANNING

Committee

25th September 2013

<p><b>6. Planning Application 2013/157/FUL - Fieldhouse, Feckenham Road, Hunt End, Redditch B97 5QP</b></p> <p>(Pages 23 - 30)</p> <p>Head of Planning and Regeneration</p>	<p>To consider a Planning Application for a proposed new dwelling and garage in the garden.</p> <p>Applicant: Mr and Mrs R Pearce</p> <p>(Report attached – Site Plan under separate cover)</p> <p><b>(Astwood Bank &amp; Feckenham Ward)</b></p>
<p><b>7. Planning Application 2013/167/FUL - Winslow Close, Winyates East, Redditch B98 0NQ</b></p> <p>(Pages 31 - 34)</p> <p>Head of Planning and Regeneration</p>	<p>To consider a Planning Application for the installation of refuse and recycling bin storage.</p> <p>Applicant: Redditch Borough Council</p> <p>(Report attached – Site Plan under separate cover)</p> <p><b>(Winyates Ward)</b></p>
<p><b>8. Planning Application 2013/193/ADV - New Petrol Filling Station, Land at Teardrop Site, Bordesley Lane, Redditch B97 6RR</b></p> <p>(Pages 35 - 38)</p> <p>Head of Planning and Regeneration</p>	<p>To consider a Planning Application for three internally illuminated fascia signs, one internally illuminated totem sign, four non-illuminated 'Fill Up Either Side' signs, eight non-illuminated pump flag signs and one non-illuminated brand wall sign.</p> <p>Applicant: Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd</p> <p>(Report attached – Site Plan under separate cover)</p> <p><b>(Abbey Ward)</b></p>
<p><b>9. Planning Application 2013/205/COU - Unit 1A, Millsborough House, Millsborough Road, Redditch</b></p> <p>(Pages 39 - 42)</p> <p>Head of Planning and Regeneration</p>	<p>To consider a Planning Application for a change of use from Class A1 (Retail) to Class D2 – Gymnasium (Assembly and Leisure)</p> <p>Applicant: Mr R Vincent</p> <p>(Report attached – Site Plan under separate cover)</p> <p><b>(Central Ward)</b></p>
<p><b>10. Planning Application 2013/206/ADV - Traffic island A4023, Alders Drive, Redditch</b></p> <p>(Pages 43 - 44)</p> <p>Head of Planning and Regeneration</p>	<p>To consider a Planning Application for four advisement sign panels.</p> <p>Applicant: Redditch Borough Council</p> <p>(Report attached – Site Plan under separate cover)</p> <p><b>(Church Hill Ward); (Winyates Ward)</b></p>



# PLANNING

Committee

25th September 2013

<p><b>11. Planning Application 2013/207/ADV - Woodrow Drive and Rough Hill Drive Roundabout</b></p> <p>(Pages 45 - 46)</p> <p>Head of Planning and Regeneration</p>	<p>To consider a Planning Application for four advertisement sign panels.</p> <p>Applicant: Redditch Borough Council</p> <p>(Report attached – Site Plan under separate cover)</p> <p><b>(Headless Cross &amp; Oakenshaw Ward)</b></p>
<p><b>12. Planning Application 2013/208/ADV - Butlers Hill Lane and Brockhill Drive roundabout</b></p> <p>(Pages 47 - 48)</p> <p>Head of Planning and Regeneration</p>	<p>To consider a Planning Application for four advertising sign panels.</p> <p>Applicant: Redditch Borough Council</p> <p>(Report attached – Site Plan under separate cover)</p> <p><b>(Batchley &amp; Brockhill Ward)</b></p>
<p><b>13. Planning Application 2013/209/ADV - Hewell Lane, Brockhill Drive and Birchfield Roundabout</b></p> <p>(Pages 49 - 50)</p> <p>Head of Planning and Regeneration</p>	<p>To consider a Planning Application for three advertising sign panels.</p> <p>Applicant: Redditch Borough Council</p> <p>(Report attached – Site Plan under separate cover)</p> <p><b>(Batchley &amp; Brockhill Ward)</b></p>
<p><b>14. Planning Application 2013/210/ADV - Coventry Highway and Alders Drive Roundabout</b></p> <p>(Pages 51 - 52)</p> <p>Head of Planning and Regeneration</p>	<p>To consider a Planning Application for four advertising sign panels.</p> <p>Applicant: Redditch Borough Council</p> <p>(Report attached – Site Plan under separate cover)</p> <p><b>(Church Hill Ward); (Winyates Ward)</b></p>

## 15. Exclusion of the Public

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:

**“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.**

**These paragraphs are as follows:**

**subject to the “public interest” test, information relating to:**

- Para 1 - any individual;**
- Para 2 - the identity of any individual;**
- Para 3 - financial or business affairs;**
- Para 4 - labour relations matters;**
- Para 5 - legal professional privilege;**
- Para 6 - a notice, order or direction;**
- Para 7 - the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime;**

**may need to be considered as “exempt”.**

## 16. 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

28th August 2013

### MINUTES

#### Present:

Councillor Andrew Fry (Chair), Councillor Alan Mason (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Joe Baker, Roger Bennett, Brenda Quinney, David Bush (substituting for Councillor Roger Smith), Brandon Clayton (substituting for Councillor Mike Chalk), Bill Hartnett (substituting for Councillor Wanda King) and Pat Witherspoon (substituting for Yvonne Smith)

#### Also Present:

Councillor Mark Shurmer

#### Officers:

A Rutt and C Flanagan

#### Democratic Services Officer:

J Bayley

#### 29. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Michael Chalk, Roger Hill, Wanda King and Yvonne Smith.

#### 30. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

#### 31. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

##### RESOLVED that

**the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 31st July 2013 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.**

.....  
Chair

# Planning Committee

**32. PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/145/FUL –  
LAND AT WIRE HILL DRIVE, LODGE PARK**

Erection of twelve new detached dwellings with garages.

Applicant: JMH 10 Ltd

The following people addressed the Committee under the Council's public speaking rules.

Mr J Crow – resident – objecting  
Mr Blewitt – resident – objecting  
Councillor Andrew Fry (Ward Councillor and Objector)  
Councillor Mark Shurmer (Ward Councillor and Objector)

**RESOLVED that**

**a decision on this matter be DEFERRED for Members to undertake a site visit to Wirehill Drive to view the two proposed access points for the development, the topography of the area and the layout of the road.**

(Further to having advised at the start of the meeting of his intentions to withdraw from the Committee to the public gallery for this item, in order to speak to the Application in his capacity as a local Ward Member, the Chair, Councillor Andrew Fry, withdrew from the meeting following the Officer's presentation and conclusion of public speaking on the item in accordance with the Council's public speaking rules, and was not present for the Committee's debate and decision on the matter,

The Committee's Vice-Chair, Councillor Alan Mason was in the Chair for this matter.

Councillor Mark Shurmer, in attendance in the public gallery and also registered to speak on the item as a Ward Councillor, also withdrew from the meeting following the Officers presentation and conclusion of public speaking in accordance with the Council's public speaking rules.)

**33. PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/174/COU –  
19-20 LAKESIDE INDUSTRIAL PARK, NEW MEADOW ROAD,  
LODGE PARK**

Change of use to Class D2 gymnasium (Class D.2)

Applicant: Mr Paul Summers

Mr Summers, 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.**

(Having considered the Application and its merits, Members were of the view that, as other similar change of use applications had been allowed in the vicinity of the application site, together with the close proximity of the Arrow Valley Park, an established leisure facility, the proposed use was acceptable).

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm  
and closed at 8.24 pm

.....  
CHAIR



## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

---

### **PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/130/RC3**

#### **PUBLIC ART PIECE TO CELEBRATE THE REDDITCH SPRINGS AND WIREFORM INDUSTRY**

#### **GRASSED AREA NEXT TO TOWN HALL, WALTER STRANZ SQUARE, REDDITCH**

**APPLICANT: LEISURE AND CULTURE, REDDITCH BOROUGH  
COUNCIL**

**EXPIRY DATE: 18 JULY 2013**

**WARD: ABBEY**

**(See additional papers for Site Plan)**

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

Members will be aware that this application was considered at Planning Committee on 3rd July 2013. The application was deferred to allow the Committee to receive further information on the size of the artwork in relation to the existing building. Officers would clarify that additional details have been provided showing the sculpture insitu. The details will be provided as part of the powerpoint presentation for the application. The details submitted demonstrate that the sculpture would be in scale with the surrounding features within the Square and would not be a dominant feature in this location.

It is anticipated that a bench that exists in front of the proposed sculpture would be relocated within the Square to enable a better view of the sculpture.

The following text is a combination of the main and update report that was provided for the 3rd July 2013 meeting.

#### **Site Description**

The site is a linear area of grassed land, outside the Town Hall, to the west of Walter Stranz Square. Young tree planting exists close to where the sculpture would be located. Benches and streetlighting are also close to the application site. The rest of the Square beyond the grassed area is predominantly hardsurfacing, although another linear area of grass exists opposite the application site and includes the traditional lamp post from Auxerre.

# PLANNING COMMITTEE

25th September 2013

---

## Proposal description

The proposal comprises of a sculpture that would be an open box turned upside down with springs cascading out of the box. Overall the sculpture would be approximately 2.5 x 2.5 metres by 2.5 metres in height. It would be built in mild steel but have a galvanised finish. The box would be distressed to imitate cardboard, and finer details such as crinkling on the lid of the box would be provided to create an authentic corrugated section. The springs would be made from mild steel and would be fully joined whilst still providing a random appearance. This will help form a structural support for the sculpture without the need for structural girders. The sculpture will be secured to the ground via a concrete base.

## 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](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

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

## ***National planning policy***

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Para. 58 of the NPPF encourages development to establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create an attractive place to live, work and visit. It also encourages development to respond to local character, history and reflect the identity of local surroundings.

## ***Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3***

R.1	Primarily Open Space
E(TCR).1	Vitality and Viability of the Town Centre
B(BE).13	Qualities of Good Design
B(BE).20	Public Art

## ***Supplementary Planning Guidance / Supplementary Planning Documents***

Redditch Borough Council Supplementary Planning Document - Designing for Community Safety

## ***Other relevant corporate plans and strategies***

Town Centre Strategy (TCS)

## **Relevant site planning history**

None

## **Public Consultation responses**

No comments submitted.



## PLANNING COMMITTEE

25th September 2013

---

### Consultee responses

#### *Town Centre Co-ordinator*

No objections.

#### *Community Safety*

Would recommend that:

- 1) Consideration is given to protecting the artwork with a transparent anti-graffiti coating which will allow any graffiti to be more easily removed.
- 2) Further details of the spring sizes and arrangements, in particular the gaps within and between the coils are provided to assess these risks and the ease of removing wedged items.
- 3) Consideration be given to creating a boundary for the artwork.
- 4) The service hatch providing access to the electrical wiring is secured with a key lock.

Note that CCTV coverage of the artwork location from RBC camera 5 (mounted above the vacant former Poundstretcher unit) is obscured by two trees in RBC owned brick planted areas (outside former Barclays Bank building).

#### *Severn Trent Water*

No comments at the time of drafting the report.

### Assessment of proposal

The documentation that has been submitted with the application clarifies that this was an idea initiated by a local Councillor to celebrate the heritage of the springs and wireform industry in Redditch as it was felt at the time that public awareness of the significance of the industry was very low. A steering group was set up that included local spring businesses, NEW college representatives as well as RBC staff, and the then Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Culture. 35 students from the college entered a competition to create artistic concepts to celebrate the industry. Two concepts were shortlisted, and following press releases, and a public consultation that took place in Redditch Library, the public voted for the proposed sculpture that forms part of this application.

Redditch has a long history of mass producing springs (100 years approx.). The spring industry was an off shoot of the needle industry which was a major consumer of wire. Whilst the needle industry has diminished in Redditch, spring manufacturing remains in this area with 80 local businesses dedicated to the manufacture of springs and wireform in one form or another. It is important to note that the first spring ever made was in premises in Peakman Street, hence the intention of providing the sculpture close to this street and within the Town Centre.

The key issues for consideration in this case are:-

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**25th September 2013**

---

### Principle

The site is within an area that is designated as Primarily Open Space in the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3 and comprises of a small area of grass that is surrounded by a hard landscaped pedestrianised area. Policy R.1 of the Local Plan would apply which discourages the total or partial loss of Primarily Open Space. However, it also states that proposals for development that contributes to the nature and purpose of the open space may be deemed acceptable. It is considered that the provision of public art in this open space area would visually enhance this civic location and as such would comply with this policy.

B(BE).20 of Local Plan No. 3 would also apply and seeks the provision of public art that contributes to the improvement of public outdoor space, legibility and the creation of landmarks. Any proposals should be sited and designed to improve the quality of public outdoor space, and enhance local distinctiveness. The proposed sculpture would comply with this policy as it would enhance the quality and visual appearance of this open space location. Also, the location for the sculpture is close to where the first spring was made in Redditch, therefore, there would be historical links to providing the sculpture outside the Town Hall and as such would enhance local distinctiveness and raise awareness of local history in this location.

### Design and layout

The design has been shortlisted by the steering group and the final option was voted for by members of the public as a result of a public consultation that took place in Redditch Library. The sculpture would be a sufficient size to provide a presence without being overbearing on the rest of the open space area. In addition the proposal would not detract from other features that exist within this area such as the traditional lamp post from Auxerre, and other hard / soft landscaping features nearby. The design of the sculpture is considered to be acceptable in this location and would generally enhance the streetscene.

### Trees

Whilst there are young trees close to the application site, the sculpture would not have a detrimental impact on the health and safety or longevity of these trees.

### Other issues

In respect to comments submitted by Community Safety, additional information has been submitted by the applicant.

Regarding the galvanized finish and whether this would need any further treatment with regard to resisting graffiti or making its removal easier. The zinc surface, which coats the steel as part of the galvanizing process, is slightly 'greasy' by its very nature, so very resistant to the permanent bonding of paints and other decorative surface treatments. If paint is applied directly

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**25th September 2013**

---

to the new and untreated zinc surface this will often lift off over the following weeks and months on its own through weathering. Or, if it has been applied accidentally, it can be removed with an appropriate solvent cleaner or a mild scourer used. Therefore, it is considered in this case that any additional barrier preparations or anti-graffiti paints are not necessary on this occasion.

With regard to the physical structure of the springs, the artist will be gauging the density and gaps as he constructs the piece to minimise any inclinations to climb the piece through the look and shape of the trunk of the sculpture. In addition, the density of the metalwork at the base should be such that the removal of any litter should become part of a normal litter picking process. However, the artist will be paying a lot of attention to these factors to reduce any undue problems.

A light will be fixed inside the solid steel box and so would be impossible to reach from below. The back of the box (in the folds of the pretend cardboard box) is where maintenance can attend to changing bulbs or working on the light. A particular key will be required but at 2.5 metres high we do not anticipate a problem in any case. The look of the box will not be affected.

In respect to CCTV coverage, one of the trees that is blocking the view of the proposed art work from the nearest CCTV camera, is intended to be trimmed back. If it is considered that the work is not sufficient to enable suitable coverage, the Council's Landscape Section are agreeable to removing the tree and replacing with a large plant instead.

Officers consider that these details address the issues raised by Community Safety. However, in respect to the camera coverage, it is considered appropriate to add an informative regarding possible tree removal if needed.

### Conclusion

The proposal would be in keeping with the area and this would be a suitable location for this piece of art that would enhance local distinctiveness and raise awareness of the local history in this location. The proposal would also comply with policies in the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3 and guidance set out in the NPPF.

### Recommendation

**That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations it is recommended that permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:**

- 1 Development to commence within 3 years.
- 2 Materials to be as indicated in the application details submitted.
- 3 Plans approved defined.

# **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**25th September 2013**

---

## Informatives

- 1 Reason for approval.
- 2 Positive and proactive informative
- 3 The applicant is recommended to contact RBC Community Safety when initial tree work has taken place on the tree obscuring CCTV coverage, to ascertain if further work is required. If so, the applicant is required to contact RBC Landscape Services to organise the removal of the tree and replacement planting.

## **Procedural matters**

This application is being reported to the Planning Committee because the applicant is Redditch Borough Council. As such the application falls outside the scheme of delegation to officers.

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

---

**PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/145/FUL**

**ERECTION OF 12 NEW DETACHED DWELLINGS WITH GARAGES**

**LAND AT WIREHILL DRIVE REDDITCH**

**APPLICANT: JMH 10 LTD**  
**EXPIRY DATE: 5TH SEPTEMBER 2013**

**WARD: LODGE PARK**

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](mailto:steve.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)) for more information.

**(See additional papers for Site Plan)**

### **Site Description**

The application site consists of a triangular shaped area of grass, located adjacent to both the Warwick Highway (to the south) and Wirehill Drive (to the north). The land falls away, steeply in parts, in a south-west to north-east direction towards Wirehill Drive.

Beyond the western boundary are the properties 1-7 Gaydon Close. Beyond Wirehill Drive, to the north lies a further residential area, Himbleton Close. The northern boundary to the site contains a mixed species hedgerow which includes a semi-mature Oak Tree which is protected by means of TPO No.142.

### **Proposal Description**

This is a full planning application to erect twelve, three bedroomed detached dwellings.

Two house types are proposed. House type A (6 no.) would have an integral garage, with House type B (6 no.) having an attached single garage. All dwellings would have additional in curtilage parking.

Every house would be formed of brickwork walls under a tiled roof.

Vehicular access to serve the development is proposed to be formed in two places, both off Wirehill Drive. The first would be at a point approximately 25 metres to the east of the existing vehicular access serving Himbleton Close. This would serve Plots 1 to 10. The second would be located to the east of the existing protected oak further to the east. This access would serve Plots 11 and 12.

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

**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](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

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

***National Planning Policy***

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

***Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3***

- R.1 Primarily Open Space
- R.2 Incidental Open Space
- CS.6 Implementation of Development
- CS.7 The Sustainable location of development
- CS.7 Landscape Character
- B(HSG).6 Development within or adjacent to the curtilage of an existing dwelling
- B(BE).13 Qualities of Good Design
- C(T).12 Parking Standards (Appendix H)
- B(NE).1a Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
- S.1 Designing out Crime

Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states that due weight be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to the degree of consistency with the NPPF (the closer the policies of the plan to the policies of the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given). In accordance with paragraph 215 of the NPPF, the above policies should be afforded due weight, as the aspirations of these policies are consistent with the NPPF.

***Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents***

Encouraging Good Design  
Designing for community safety  
Open space provision

***Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy 2012-2027 (adopted Nov 2012)***

WCS.17 Making provision for waste in all new development

***Constraints***

Borough of Redditch Tree Preservation Order (TPO) No.142

**Relevant Site Planning History**

Application no	Proposal	Decision	Date
2008/305/RC4	Outline application for residential development	Approved	05.11.2008

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

25th September 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 notices on site, and by press notice.

### Responses against

4 comments received raising the following points:

- Mature hedgerow across site should be retained/protected
- The site should be retained as a recreational area for the local community
- Increase in traffic would cause noise disturbance
- Loss of green space
- Unsustainable form of development
- Vehicular and pedestrian safety would be compromised if permission were to be granted
- The land should not be developed in principle
- The proposals would harm the character of the area
- Wildlife in the area would be adversely affected
- Concerns raised regarding subsidence
- The proposed development would be on elevated ground and would impact upon privacy
- This area was originally to be retained as a sound barrier to prevent noise from the adjoining highways

### Petition

A petition of 14 signatures has been received from residents raising concerns of road safety, site history and loss of green space.

Other issues which are not material planning considerations have been raised, but are not reported here as they cannot be considered in the determination of this application.

### Consultee Responses

#### ***County Highway Network Control***

Highways comment that the proposed development is acceptable in highways terms and therefore raise no objection subject to the inclusion of conditions covering access turning and parking, on site roads specification and the submission of a Construction Management Plan.

The County request that a contribution under the 'Infrastructure Delivery Plan' be sought as part of the application.

#### ***Worcestershire Regulatory Services (Environmental Health)***

Comments summarised as follows:

The applicant should demonstrate that appropriate noise attenuation has been considered in the design of the development. Such attenuation could include the use of an acoustic barrier fence to the rear gardens (running

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**25th September 2013

---

parallel to the Warwick Highway). Due to the proximity of the proposed development site to nearby properties, a construction environmental management plan should be submitted in order to ensure that residential amenities are safeguarded during the construction period.

***RBC Arboricultural Officer***

No objections are raised provided the Oak Tree and hedge line to be retained on the boundary of Wirehill Drive are afforded full protection in accordance with BS5837:2012 during construction works. An arboricultural method statement should be provided for the Councils consideration together with a full landscape plan and specification to include the intended routing of all utility service lines.

***Severn Trent Water***

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

***RBC Community Safety Officer***

Has recommended and communicated measures to the applicant's agent which would improve the scheme from a community safety perspective. Comments that boundary treatments need to be robust to the rear of Plots 1 and 12. Gable end windows should be introduced at Plots 1 and Plots 8 in order to increase overlooking and natural surveillance in the interests of designing for community safety

***North Worcestershire Water Management***

Notes that the site is not located within an area of fluvial flood risk and there is no evidence of the site being affected by past surface water flooding. A public foul sewer is located nearby and therefore connection to this is unlikely to be a problem provided the applicant has received consent from Severn Trent Water to connect

***WCC Educational Services***

Confirm that a financial contribution towards education provision would NOT be required in this case

***Waste Management team***

Wheelie bin requirement confirmed for inclusion in the planning obligation

**Background**

Planning permission was granted for residential development in outline form under 2008/305/RC4 following this applications presentation at the RBC Planning Committee on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2008. The application site under that application included a much smaller triangular wedge to the immediate north of the hedgerow containing the oak tree referred to earlier and included the land right up to the Wirehill Drive / Gaydon Close road junction. Under the current application, no dwellings are proposed to be erected on this area of land as was the wish of the RBC Planning Committee in 2008, although the



**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE****25th September 2013**

proposed vehicular access linking Wirehill Drive to the larger triangle of land would need to cross this area.

The outline consent granted in 2008 has now lapsed and therefore no consent for residential development (in principle) exists. It is therefore necessary to re-examine the principle of whether residential development should be permitted together with the other details submitted as part of this (full) planning application.

**Assessment of Proposal**

The key issues for consideration are as follows:

- a) Principle of development
- b) Design, appearance and layout
- c) Impact of the development upon nearby residential amenities
- d) Impact of the proposals on highway safety
- e) Sustainability
- f) Planning Obligation requirements

**Principle of development**

The site which would contain the proposed twelve new dwellings is designated as Primarily Open Space within the Local Plan, where Policy R.1 applies. The smaller triangle of land as referred to above, from which access to the site is to be gained, is undesignated within the Local Plan and thus can be considered as incidental open space under Policy R.2. Policy R.1 is a criteria based policy, whereby in assessing applications for development on Primarily Open Space certain factors will be taken into account. These factors and *your Officers responses* to these are listed as follows:

- i), The environmental and amenity value of the area

*Given the topography of the land the site has no particular or notable amenity value*

- ii) The recreational, conservation, wildlife, historical and visual and community amenity value of the site

*The site as a whole performs a visual open space function but has little wildlife or community value*

- iii) The merits of retaining the land in its existing open use, and the contribution or potential contribution the site makes to the character and appearance of the area

*The hedgeline and protected oak tree, together with the triangle of land to the immediate north adjoining Wirehill Drive make a contribution to*

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**25th September 2013

---

*the open character and appearance of Wirehill Drive, although the larger triangle which is proposed for residential development does not*

- iv) The merits of protecting the site for alternative open space uses.

*It would be difficult to suggest appropriate alternative open space uses on the site given the topography of the land*

- v) The location, size and environmental quality of the site.

*The location, size and quality of the open space is considered to be compromised by the sites close proximity to Wirehill Drive*

- vi) The relationship of the site to other open space areas in the locality and similar uses within the wider area

*There are other open spaces within Lodge Park, including the Lodge Park Pool area, which lies within 300 metres of the site by means of the nearest footpath*

- vii) Whether the site provides a link between other open areas or a buffer between incompatible land uses.

*In this case the site neither provides a link between other open areas nor a buffer between incompatible land uses as it is surrounded by residential development*

- viii) That it can be demonstrated that there is a surplus of open space and that alternative provision of equivalent or greater community benefit will be provided in the area at an appropriate, accessible locality.

*The Councils Open Space Needs Assessment shows that there is a deficit and therefore no surplus of open space in the Lodge Park ward. However, the ward abuts the Arrow Valley Park and therefore is in close proximity to high quality open space provision*

- ix) The merits of the proposed development to the local area or the Borough generally.

*The merits of the proposal should be considered holistically against the positive and negative points raised above and will be addressed further in the conclusion of this section.*

The assessment of the site in relation to the above criteria has shown that the smaller triangular area to the immediate north performs a visual open space function and that it lies in a ward with a deficit of open space in relation to the Borough average. For these reasons your Officers have continued to

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

25th September 2013

---

resist the construction of new dwellings within the smaller area to the north which is incidental open space and subject to Policy R.2 in the Local Plan. This area therefore remains free from development. This serves to protect the hedgerow and maintain the visual amenity of the flatter area of the site in relation to Wirehill Drive.

Members will be aware that the Council cannot at present demonstrate a five year supply of housing land as required under the NPPF, a fact that should be given weight in the consideration of this application. Having carefully re-assessed this application afresh from that submitted in 2008, your officers have concluded that there are no 'in principle' policy reasons why the site cannot be developed for housing purposes subject to acceptability of the other matters as listed below and consider that the need for housing outweighs the benefits of protecting this small and low quality area of open space.

### Design, appearance and layout

Policy both nationally and locally requires new developments *inter alia* to respect and respond to the local distinctiveness of an area. The layout of the development is that of a simple cul-de-sac arrangement, similar albeit smaller in scale to the existing development of Gaydon Close (to the west) which is similarly accessed via Wirehill Drive.

It is noted that the surrounding character and pattern of development varies between approximately 36-60dph, and comprises some semi detached, but mostly terraced housing. The proposed detached development of 12 new dwellings would represent a low density development with a resultant lower number of vehicle trips than might occur if the site were to be developed at a higher density commensurate with the sites surroundings.

The hedge line clearly visible from Wirehill Drive would be retained and therefore much of the development would be partially screened from Wirehill Drive.

The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in appearance, with each plot easily achieving garden sizes which accord with minimum sizes set out in the Councils adopted SPG 'Encouraging Good Design'. Officers have concluded that the development would not be inappropriate and over-intensive in appearance. The dwellings would complement in appearance those of the existing surrounding area.

The proposed use of a cul-de-sac layout is encouraged from a secured by design perspective. Defensible space to properties has been introduced, and the lack of terraced properties has prevented the use of shared rear access alleyways which are not generally encouraged. Passive surveillance over parking areas has been accommodated as per the requests of the Community Safety Officer by the introduction of windows to side gable elevations.

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE****25th September 2013**

---

Impact upon nearby residential amenity

The proposed development by virtue of its siting and scale would not have an overbearing or visually intimidating impact upon nearby properties. Within all new developments it is necessary to assess whether the Council's minimum separation distance of 22 metres would be achieved between rear facing windows serving a proposed development and rear facing windows to existing development. The 22 metre distance is achieved in respect of each plot.

Representations received comment that the site was originally to be retained as a sound barrier to prevent noise from the adjoining highways such as Wirehill Drive. Officers would comment that road noise from traffic travelling along Wirehill Drive would be unlikely to be higher than presently experienced by occupiers of numbers 1 to 7 Gaydon Close due to the presence of the proposed Plots 1 to 6 (running parallel to the rear gardens of these properties) which would be more likely to reduce noise spill arising from vehicles travelling along Wirehill Drive.

Clearly many forms of new built development have the potential to disturb and inconvenience nearby occupiers during the construction phase. In the case of permission being granted for this development, it is recommended that hours of operation on site be restricted by condition. Action can be taken separately and immediately by Environmental Health Officers under the Environmental Protection Act if a statutory nuisance is considered to exist.

Worcestershire Regulatory Services have commented in respect of the proposed development's proximity to the busy Warwick Highway to the south and the issue of noise intrusion for future occupiers of the development. Officers would comment that only Plots 6 and 7 would be materially closer to the Warwick highway than those of numbers 7 to 15 Gaydon Close further to the west. Although a thick belt of mature trees exists between the southern boundary of the application site and the Warwick Highway further to the south, it is recommended that a condition be imposed in the case of permission being granted which would require an acoustic fence to be provided along the southern boundary to the site, in the interests of protecting the amenities of future occupiers of this development.

Impact of the proposals on highway safety

County Highways officers have examined the proposals and have raised no objection to the proposals on highway safety grounds commenting that the additional vehicle trips associated with such a development would not have a detrimental impact upon the surrounding highway network.

Officers are satisfied that the conditions as requested by Highway Network Control are necessary and reasonable having regard to government guidance which exists with respect to planning conditions (Circular 11/95). The conditions requested are those set out as Conditions 10, 11 and 12 in the

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**25th September 2013**

---

recommendation below. It is not considered appropriate in this case to seek the infrastructure contribution following legal advice that has been received.

Parking provision on site would accord with parking standards, having regards to requirements for three bedroomed dwellings.

### Sustainability

The site lies within the urban area of Redditch, and is therefore considered to be in a sustainable location. Officers are satisfied that the site links with cycle and public transport provision in the area, and it is considered that the site could be accessed by a variety of modes of transport, in line with planning policy objectives.

### Planning Obligation required

The size of the proposed development is above the policy threshold for requiring contributions which should be sought via a planning obligation which in this case would cover:

- A contribution towards playing pitches, play areas and open space in the area, due to increased demand/requirement from future residents, is required in compliance with the SPD.
- A contribution to provide refuse and re-cycling bins for the new development in accordance with Policy WCS.17 of the adopted Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy

A contribution towards education provision would also normally be sought in accordance with the SPG, however the county team have confirmed that there is no justifiable need for a contribution in this case and it is therefore not included.

At the time of writing, the planning obligation is in draft form.

### Other matters

A minor amendment to the submitted site layout plan has been requested which would re-position the row of proposed dwellings (Plots 1 to 6 only) by two metres further to the south (such that Plot 1 would be positioned two metres further into the site). This amendment would result in the retention of a greater length of the hedge referred to in the main report. The plan requested is agreeable to the applicant but at the time of writing has yet to be finalised.

### Conclusion

Notwithstanding nearby residents concerns over the proposed new development, the proposals are considered to accord with national and local policy criteria. Officers consider that this detailed application is wholly acceptable having regards to the site's constraints and all other material considerations. Approval of this application would meet some of the demonstrated housing need in the Borough which is considered to outweigh

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**25th September 2013**

---

the need to retain this area as open space. The proposal is considered to comply with the planning policy framework and is unlikely to cause harm to amenity or safety. Subject to the satisfactory completion of the planning obligation, this application can be recommended for approval.

### **Recommendation**

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

- 1) the satisfactory completion of a S106 planning obligation ensuring that:**
  - a) Contributions are paid to the Borough Council in respect to off-site open space in accordance with the Councils adopted SPD
  - b) A financial contribution is paid to the Borough Council towards the provision of wheelie bins for the new development;
- 2) the submission of a satisfactory amendment to site layout plan ref: 2012.005-02 showing the minor re-positioning of Plots 1 to 6; and**
- 3) the Conditions and informatives as summarised below:**

### **Conditions**

1. Development to commence within three years
2. Materials to be submitted – walls and roof
3. Landscaping scheme to be submitted to LPA
4. Landscaping scheme to be implemented in accordance with details agreed
5. Arboricultural method statement
6. Tree protection measures for on-site working
7. Development in accordance with plans (listed)
8. Provision of an acoustic fence – details to be provided
9. Limited working hours during construction period
10. H13: Access turning and parking
11. HC41: On site roads – submission of details
12. HC54: Construction Environmental Management Plan

### **Informatives**

1. Reason for approval
2. Drainage
3. S106 agreement is attached to this consent
4. LPA acted in a positive and proactive manner
5. Community safety informative

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

**25th September 2013**

---

6. Highway informatives HN4, HN7, HN8

**Procedural matters**

This application is being reported to the Planning Committee because the application is classified as 'major'; the recommendation is that permission be granted subject to a planning obligation and because two or more objections have been received.





## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

---

**PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/157/FUL**

**PROPOSED NEW DWELLING AND GARAGE IN THE GARDEN**

**FIELDHOUSE, FECKENHAM ROAD, HUNT END, REDDITCH,  
WORCESTERSHIRE, B97 5QP**

**APPLICANT: MR & MRS R PEARSE**

**EXPIRY DATE: 17TH SEPTEMBER 2013**

**WARD: ASTWOOD BANK AND FECKENHAM**

The author of this report is Harjap Rajwanshi, Planning Assistant (DM), who can be contacted on extension 3384 (e-mail:

harjap.raiwanshi@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) for more information.

**(See additional papers for Site Plan)**

### **Site Description**

The application site is situated to the north of Feckenham Road, Hunt End and lies within the Astwood Bank and Feckenham Ward and within the urban area of Redditch as defined within the Borough of Redditch Local Plan 3.

The area is predominantly residential with detached and semi detached dwellings situated to the east, west, and north west of the site. To the north of the site lies land defined within the Borough of Redditch Local Plan 3 as Open Space and to the south of the site lies land defined within the Borough of Redditch Local Plan 3 as Green Belt which comprises of a ménage for training horses.

The site is of an irregular shape, approximately 0.07 hectares in size and is predominantly laid to grass with individual trees situated to the rear (north) boundary and to the side (west) boundary. The ground level rises gently from east to west and the site is currently part of the extended grounds of the dwelling known as Fieldhouse, though is separated from the main garden by a stream and fencing which borders the stream on both sides.

### **Proposal Description**

The application seeks planning permission to construct a full two storey dwelling with a part gable roof and pitched roof with an attached garage with a gable roof and dormer at first floor comprising of a study/gym area. The front elevation would comprise of a pitched roof which would protrude forward of the main two storey dwellings roof ridge line by approximately 1.9m (L). The side (east) elevation would comprise of covered patio with a mono pitch roof and the rear (north) elevation would comprise of a wc and utility with a mono pitch roof which would extend beyond the main rear elevation by approximately 1.3m (L).

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE****25th September 2013**

The ground floor would comprise of a front porch, lounge, dining room, hall, sitting room, utility, wc, kitchen and garage with a parking area. The first floor would comprise of three bedrooms, a dressing room, ensuite, bathroom and a study/gym area. Two dormers are proposed to the first floor front elevation and a single dormer is proposed to the rear elevation.

The proposed dwelling would be constructed on land naturally separated from the dwelling known as Fieldhouse, by the stream that runs approximately north/south across the current garden. The proposed dwelling would measure a maximum of 7.7m (H) and would be constructed internally of an oak frame and constructed externally of a combination of render, timber weather-boarding and brick walls, clay plain roof tiles, timber doors, framed windows, a close boarded timber fence and a permeable gravel vehicular access.

The side garden would face the side elevation of the dwelling known as Fieldhouse and the means of access to the dwelling would be off Feckenham Road via a newly formed vehicular access into the site.

The existing pedestrian bridge would be removed and a new pedestrian bridge would be constructed to enable access to land within the curtilage of the proposed site and a total of six trees would be removed.

**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](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

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

***National Planning Policy***

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

***Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3***

CS.7	The sustainable location of development
B(HSG).6	Development within or adjacent to the Curtilage of an Existing Dwelling
B(BE).13	Qualities of Good Design
C(T).12	Parking Standards

**Relevant Site Planning History**

None.

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

---

### **Public Consultation Responses**

Responses against

9 comments received raising the following concerns:

- Highways safety concerns - the proposed access adjacent to the narrow bridge would have insufficient visibility towards high speed oncoming traffic along this very narrow section of Feckenham Road and the adjacent bridge. The proposed access would therefore compromise both pedestrian and vehicular safety along a very narrow lane which only allows single lane traffic. There are no pedestrian footpaths and therefore disruption would result by heavy vehicles to traffic and local residents during the construction phase. An alternative access should be considered to overcome highways safety concerns.
- The proposed ground floor sitting room and lounge windows to the side (west) elevation could impact upon the privacy of the neighbouring dwelling to the west of the application site, Perry Mill House, which is situated on higher land than the proposed development.
- The proposal would set a precedent for similar infill developments for several dwellings in the surrounding area which have large gardens which could potentially hold two or three more dwellings. This would significantly change the feel of the rural area which is worth sustaining.

### **Consultation Response**

Internal Consultees:

#### **Tree Officer**

No objection.

#### **Drainage Officer**

No objection subject to drainage condition and consent required for works to the proposed pedestrian access bridge from the Environment Agency.

County Consultees:

#### **County Highway Network Control**

No objection subject to access, turning and parking condition, visibility splay condition, access gate condition, private apparatus within highway informative and alteration of highway to provide vehicle crossover informative. Request a contribution towards wider highway infrastructure provision.

#### **Worcestershire Regulatory Services (WRS) Environmental Health**

No Objection subject to condition controlling noise and dust.

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

---

### External Consultees:

#### **Severn Trent Water**

No Objection subject to a condition for the disposal of surface and foul sewage

### Assessment of Proposal

The main considerations in this application are the principle of the proposed development, the impact of the plot sub-division and the resulting layout in respect of the character of the area, the impact of the proposal on the neighbouring amenities and the impact on highways and servicing issues.

### Principle of Development

Despite the fact that gardens have been excluded from the definition of previously developed land within the NPPF, it is considered that the principle of erecting a residential dwelling in this location is acceptable. The proposal would comply with policy B(HSG).6 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan 3 as the application site is situated within a run of development and within an established residential urban area of Redditch as defined within the Borough of Redditch Local Plan 3.

### Impact on Design/Impact on Character of Street Scene

The Encouraging Good Design SPG used to appraise the appearance and design of the proposal and Policies B(BE).13 and B(HSG).6 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 3 are consistent with the design principles contained within the NPPF (section 7). Within both of these documents achieving good design is of fundamental importance.

Policy B(HSG).6 of the adopted Local Plan is supportive of new residential development within the curtilage of a dwelling house providing it respects the character and appearance of its surroundings and does not impinge on the residential amenities enjoyed by occupiers of existing nearby development.

The existing building line fronting onto Feckenham Road is staggered and would therefore not be disrupted by the proposed development. The surrounding area also contains a mixture of housing styles with irregular shapes rather than homogenous layouts and appearances. It is considered therefore that the contemporary appearance of the dwelling, whilst being different to that of neighbouring dwellings, would be acceptable by virtue of no defined house type prevailing in the street scene.

The proposal would comply with the spacing standard requirements of The Encouraging Good Design SPG by virtue of the proposed dwelling being set off the neighbouring dwelling boundary in excess of 1m (L). The proposal would have a usable garden space in excess of 70 square metres and the proposed side elevations would consist of blank gable end walls. The proposed dwelling would approximately measure a maximum of 7.7m (H) and the submitted street scene plan illustrates the proposal would respect the

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**25th September 2013**

---

scale and height of the neighbouring dwellings by virtue of the change of level. The proposed first floor front and rear elevation dormers would respect the depth of the proposed roof slope and would have square proportions.

Having regards to Policies B(BE).13 and B(HSG).6 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 3, The Encouraging Good Design SPG and the NPPF, the proposal is considered to be acceptable by virtue of its siting, scale and design and therefore the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the street-scene.

### Impact on Neighbouring Amenities

Paragraph 17 of the NPPF advises to seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

The proposal would not have a detrimental impact upon neighbour amenity in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy by virtue of its siting, scale and design and would therefore respect the amenity of the adjacent dwellings. The proposed rear first floor elevation windows would overlook land defined within the Borough of Redditch Local Plan 3 as Open Space and would therefore not overlook any private residential amenity space. The proposed front elevation windows would not front onto any residential dwelling. The boundary treatment would consist of a 2m (H) fence and the curtilage of the site would retain some trees for screening purposes.

### Parking and Access Arrangements

The Highways Officer has stated the parking standards for the proposal would be acceptable. Conditions requiring details to be submitted to ensure highways safety regarding access, turning and parking, the provision of visibility splays and any new access gate to be inward opening and set back five metres from the adjoining carriageway edge would safeguard highways safety concerns. The proposal would therefore have no detrimental impact on highway safety.

Whilst the highway authority have requested a contribution towards wider infrastructure, the legal advice remains at this stage that these should not be sought as there is not yet a reasonable process for doing so. Thus it is not required or included as part of the recommendation below.

### Other Issues

As noted above, the Highways Officer has stated no objection to the proposed access off Feckenham Road subject to the conditions noted above which would overcome highway safety concerns.

The proposed ground floor sitting room and lounge windows to the side (west) elevation would not have a major detrimental impact on the privacy of the neighbouring dwelling to the west of the application site, Perry Mill House,

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

25th September 2013

which is situated on higher land than the proposed development, as the side boundary treatment would consist of a 2m (H) fence and there would be a separation distance in excess of 20m (L) between the (west facing) side gable wall of Perry Mill House and the proposed dwellings (east facing) side elevation gable wall.

As noted above, despite the fact that gardens have been excluded from the definition of previously developed land within the NPPF, it is considered that the principle of erecting a residential dwelling in this location is considered to be acceptable. Therefore objections relating to the proposal setting a precedent for similar infill developments cannot be given weight in the determination of this application.

### Conclusion

It is considered that the proposal would comply with Policy B(BE).13, Policy B(HSG).6, Policy C(T).12 and Policy CS7 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3, the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Encouraging Good Design and the NPPF (2012). The proposal would not cause any significant detrimental impact to the parking and access arrangements or to the amenities of the neighbouring dwellings and would be acceptable in terms of appearance and design. As such the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

### 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) Access, turning and parking (H13)
- 4) Visibility splays (HC5)
- 5) Access gates (HC7)
- 6) Walls and roofs (materials to be submitted)
- 7) Garage to have ancillary use to main dwelling

### Informative

- 1) Reason for approval
- 2) LPA acted in a positive and proactive manner
- 3) Drainage
- 4) Private apparatus within the highway (HN4)
- 5) Alteration of highway to provide new or named vehicle crossover (HN5)

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

**25th September 2013**

---

**Procedural Matters**

This application is being reported to Planning Committee for determination as the application is recommended for approval and has received more than one objection to it. As such the application falls outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.





## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

---

**PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/167/FUL**

**INSTALLATION OF REFUSE AND RECYCLING BIN STORAGE**

**WINSLOW CLOSE, WINYATES EAST, REDDITCH, B98 0NQ**

**APPLICANT: REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**EXPIRY DATE: 30TH SEPTEMBER 2013**

**WARD: CENTRAL**

**(See additional papers for Site Plan)**

The author of this report is Ailith Rutt, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on extension 3374  
(e-mail: [ailith.rutt@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:ailith.rutt@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)) for more information.

### **Site Description**

Communal area outside existing block of flats, comprising grassed areas and hard surfaced parking spaces. The site is formed of three small parcels, one outside the external door to the building on existing parking spaces; one adjacent a footpath entrance on the grass and the final one in the parking area to the south of the building.

### **Proposal Description**

Communal area outside existing block of flats, comprising grassed areas and hard surfaced parking spaces. The site is formed of three small parcels, one outside the external door to the building on existing parking spaces; one adjacent a footpath entrance on the grass and the final one in the parking area to the south of the building.

### **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](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

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

### ***National Planning Policy***

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

### ***Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3***

B(BE)13 Qualities of Good Design

B(BE)28 Waste Management

C(T)12 Parking Standards

R2 Protection of Incidental Open Space

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

---

### ***Supplementary Planning Guidance***

Encouraging Good Design

### ***Relevant Site planning History***

None

### **Public Consultation Responses**

No comments received – any received after the publication of the report will appear on the Update paper

### **Consultee Responses**

#### ***County Highway Network Control***

Comments awaited

### ***Waste Management***

Comments awaited

### **Assessment of Proposal**

The key issues for consideration in this case are loss of incidental open space and parking provision and the impact of the proposal on the visual amenity of the area.

The area surrounding the residential built form would remain largely open in appearance, as the bin storage areas would not be overly high, and the railings allow for views through. Therefore, the theoretical loss of incidental open space is not considered to be sufficiently significant to warrant refusal in this case.

The loss of 6 parking spaces is not considered to be of concern in this location, due to the significant quantity of spaces that would remain available and the apparently low demand for them.

### **Conclusion**

The proposal is not considered likely to cause any harm, would be of benefit to local residents and complies with the local and national policy framework.

### **Recommendation**

**Subject to expiry of the consultation period on 27 September 2013 with no new material considerations raised, it is recommended that having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, authority be delegated to the Head of Planning & Regeneration to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions and informatives as summarised below:**

- 1 Time limit for commencement of development
- 2 Development to be as per the approved plans

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

**25th September 2013**

---

3 Materials to be as shown on plans or agreed in writing

Informatives

1 Reason for approval

**Procedural matters**

This application is reported to Planning Committee for transparency because Redditch Borough Council is the applicant.



REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

**PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/193/ADV**

**PROPOSAL: THREE INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED FASCIA SIGNS, ONE INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED TOTEM SIGN, FOUR NON ILLUMINATED 'FILL UP EITHER SIDE; SIGNS, EIGHT NON ILLUMINATED PUMP FLAG SIGNS AND ONE NON ILLUMINATED BRAND WALL SIGN**

**LOCATION: NEW PFS SITE, LAND AT TEARDROP SITE, BORDESLEY LANE, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B97 6RR**

**APPLICANT: SAINSBURY'S SUPERMARKETS LTD**

**EXPIRY DATE: 6TH SEPTEMBER 2013**

**WARD: ABBEY**

The author of this report is Ailith Rutt, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on extension 3374  
(e-mail: ailith.rutt@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) for more information.

**(See additional papers for Site Plan)**

**Site Description**

The site lies adjacent to the roundabout on the A441 from which the Sainsbury's supermarket store is accessed. The site is bounded by Bordesley Lane that leads to the crematorium and the Abbey Stadium, Millrace Road and the A441.

A petrol filling station is currently being constructed on the site.

**Proposal Description**

The application seeks consent to display advertisements as follows:

- Three internally illuminated fascia signs, two mounted on the canopy of the PFS and one on the kiosk frontage
- One internally illuminated totem sign on the verge fronting the Millrace Road/Bordesley Lane junction
- Four non-illuminated 'fill up either side' signs to be mounted at ground level in each aisle
- Eight non illuminated pump flag signs, one for each petrol filling pump
- One non illuminated brand wall sign on the kiosk adjacent the door, stating opening times

**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

25th September 2013

---

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

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

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

## ***National Planning Policy***

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

## **Relevant site planning history**

<b>Appn. no</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Date</b>
2011/258/FUL	Erection of a petrol filling station including forecourt shop, canopy and 8 pumps, car wash, car care facilities, car parking, offset fills and associated plant and landscaping	Granted	30.03.2012

## **Public Consultation responses**

None received

## **Consultee responses**

### ***County Highway Network Control***

No objection

## **Assessment of proposal**

The NPPF requires that applications for advertisement consent are considered on the basis of the impact of the proposed signage on highway safety and public amenity.

### **Highway safety**

No objections have been raised by the Highway Officer in relation to this proposal. It is not considered that the number, size or design of the signs proposed is such that there would be any harmful effects on users of the adjacent highway network.

### **Public amenity**

The proposed signs would not face the Bordesley Lane frontage and therefore would not result in any detrimental impacts on users of the crematorium or on any wildlife habitats beyond in the Arrow Valley Country Park.

The proposed signs would not face directly onto the A441 Birmingham Road and as such would not result in any detrimental impacts on residential amenities, further aided by the great separation distance between the site and any such properties.

# **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**25th September 2013**

---

It is considered that the size, style and design of the signs would be sympathetic to the design and layout of the PFS and therefore not cause any harm to the visual amenity of the surrounding area.

## Conclusion

It is therefore concluded that the proposal complies with the national and local planning policy framework and is acceptable.

## Recommendation

**That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, advertisement consent be GRANTED subject to conditions and informatives as summarised below:**

- 1 to 5)            Standard advert conditions
- 6)                As per plans submitted

## Informatives

None required in this case

## **Procedural matters**

The application is reported to committee at its own request; at the time of determining the PFS application noted above, it was requested that any signage also be reported to the Planning Committee for determination.





## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

---

**PLANNING APPLICATION: 2013/205/COU**

**CHANGE OF USE FROM CLASS A1 (RETAIL) TO CLASS D2 -  
(ASSEMBLY AND LEISURE).**

**UNIT 1A, MILLSBOROUGH HOUSE, MILLSBOROUGH ROAD, REDDITCH**

**APPLICANT: MR RUSSELL VINCENT  
EXPIRY DATE: 29 OCTOBER 2013**

**WARD: CENTRAL**

**(See additional papers for Site Plan)**

The author of this report is Nina Chana, Planning Assistant (DM), who can be contacted on extension 3207 (e-mail: [nina.chana@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:nina.chana@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)) for more information.

### **Site Description**

Site forms part of a larger complex that was formerly a spring factory which over the years has been divided into smaller units consisting of a mixture of uses. The application site (Unit 1A) is located at the side of the main building, on the ground floor and fronts onto Millsborough Road. The unit was formally occupied by a company selling haberdashery items as well as curtains, blinds, fabrics, etc. This business (Vale Fabrics) has recently moved to another location within the Redditch area, hence the unit is currently empty.

### **Proposal Description**

The application is for the change of use from A1 Retail use to D2 Assembly and Leisure use. However the applicant has specified within his application that his current intention is to use the unit as a gymnasium. The unit would be refurbished to accommodate gym machines and other associated equipment.

The facility would be open to gym members from 7.00am to 10.00pm Monday to Friday, 7.00am to 10 pm Saturdays and 7am to 4pm on Sundays.

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

### ***National planning policy***

National Planning Policy Framework

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

***Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3***

E(TCR).3 Peripheral Zone

E(TCR).4 Need and the Sequential Approach

Millsborough House is included in the Council's Schedule of Buildings of Local Interest

**Relevant site planning history**

<b>Appn. no</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Date</b>
1995/023	Change of Use from recreational and part Industrial uses to A1 Retail	Approved	01.03.1995

**Consultation responses**

No public comments received to date and no statutory consultations required

**Assessment of proposal**

The site is within an area designated as the Town Centre Peripheral Zone in the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3. Policy E(TCR).3 would apply. The primary aim of Policy E(TCR).3 is to complement the role and function of the Town Centre and encourage a mixture of uses such as residential, retail, commercial, light industry, warehousing, social, community, education, leisure or entertainment.

As stated above, the building has a history of industrial use and this use has been maintained when the building was subdivided into smaller commercial units, although other peripheral zone uses have since been approved and encouraged in the building. The unit concerned had the benefit of A1 use and has had a retail use until recently. This use was implemented for a period of 18 years but has since moved to other premises within the town. It is now proposed to use the unit as a gymnasium which falls under use class D2. This use would be compatible with Policy E(TCR).3 and as such the proposal would support the role and function of the Town Centre, and is considered to be acceptable.

The unit is in a sustainable location and there are plenty of available parking opportunities in close proximity to the site such that there are no concerns raised in this regard.

**Conclusion**

It is concluded that the proposed change of use would comply with the national and local planning policy framework and is therefore acceptable in this location of the town.

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

---

### Recommendation

That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, authority be delegated to the Head of Planning & Regeneration to GRANT planning permission subject to the expiry of the consultation period on 1st October 2013 with no new material considerations having been raised and to conditions and informatives as summarised below:

- 1 Development to commence within 3 years.
- 2 D2 Use
- 3 Plans approved specified

### Informatives

- 1 Reason for approval

### **Procedural matters**

This application is reported to planning committee for determination because it falls outside of the scheme of delegation set out in the constitution as it is change of use to a D2 use.



## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

---

**PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/206/ADV**

**FOUR ADVERTISEMENT SIGN PANELS**

**TRAFFIC ISLAND A4023, ALDERS DRIVE, REDDITCH  
WORCESTERSHIRE**

**APPLICANT: REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL  
EXPIRY DATE: 7TH OCTOBER 2013**

**WARD: WINYATES AND CHURCH HILL**

**(See additional papers for Site Plan)**

The author of this report is Claire Gilbert, Planning Officer (DC), who can be contacted on extension 3214 (e-mail: [claire.gilbert@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:claire.gilbert@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)) for more information.

### **Site Description**

Grass mounded roundabout at road junction. Roundabout has six arms.

### **Proposal Description**

Four small signs to advertise roundabout sponsors. Signs would be 1m wide, and 0.5m tall and mounted on a pole at each end, with the top 0.8m above ground level. No illumination is proposed.

### **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](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

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

### ***National Planning Policy***

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

### ***Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3***

B(BE)13 Qualities of good design

B(BE)18 Advertisements

### ***Relevant Site planning History***

1997/355/ADV - Advertising Boards- Consent to Display Advert Granted  
20/02/1998

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

---

### Consultee Responses

#### *County Highway Network Control*

No objection

### Assessment of Proposal

The NPPF requires that applications for advertisement consent are considered on the basis of the impact of the proposed signage on highway safety and public amenity.

#### Highway safety

No objections have been raised by highways in relation to this proposal. It is not considered that the signs proposed would have any harmful effects on users of the adjacent highway network.

#### Public amenity

The proposed signage is considered to be of a size and height that would be appropriate for its location, such that it would not appear out of character or visually intrusive in the street scene.

#### Conclusion

It is concluded that the proposed signage would comply with the national and local planning policy framework and is therefore acceptable.

### Recommendation

**That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, advertisement consent be GRANTED subject to conditions and informatives as summarised below:**

1-5 Standard advert conditions

6 As per plans submitted

#### Informatives

None required in this case

### **Procedural matters**

Applications submitted by the Borough Council are automatically reported to the Planning Committee for determination for transparency.

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

---

**PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/207/ADV**

**FOUR ADVERTISING SIGN PANELS**

**WOODROW DRIVE AND ROUGH HILL DRIVE ROUNDABOUT**

**APPLICANT: REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**EXPIRY DATE: 7TH OCTOBER 2013**

**WARD: HEADLESS CROSS AND OAKENSHAW**

**(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**

Grass mounded roundabout that links Rough Hill Drive, Greenlands Drive, Woodrow north, and Woodrow Drive and as such the roundabout has four arms. Some tree planting and landscaping currently exists on the roundabout.

### **Proposal Description**

Four small signs to advertise roundabout sponsors. Signs would be 1.0m wide, and 0.5m tall and mounted on a pole at each end, with the top 0.8m above ground level. No illumination is proposed.

### **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](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

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

### ***National Planning Policy***

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

### ***Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3***

B(BE)13 Qualities of good design

B(BE)18 Advertisements

### ***Relevant Site planning History***

None

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

---

### Consultee Responses

#### ***County Highway Network Control***

Comments awaited.

### Assessment of Proposal

The NPPF requires that applications for advertisement consent are considered on the basis of the impact of the proposed signage on highway safety and public amenity.

#### Highway safety

No comments have been received so far. However, given the signage is very similar to those that have been granted advert consent on other roundabouts in 2011, it is unlikely that County Highway Network Control would raise objections to this proposal. It is considered unlikely that the signs proposed would have any harmful effects on users of the adjacent highway network.

#### Public amenity

The proposed signage is considered to be of a size and height that would be appropriate for its location, such that it would not appear out of character or visually intrusive in the street scene.

#### Conclusion

It is concluded that the proposed signage would comply with the national and local planning policy framework and is therefore acceptable.

### Recommendation

**That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, advertisement consent be GRANTED subject to conditions and informatives as summarised below:**

- 1-5 Standard advert conditions
- 6 As per plans submitted

#### Informatives

None required in this case

### **Procedural matters**

Applications submitted by the Borough Council are automatically reported to the Planning Committee for determination for transparency.



## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

---

**PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/208/ADV**

**FOUR ADVERTISING SIGN PANELS**

**BUTLERS HILL LANE AND BROCKHILL DRIVE ROUNDABOUT**

**APPLICANT: REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**EXPIRY DATE: 6TH SEPTEMBER 2013**

**WARD: BATCHLEY AND BROCKHILL**

**(See additional papers for Site Plan)**

The author of this report is Nina Chana, Planning Officer (DC), who can be contacted on extension 3207 (e-mail: [nina.chana@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:nina.chana@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)) for more information.

### **Site Description**

Grass mounded roundabout at road junction. Roundabout has five arms

### **Proposal Description**

Four small signs to advertise roundabout sponsors. Signs would be 1.0 m wide, and 0.8m tall and mounted on a pole at each end, with the top 0.8m above ground level. No illumination is proposed.

### **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](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

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

### ***National Planning Policy***

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

### ***Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3***

B(BE)13 Qualities of good design

B(BE)18 Advertisements

### ***Relevant Site planning History***

None

### **Consultee Responses**

#### ***County Highway Network Control***

No objection

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

---

### **Assessment of Proposal**

The NPPF requires that applications for advertisement consent are considered on the basis of the impact of the proposed signage on highway safety and public amenity.

#### **Highway safety**

No objections have been raised by highways in relation to this proposal. It is not considered that the signs proposed would have any harmful effects on users of the adjacent highway network.

#### **Public amenity**

The proposed signage is considered to be of a size and height that would be appropriate for its location, such that it would not appear out of character or visually intrusive in the street scene.

#### **Conclusion**

It is concluded that the proposed signage would comply with the national and local planning policy framework and is therefore acceptable.

### **Recommendation**

**That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, advertisement consent be GRANTED subject to conditions and informatives as summarised below:**

1-5 Standard advert conditions  
6 As per plans submitted

#### **Informatives**

None required in this case

### **Procedural matters**

Applications submitted by the Borough Council are automatically reported to the Planning Committee for determination for transparency.

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

---

**PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/209/ADV**

**THREE ADVERTISING SIGN PANELS**

**HEWELL LANE, BROCKHILL DRIVE AND BIRCHFIELD ROUNDABOUT**

**APPLICANT: REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**EXPIRY DATE: 7 OCTOBER, 2013**

**WARD: BATCHLEY AND BROCKHILL**

**(See additional papers for Site Plan)**

The author of this report is Steven Edden, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on extension 3206.

(e-mail: [steven.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:steven.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)) for more information.

### **Site Description**

Grass mounded roundabout at road junction. Roundabout has five arms

### **Proposal Description**

Three small signs to advertise roundabout sponsors. Signs would be 1m wide, and 0.5m tall and mounted on a pole at each end, with the top 0.8m above ground level. No illumination is proposed.

### **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](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

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

### ***National Planning Policy***

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

### ***Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3***

B(BE)13 Qualities of good design

B(BE)18 Advertisements

### ***Relevant Site planning History***

None

### **Consultee Responses**

#### ***County Highway Network Control***

No objection.

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

---

### **Assessment of Proposal**

The NPPF requires that applications for advertisement consent are considered on the basis of the impact of the proposed signage on highway safety and public amenity.

#### **Highway safety**

No objections have been raised by highways in relation to this proposal. It is not considered that the signs proposed would have any harmful effects on users of the adjacent highway network.

#### **Public amenity**

The proposed signage is considered to be of a size and height that would be appropriate for its location, such that it would not appear out of character or visually intrusive in the street scene.

#### **Conclusion**

It is concluded that the proposed signage would comply with the national and local planning policy framework and is therefore acceptable.

### **Recommendation**

**That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, advertisement consent be GRANTED subject to conditions and informatives as summarised below:**

1-5 Standard advert conditions  
6 As per plans submitted

#### **Informatives**

None required in this case

### **Procedural matters**

Applications submitted by the Borough Council are automatically reported to the Planning Committee for determination for transparency

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

---

**PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/210/ADV**

**FOUR ADVERTISING SIGN PANELS**

**COVENTRY HIGHWAY AND ALDERS DRIVE ROUNDABOUT**

**APPLICANT: REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**EXPIRY DATE: 7 OCTOBER 2013**

**WARD: WINYATES AND CHURCH HILL**

**(See additional papers for Site Plan)**

The author of this report is Ruth Lambert, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on extension 1373.

(e-mail: [ruth.lambert@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:ruth.lambert@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)) for more information.

### **Site Description**

Grass mounded roundabout at road junction. Roundabout has four arms.

### **Proposal Description**

Four small signs to advertise roundabout sponsors. Signs would be 1.0m wide, and 0.5m tall and mounted on a pole at each end, with the top 0.8m above ground level. No illumination is proposed.

### **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](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

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

### ***National Planning Policy***

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

### ***Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3***

B(BE)13 Qualities of good design

B(BE)18 Advertisements

### ***Relevant Site Planning History***

None.

### **Consultee Responses**

#### ***County Highway Network Control***

No objection.

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

25th September 2013

---

### **Assessment of Proposal**

The NPPF requires that applications for advertisement consent are considered on the basis of the impact of the proposed signage on highway safety and public amenity.

#### **Highway safety**

No objections have been raised by highways in relation to this proposal. It is not considered that the signs proposed would have any harmful effects on users of the adjacent highway network.

#### **Public amenity**

The proposed signage is considered to be of a size and height that would be appropriate for its location, such that it would not appear out of character or visually intrusive in the street scene.

#### **Conclusion**

It is concluded that the proposed signage would comply with the national and local planning policy framework and is therefore acceptable.

### **Recommendation**

**That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, advertisement consent be GRANTED subject to conditions and informatives as summarised below:**

1-5 Standard advert conditions  
6 As per plans submitted

#### **Informatives**

None required in this case.

### **Procedural matters**

Applications submitted by the Borough Council are automatically reported to the Planning Committee for determination for transparency.