

Planning Committee

Tue 15 Jul
2008
7.00 pm

Council Chamber
Town Hall
Redditch



www.redditchbc.gov.uk

Access to Information - Your Rights

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

Your main rights are set out below:-

- Automatic right to attend all formal Council and Committee meetings unless the business would disclose confidential or “exempt” information.
- Automatic right to inspect agendas and public reports at least five days before the date of the meeting.
- Automatic right to inspect minutes of the Council and its Committees

(or summaries of business undertaken in private) for up to six years following a meeting.

- Automatic right to inspect lists of background papers used in the preparation of public reports.
- Access, on request, to the background papers on which reports are based for a period of up to four years from the date of the meeting.
- Access to a public register stating the names and addresses and electoral areas of all Councillors with details of the membership of all Committees etc.

A reasonable number of copies of agendas and reports relating to items to be considered in public must be made available to the public attending meetings of the Council and its Committees etc.

- Access to a list specifying those powers which the Council has delegated to its Officers indicating also the titles of the Officers concerned.
- Access to a summary of the rights of the public to attend meetings of the Council and its Committees etc. and to inspect and copy documents.
- In addition, the public now has a right to be present when the Council determines “Key Decisions” unless the business would disclose confidential or “exempt” information.
- Unless otherwise stated, most items of business before the Executive Committee are Key Decisions.
- Copies of Agenda Lists are published in advance of the meetings on the Council’s Website:

www.redditchbc.gov.uk

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

Trish Buckley

Members Services Officer

Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH

Tel: (01527) 64252 Ext. 3265 Fax: (01527) 65216

e.mail: trish.buckley@redditchbc.gov.uk

Minicom: 595528

آپ انگریزی میں مدد چاہتے ہیں۔ نسلیاتی رسائی [Ethnic Access] سے رابطہ کریں ٹیلیفون: 01905 25121

ইংরেজি ভাষার বিষয়ে সাহায্য চান – এথনিক অ্যাকসেস [Ethnic Access] এর সঙ্গে যোগাযোগ করুন, টেলিফোন: 01905 25121

‘Potrzebujesz pomocy z Angielskim – skontaktuj się z Ethnic Access Tel: 01905 25121’

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 follows:

in accordance with the running order detailed in this agenda (Applications for Planning Permission item) 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) Councillors' questions to the Officers - to clarify detail.
- 4) Public Speaking - in the following order:-
 - a) Objectors to speak on the application;
 - b) Supporters to speak on application;
 - c) Applicant to speak on application.

Speakers will be called in the order they have notified their interest in speaking to the Planning Officers (by the 4.00 p.m. deadline on the Friday before the meeting) and invited to the table or lecturn.

- Each individual speaker, or group representative, will have up to a maximum of 3 minutes to speak. (Please press button on "conference unit" to activate microphone.)
 - 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.)
- 5) 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.2, 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 5.00 p.m. on the Friday before the meeting.
- 5) Anyone wishing to address the Planning Committee on applications on this agenda must notify Planning Officers by 5.00 p.m. on the Friday before 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 the Ringway Car Park.

Declaration of Interests: Guidance for Councillors

DO I HAVE A "PERSONAL INTEREST" ?

- Where the item relates or is likely to affect your **registered interests** (what you have declared on the formal Register of Interests)

OR

- Where a decision in relation to the item might reasonably be regarded as affecting **your own** well-being or financial position, or that of your **family**, or your **close associates** more than most other people affected by the issue,

you have a personal interest.

WHAT MUST I DO? **Declare the existence, and nature, of your interest and stay**

- The declaration must relate to specific business being decided - a general scattergun approach is not needed
- **Exception** - where interest arises only because of your membership of another **public body**, there is no need to declare unless you **speak** on the matter.
- You **can vote** on the matter.

IS IT A "PREJUDICIAL INTEREST" ?

In general only if:-

- It is a personal interest **and**
- The item affects your **financial position** (or conveys other benefits), or the position of your **family, close associates** or bodies through which you have a **registered interest** (or relates to the exercise of **regulatory functions** in relation to these groups)

and

- A member of public, with knowledge of the relevant facts, would reasonably believe the interest was likely to **prejudice** your judgement of the public interest.

WHAT MUST I DO? **Declare and Withdraw**

BUT you may make representations to the meeting before withdrawing, **if** the public have similar rights (such as the right to speak at Planning Committee).



PLANNING COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 15th July, 2008

7.00 pm

Council Chamber Town Hall

Agenda

Membership:

Cllrs: M Chalk (Chair) J Field
D Smith (Vice-Chair) W Hartnett
K Boyd-Carpenter N Hicks
D Enderby D Hunt
R J Farooqui

1. Apologies and named substitutes	To receive apologies for absence and details of any Councillor nominated to attend the meeting in place of a member of the Committee. (No Specific Ward Relevance)
2. Declarations of interest	To invite Councillors to declare any interest they may have in the items on the Agenda. (No Specific Ward Relevance)
3. Confirmation of minutes (Pages 1 - 6)	To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on the 17th of June 2008. (Copy attached) (No Specific Ward Relevance)
4. Applications for planning permission (Pages 7 - 32) John Staniland, Acting Director of Environment and Planning	To consider applications for planning permission. (Report attached) Various Wards
5. National Planning Policy Framework - update on changes (Pages 33 - 38) John Staniland, Acting Director of Environment and Planning	To advise Members on changes to the National Planning Policy Framework and its implications for the Planning Committee. (Report attached) All Wards

PLANNING

Committee

Tuesday, 15th July, 2008

<p>6. Enforcement of Planning Control - updates</p> <p>(Pages 39 - 44)</p> <p>John Staniland, Acting Director of Environment and Planning</p>	<p>To receive a number of updates in relation to enforcement of Planning Control.</p> <p>(Report attached)</p> <p>Various Wards</p>
<p>7. Exclusion of the public</p>	<p>During the course of the meeting it may be necessary, in the opinion of the Acting Borough Director, to consider excluding the public from the meeting on the grounds that exempt information is likely to be divulged. It may be necessary, therefore, to move the following resolution:</p> <p>“that, under S.100 I of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following matter(s) on the grounds that it/they involve(s) the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the relevant paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) of the said Act, as amended.</p> <p>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</p>
<p>8. Confidential matters (If any)</p>	<p>To deal with any exceptional matters necessary to consider after the exclusion of the public (none notified to date.)</p> <p>(No Specific Ward Relevance)</p>

Planning Committee

17th June 2008

Minutes

Present:

Councillor M Chalk (Chair) and Councillors Boyd-Carpenter, Braley (substituting for Councillor Farooqui), B Clayton (substituting for Councillor Smith), Field, Hartnett and Hunt.

Officers:

L Hadley, A Hussain and A Rutt.

Committee Services Officer:

J Smyth.

5. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Enderby, Farooqui, Hicks and Smith.

6. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest at this point in the meeting.

(See also Minute 8 / Application 2008/132 below for a declaration by a non-member of the Committee.)

7. MINUTES

RESOLVED that

subject to Members noting an amendment to the 22nd April minutes to correct the spelling of an objector's name in relation to Planning Application 2008/051 ("Blaydon" should have been recorded as "Bladon"), the minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on the 22nd of April and 20th of May 2008 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

8. APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

The Committee considered a number of applications for planning permission.

Officers tabled an update report detailing any late responses to consultation, changed recommendations, further conditions, any

additional Officer comment and one Urgent Business addition to the agenda (as detailed below). This report was further updated orally at the meeting as appropriate to each application.

Public speaking was permitted, in accordance with the Council's agreed procedures, in relation to four of the applications being considered, as detailed below.

RESOLVED that

the following applications for planning consent be determined as detailed below:-

08/143 Change of use of a steel portal framed building to a meat processing plant to service local needs Windy Bank, Astwood Lane, Astwood Bank Mr Terry Simpson

(Mrs A Pulsford, objector, addressed the Committee under the Council's public speaking rules.)

Having regard to the Development Plan and to other material considerations, Planning Permission be REFUSED for the reason stated in the report and the following additional reason:

"2. The proposed vehicle access serving the site is considered inadequate and likely to result in conflict between goods vehicles accessing the site from Astwood Lane and those using the Astwood Farm Site. The road network surrounding the site is not suitable for any additional increase in goods vehicle traffic and as such the proposal is considered contrary to Policy C(T).1 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3."

08/073 Development of five dwellings with associated access drives and amenity space Land adjacent to Saltways Cheshire Home Church Road, Webheath Bradley Design Homes

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

Mr P Hill – objector
Ms J Anderson – objector

Planning Committee

17th June 2008

Mr A Smith – Agent for the Applicant
Mr C Cheetham – on behalf of the Applicant.)

Having regard to the Development Plan and to other material considerations, Planning Permission be REFUSED, for the following reason:

“The proposed bungalow, by reason of its size, bulk and position, would result in an overbearing impact on the residents of Shirehampton Close, contrary to Policies B(HSG).6 and B(BE).13 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3 and the SPG Encouraging Good Design”.

(This decision was taken contrary to Officer recommendation for the reason stated above.)

08/107 Warehouse extension with associated
service yard and landscaping
29-31 Hemming Road, Washford
Avon Freight Group

Having regard to the Development Plan and to other material considerations, Planning Permission be GRANTED, subject to the conditions stated in the report.

08/121 Change of use of part of farm shop
to tea room and extension to link existing
shop premises to form food preparation area
The Stables Farm Shop, Astwood Lane,
Astwood Bank
Mr J Cockburn

(The following people addressed the Committee under the Council’s public speaking rules:

Mr C Bates, Objector
Mr A Mayell – the Applicant’s Agent
Mr French – the Applicant’s Shop Manager.)

Consideration of this item be DEFERRED to allow for a Members’ Site Visit to take place.

08/132 Replacement of a bungalow with a
two storey 5 bedroom house

56 Hither Green Lane, Abbey Park
Mr N Jinks

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

Mr Thornton – Objector
Mr G Smith – Objector
Cllr C MacMillan – Objector
Mr N Smith – the Applicant.

Prior to commencement of his public speaking session, Councillor MacMillan, speaking in a personal capacity as an objector to the application, declared his personal and prejudicial interest in view of the fact that he lived in close proximity to the application site and, in accordance with regulations governing Members' interests - Section 81 of the Local Government Act 2000 - at the conclusion of public speaking, he withdrew from the meeting for the duration of the Committee's consideration of the application.)

Consideration of this item be DEFERRED to allow for a Members' Site Visit to take place.

08/140 Change of use from retail to a
fast food takeaway
Unit 5 Woodrow Centre, Woodrow
Mr J Iqbal

Having regard to the Development Plan and to other material considerations, Planning Permission be GRANTED, subject to the conditions stated in the report and the following additional condition:

“3) - Fume extraction details to be submitted and agreed”.

9. INFORMATION ITEMS

The Committee received an item of information in relation to an outcome of an appeal against a planning decision, namely:

Planning Reference 2007/338/OUT

New medical centre and car park, with demolition of existing car park, together with retail pharmacy and café
Car Park 7, Church Road and Adelaide Street, Town Centre

Planning Committee

17th June 2008

The Committee noted that this appeal against the Committee's decision to refuse planning permission for the proposed extension had been DISMISSED.

10. ENFORCEMENT OF PLANNING CONTROL

The Committee considered two contraventions of planning law, namely:

- 1) Enforcement Report - 1 - 2008/097/ENF
Unauthorised works to a Grade II Listed Building, namely the removal of a lantern and weather vane from the roof and insertion of roof lights
Prospect Hill, Town Centre

RESOLVED that

authority be delegated to the Head of Legal, Democratic and Property Services, in consultation with the Head of Planning and Building Control, to take Enforcement action by way of the serving of a Listed Building Enforcement Notice and / or the instigation of prosecution proceedings, if required, in relation to a breach of Planning Control, namely the carrying out of works to a Listed Building without consent.

- 2) Enforcement Report - 2 - 2007/229/ENF
Non-compliance with a condition requiring the provision of a car transporter bay
Washford Drive, Washford

RESOLVED that

authority be delegated to the Head of Legal, Democratic and Property Services, in consultation with the Head of Planning and Building Control, to take Enforcement action in relation to a breach of Planning Control, namely, failure to comply with the requirements of a Breach of Condition Notice, and to authorise the institution of legal proceedings by way of prosecution, if required, for the reasons stated in the report.

The meeting commenced at 7.00 p.m.
and closed at 9.22 p.m.

.....
CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee

Various Wards

15th July 2008

4. APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

(Report of the Acting Director of Environment and Planning)

1. Purpose of Report

To determine the attached applications for planning consent.

2. Recommendation

The Committee is asked to RESOLVE that

having regard to the development plan and to other material considerations, the attached applications be determined, the Committee having considered the recommendations indicated in each individual report, or subsequent update report.

3. Financial, Legal, Policy and Risk Implications

- 3.1 Financial : None.
- 3.2 Policy : As detailed under each individual application.
- 3.3 Legal : Set out in the following Acts:-
Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Planning and Compensation Act 1991
- 3.4 Others : Human Rights Act
Crime and Disorder Act.
- 3.5 None identified.

Report

4. Background Papers

Planning application files (including letters of representation).
Worcestershire County Structure Plan 1996 - 2011.
Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 3.

5. **Consultation**

Consultees are indicated for each individual proposal.

6. **Other Implications**

Community Safety: See specific reports.

Human Resources: None.

Social Exclusion: None: all applications are considered on strict planning merits regardless of status of applicant.

Sustainability: See specific reports.

7. **Author of Report**

The author of this report is John Staniland (Head of Planning and Building Control), who can be contacted on extension 3203 (e-mail: john.staniland@redditchbc.gov.uk) for more information.

8. **Appendices**

Appendix 1 - Index.

Appendix 2 - Applications.

Update reports (to follow - under separate cover)

INDEX

<u>Application No.</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
2008/121	Change of use of part of farm shop to tea room and extension to link existing shop premises to form food preparation area	The stables farm shop, Astwood lane, Astwood Bank	404
2008/132	Replacing a bungalow with a two storey 5 bedroom house	56 Hithergreen Lane	412
2008/149	Retrospective application: outdoor seating area with electronic awning	Astwood Bank Club, 5a Dark Lane, Astwood Bank	418
2008/182	Part change of use to B2 (general industrial) use	Unit 17 Oxleasow Road, East Moonsmoat, Redditch	422

2008/121

**CHANGE OF USE OF PART OF FARM SHOP TO TEA ROOM AND
EXTENSION TO LINK EXISTING SHOP PREMISES TO FORM FOOD
PREPARATION AREA
THE STABLES FARM SHOP, ASTWOOD LANE, ASTWOOD BANK
MR J COCKBURN**

It should be noted that this application was deferred from the 17th of June Planning Committee in order for a site visit to be carried out by Members. This took place on the 8th July 2008.

Site Description

This single storey 'L' shaped building whose walls are clad in timber weatherboarding was formerly used as offices before consent was granted to change the use to a 'Farm Shop' in 2007 under application 2007/053. The building is located to the northern side of Astwood Lane, west of the Astwood Bank village centre, and approximately 100 metres due West of the junction with 'Priest Meadow Close'. There is an existing access to the site, directly off Astwood Lane, at the brow of a hill. The site lies within the Green Belt as identified in the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3.

Proposal Description

The application proposes an extension to the existing building and part change of use as follows:

1. Change of existing kitchen area to store (no change in floor space)
2. Change of use of existing store to a tea room. This existing area (and the proposed area) measures approximately 5 metres in width by 6.5 metres in length. The tea room's proposed hours of opening would be Tuesday to Sunday from 10am to 3pm in the winter and 10am to 4pm in the summer.
3. Filling in of existing corner area by extension which would form a physical link between the main farm shop and the proposed tea room. This area would measure 4 metres in length and 5 metres in width. This area would contain a 'food preparation area' and a W.C. suitable for disabled persons. Externally, one window would serve the W.C. and a window and door would serve the food preparation area. The extension would be clad in timber weatherboarding to match the existing building. No changes to the existing parking arrangement are proposed – (parking for 6 no. car parking spaces is provided within the site).

Key Policies

National Planning Guidance

PPG.2 Green Belts

Worcestershire County Structure Plan

D.35 Retailing in Rural Settlements

D.36 Farm Shops

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 3

B(RA).1 Detailed extent of, and control of development in the Green Belt

B(RA).4 Change of Use of buildings in rural areas for employment purposes

B(RA).6 Farm Diversification

B(BE).13 Qualities of Good Design

E(TCR).9 District Centres

E(TCR).11 Local shops / Parades

C(T).1 Access to and within development

Relevant site planning history

2007/053 Change of Use from B1 (Offices) to A1 (Farm Shop)
Granted May 2007.

The site is located within the Green Belt, as defined within the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3.

Consultation Responses

Neighbour Consultation

One letter of representation (objection) received from the occupier of Charity Barn located opposite the site and to the immediate South of Astwood Lane.

Comments received are summarised as follows:

The proposal would represent encroachment on to the Green Belt, contrary to policy.

This is clearly an expansion of the business beyond the original purpose.

Proposal would have an adverse impact upon the well-established local community centre of Astwood Bank.

By allowing the addition of a cafe, it is likely that the customer base would expand by attracting people from a wider area, rather than just the local community of Astwood Bank.

In our objection to the original planning application in 2007 we highlighted that the original application mentioned a food preparation area and we forecast the development of a cafe. This was clearly always the plan of the owners. The county is littered with examples of what were originally just farm shops which subsequently have been developed massively over the years. The request to add a cafe is yet another step in what is clearly the thin edge of a wedge for the planned expansion of the business.

Since the granting of the original consent, traffic to the site has increased significantly. The original application claimed that the managers of the shop would arrive on foot, and that many customers would arrive on foot or bike. This has not happened, with the majority of customers travelling by car.

Worcestershire Highways Network Control (former Highways Partnership Unit)

The County Council as Highways Authority is satisfied that the proposal has no highway implications, and therefore has no objection to planning permission being granted.

RBC Environmental Health Officer

Would recommend that conditions be attached in the case of any approval, concerning hours of operation, odour, lighting, drainage and refuse storage.

RBC Development Plans (Planning Policy) Team

Consider that the proposals would conflict with relevant policies of the development plan, and in particular, Policy D.36 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan, and Policy E(TCR).9 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan. Therefore object to principle of proposed development.

Assessment of proposal

General Background

Members may recall that an application was granted to convert this building to a Farm Shop, following its presentation at the Planning Committee of the 27 of March 2007. Your Officer's recommendation of approval, supported by members, was based on the fact that whilst the site is located within the Green Belt, where there is a general presumption against inappropriate development as described in PPG.2 (Green Belts), the building was simply to be re-used / **converted** to a shop (Class A1 use).

Given the fact that no additional floorspace was to be created or external changes to the building were being proposed, the conversion to a farm

shop was not considered to affect the openness of the Green Belt – the most important attribute of the Green Belt.

The applicant's agent has referred to Policy D.36 of the Worcestershire County Structure plan, which specifically deals with proposed applications for Farm Shops. The explanatory memorandum to this Policy at para.6118 states that:

'Farm shops can provide a significant contribution and also provide rural employment opportunities. Generally such development is acceptable provided any associated environmental concerns are adequately addressed. Normally Farm Shops tend to be less accessible, particularly by public transport than shops located in rural settlements. Farm Shops are usually set up primarily for the sale of fresh or processed local produce. Whilst it is recognised that the range of products sold may need to be sufficiently broad to overcome problems of seasonality, non-local produce should not be the predominant element of the retail offer to ensure that the viability of any nearby village shop is not threatened. Planning conditions limiting the range of goods may be appropriate in such circumstances.'

The Policy itself states that such proposals will be permitted provided:

- a) *The development involves the re-use of an existing rural building and is ancillary to the farming use of the land.*
- b) *The development does not have an unacceptable impact on the viability of any nearby shops in a rural settlement by ensuring that non-local produce does not comprise the predominant retail offer.*

At the time of the original application's discussion at Committee, although Members were minded to grant permission, Members asked for conditions to be attached to the consent limiting hours of opening / delivery times, a plan to be submitted showing parking on site, and a condition limiting sales from the premises to ensure that the building is used as a Farm Shop and not any other shop. The precise wording of this final condition was delegated to Officers, and a draft version of the condition was circulated to all Members before the decision notice was issued.

It was considered that a condition referring to a list of specific items such as fruit, vegetables, eggs, cheese etc would be difficult and would potentially omit certain items (potentially hundreds of goods such as jams, chutneys could be locally grown and sold at the shop). The key difficulty was defining 'local' having regard to reasonableness, but also having regard to the site's location and not wishing goods to arrive from too far afield in the interests of sustainability.

The condition which Members viewed before the decision notice was issued, restricts the sale of grown and reared food and food products, flowers and plants to sources within a 30 mile radius of the application site. It does not refer to specific goods.

Officer's Considerations

Whilst the change of use of the existing 'store area' to a tea room – an area measuring just over 30 metres squared in floor area may appear at first glance relatively insignificant, your Officer's consider that there are important principles and factors to consider in this case. After careful consideration of the proposals, your Officers recommend that planning permission should be refused for the following reasons:

At the time the application for the Farm Shop was considered in March 2007, the applicant clearly stated that a cafe type use was NOT part of the proposals. The tea room proposal would be considered an A3 Class use under the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes Order). Under this order, a cafe would normally be able to change its use to a restaurant use without requiring planning permission. Even if conditions were attached to any consent restricting the use to a 'tea room only', Your Officers would consider it potentially difficult to resist and prevent a change of use to a restaurant in the future.

The applicant states that the tea room would be 'ancillary' to the main use of the building as a Farm Shop. This is an incorrect interpretation of Policy D.36 in your Officer's Opinion. Whilst in terms of a floor space comparison with the existing Farm Shop it is true to say that the tea room would be much smaller, to allow such a change would be considered by your Officer's to be contrary to Policy D.36.

Referring back to Policy D.36 of the WCC Structure Plan, under part (i), such proposals for change of use are only permitted where the development involves the re-use of an existing building **and is ancillary to the farming use of the land**. Your Officers consider that the use itself (a farm shop selling local produce ONLY) should be ancillary to the farming use of the land which surrounds the building, and NOT **ancillary to the use which is being carried out within the building itself**.

The applicant has referred also to Policy E(TCR).11 – Local Shops to which the applicant considers the proposed tea room would comply. This policy comments that proposals for shops or small groupings of shops providing essential day to day services for local communities will be supported by the Borough Council subject to appropriate Development Control standards.

Your Officers would argue that the proposed tea room is neither a shop (it is a cafe), nor is it providing an essential day to day service for local communities, (such as a greengrocers for example).

Your Officers consider that the approval of any tea room / cafe or restaurant use in this rural location, no matter how small could harm the vitality and the viability of the Astwood Bank District Centre. Whilst to your Officer's knowledge there are no tea rooms currently operating from the District Centre, it could be argued that approval of a tea room where cakes would normally also expect to be sold to accompany that cup of tea /

coffee, this could impact upon the existing bakery within Astwood Bank District Centre for example. The nature of a cafe use means that inevitably tables and chairs appear outside in a forecourt area in the summer months to accommodate additional custom generated at that time of the year by fine weather. In this respect, whilst the current obvious success of the business is applauded by your Officers, approval of a similarly successful cafe at the site through this application for part change of use and extension, just over a year after approval of the original application, would mean that further applications for similarly unsatisfactory small extensions to the building in this sensitive green belt location might be submitted in the future. As stated by the objecting resident, your Officer's are aware of similar enterprises within the county which have grown well beyond their original intentions of being Farm Shops, where significant vehicle trips are being generated in unsustainable locations, far from public transport links.

Your Officer's consider that the proposal would be at odds with adopted Policy E(TCR).9 (District Centres) of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan. Paragraph 2 comments that it is important for a range of reasons to protect and, where appropriate, enhance District Centres, particularly with regard to their useful retail function. Subject to normal development control considerations, applications for retail development in District Centres will be favourably considered. Proposals that would undermine the retail and community function of the Town and District Centres will be refused. Members will be aware that many of the Borough's District Centres contain retail units where those shops struggle to compete in the current market with competition from elsewhere. Some units are vacant where the only interest appears to be coming from non-retail (often hot food takeaway) uses. Your Officer's consider that this proposed tea room use should be considered as a proposal which would undermine the retail and community function of the District Centre and, being contrary to Policy E(TCR).9, should therefore be refused.

As stated earlier in the report, the site is considered to be in a sensitive green belt location. Permission was only allowed originally on the basis that the building would be converted WITHOUT EXTENSION to it, and that the goods to be sold would be locally produced. Statements accompanying application 2007 / 053 from the applicant's agent informed Your Officers that some visitors would arrive by car, but that many would be able to walk or cycle. The statement went on to say that the running of the shop would be maintained by a couple living nearby who would:

'be able to walk to work, or if collections are required, travel together in the same vehicle. Eventually an extra member of staff may be employed, but this is likely to be someone local who can walk to work'.

The access point to the site is neither directly linked to the residential area of Priest Meadow Close nor that of Astwood Bank by means of pavement, and there is nothing to suggest to your Officer's that comments received by the objecting property, whose dwelling lies directly opposite to the entrance to the site and whose letter comments that the managers and majority of

the customers to the business in fact travel by car, is not correct. In your Officer's opinion, the approval of this proposal would lead to an increase in vehicular traffic to a site which has poor public transport links and could lead to customers visiting the site by car ONLY for the cafe without purchasing from the shop. Within the reasoned justification to Policy B(RA).4 of the Local Plan, it comments that proposals which are likely to result in a significant increase in numbers and length of journeys by car are unlikely to be acceptable since they would conflict with the aim of moving towards a sustainable pattern of development.

A final concern to your Officers is in respect of the 'store' area, which measured just over **30 metres squared** on the original (approved) plans. This area would become the Tea Room, with the store now relocated to where the kitchen was before (an area measuring only **4.8 metres squared**). Given that the general intensity of use on the site would increase, with more goods (Tea / coffee / milk / sugar etc) having to be delivered (and stored), Your Officers would have expected to receive proposed floor plans showing a much larger storage area than one of 4.8 metres squared.

Conclusion

Your Officers are concerned with the proposals for a number of reasons as outlined above, and therefore urge members to refuse planning permission for the reason below.

Recommendation

That having regard to the development plan and to other material considerations that planning permission is refused for the following reasons:

- 1) The proposed change of use of part of this building to form a cafe, together with the proposed extension of the building would result in inappropriate development in the Green Belt which by definition is harmful to the Green Belt. The Council considers that no very special circumstances have been put forward to justify the proposals and that therefore the application is contrary to PPG.2 (Green Belts), and Policy B(RA).1 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan.
- 2) The proposals, in this unsustainable, rural location, not easily accessible to public transport links, would result in the creation of a disproportionate number of vehicular trips to the site, contrary to the principles of sustainable development. The proposals are therefore contrary to Policies C(T).1 and B(RA).4 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan.
- 3) Approval of a café use in this location would in itself be unacceptable under the terms of Policy D.36 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan, Policies B(RA).6 and E(TCR).11 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan and would harm and adversely impact upon the vitality, viability

and community function of the district centre of Astwood Bank contrary to the Reasoned Justification to Policy E(TCR).9 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan.

2008/132

**56 HITHERGREEN LANE
REPLACING A BUNGALOW WITH A TWO STOREY 5 BEDROOM
HOUSE
APPLICANT: MR NEVIL JINKS**

Site Description

The application site lies within the urban area of Redditch as defined within the Borough of Redditch Local Plan 3. It covers an area of approximately 0.087 ha, and is located at Hither Green Lane, which is situated in the Abbey Park area of Redditch. The area is predominantly residential and is characterised by modern two storey detached houses and a limited number of bungalows with garages situated to the front of the properties. The site is of an irregular shape and its curtilage includes a front car parking area and a rear garden area. To the north of the site lies a golf course. To the east, the site backs onto detached residential properties from which it is separated by a 2m fence and a mature hedgerow, which is approximately 3m (H). To the west of the site lie detached dwellings and there is a fall in ground levels to the dwellings located to the south of the site.

Proposal Description

The application seeks full planning permission for the replacement of the existing two bedroom detached bungalow with a two-storey five -bedroom house. There would be no change from the existing T-shape footprint of the dwelling as it would be constructed in the same location with the same floor area. The dwelling would be constructed in traditional red facing brick walls, wood panel windows and doors, a tiled roof, panel fencing (boundary treatment) and a concrete vehicle access and hardstanding.

The dwelling would have a front protruding asymmetric gable, with side facing gables and a ridge parallel to the front of the property. The application is accompanied by a Design and Access statement, and streetscene elevations and plans showing the difference between the existing and proposed elevations.

Key Policies

National Planning Policy

PPS.1	Delivering Sustainable Development.
PPS.3	Housing.
PPG.13	Transport.

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3

B(BE).13	Qualities of Good Design
C(T).1	Access to and within development
C(T).12	Parking Standards

S.1 Designing out Crime

Borough of Redditch Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Encouraging Good Design

Borough of Redditch Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Designing out Crime

History

The site has been the subject of an application, which is outlined below:

07/472 Detached side garage. Approved 14/01/2008

Work has begun on site on the construction of this garage, which would not affect the ability of the applicant to implement any permission that may be granted as a result of this application.

Consultees' Comments**Neighbour Consultation**

The application has been advertised in writing to neighbouring properties within the vicinity of the application site.

Eight letters of objection have been received, raising the following concerns;

- Planning permission would set a precedent for other bungalows on the estate to be granted two-storey extensions. No bungalows have been developed into two storey houses.
- Concerns that the development might eventually form a business, which would be out of character with the estate and would alter the character and mix of the estate's dwellings.
- Previous consent (for a rear conservatory and garage) and now a two storey extension would lead to an over intensification of the site.
- Concerns that there would be an encroachment of building on to the link land which the property deeds state (the link land) is to be maintained by the owners and not developed on.
- Should the two-storey extension go ahead it would restrict light into the rear elevations of property No.s 46, 48 and 54 Hither Green Lane.

- Loss of privacy and residential amenity concerns caused by the proposed 5 first floor rear elevation windows overlooking the neighbour's rear gardens and inadequate plot separation distances.
- Loss of outlook concerns caused by restricted views onto adjacent open spaces and an encroachment of the 45-degree rule to No. 54 Hither Green Lane.
- Concerns regarding whether sufficient space exists for the proposed increase in parking from 4 to 8 cars.
- During development there are concerns over working hours, security issues, suitable parking arrangements to prevent access problems and damage caused by HGV to adjacent properties.
- The proposal would not be screened by a mature hedgerow, only by some conifers and would be overpowering to adjacent properties.
- It is questionable as to whether there will be no change from the existing T-shape footprint.
- The application site breaks the 45 degree rule to the neighbouring dwelling, No. 54 Hither Green Lane.
- The proposal would change the character of the surrounding area, and result in a reduction of bungalows and properties for smaller families.
- The height of the proposed dwelling would exceed the height of No. 54 Hither Green Lane by 80cm.
- The application site is not the only bungalow in this part of the development as additional bungalows are situated at No's 42, 69 and 62. This proposal will therefore create a precedent.
- A previous proposal to convert a bungalow (No 105) into a house with a greater separation distance was limited to a dormer construction.
- A request for the Planning Committee to visit the site.
- The Committee report does not adequately reflect neighbour concerns regarding loss of light, privacy, amenity and outlook.
- It is not clear from the Committee Report that the sun sets directly over No. 56 and causes a significant loss of light to neighbouring properties No.s 46, 48 and 54 Hither Green Lane.

No objection subject to a drainage condition.

Highways Partnership Unit

No objection subject to a condition regarding access, turning area and parking facilities to be provided and a note to the applicant regarding the highway to be kept free of mud/materials.

Area Environmental Health Officer

No objection.

Assessment of proposal

Members may note this application was deferred from the 17th June 2008 Committee for a site visit to be carried out by Members which took place on 8th July 2008.

The main issues in the determination of this application are considered to be:

1. The principle of development.
2. Siting, design, layout and amenity.

1. The principle of development

The proposal would involve the redevelopment of brownfield, previously developed land, which accords with national and local policies. Abbey Park is zoned as a residential development area and within the Borough of Redditch; the principle of replacement dwellings is therefore considered to be acceptable.

2. Siting, design, layout and amenity

The proposed scheme's scale, form and massing is considered to respect fully the locality, having regard to general densities, garden size and footprint in the vicinity of the surrounding area, as well as in scale, style and appearance.

The proposal is set in excess of the adopted spacing standards and garden sizes, such that there is no cause for concern regarding any overlooking or loss of privacy to the surrounding residents. The proposal complies both with separation/spacing standards and with the orientation rules. Whilst the form and bulk of development on the site would be greater than that currently existing, it is not considered that the appearance or bulk of the proposed dwelling would be overly large for the plot or in relation to the surrounding pattern of built form in the area. The height of the proposed dwelling would not be in excess of others in the vicinity, and is therefore considered to be acceptable. In order to prevent any future additions being

formed using permitted development rights, a condition removing such rights is recommended below in order to protect the amenities of the surrounding residents.

In line with planning legislation, each case is considered on its own merits, and as this is the only bungalow on this part of the estate, it is not considered that allowing this proposal would set a difficult precedent for the future. Furthermore, each case is considered according to policy and on its own merits, therefore no concern over precedent can be substantiated.

Allowing this application would only provide consent for the use of the development as a private residential dwelling, subject to the usual permitted development rights granted under the planning legislation. If at a later date the occupant wished to run a business from the property, this would be subject to the usual requirements for planning permission, and therefore this authority would retain control over this possible future use. There is therefore no ground for refusal of this application on the basis of a possible future use for commercial purposes.

No consent is sought for a conservatory and therefore this is not for consideration here. Again, should one be added at a later date this would need to comply with the planning regulations at the time, and therefore again this authority would retain control over this possible eventuality.

Matters relating to property deeds are not material planning considerations, and thus cannot be considered further here.

No previous proposal exists to convert a bungalow at (No 105) into a house which was limited to a dormer construction. The property in question relates to (No. 108) which applied for and was granted planning permission for alterations to the roof. This proposal included raising the original roof height by 7 feet to accommodate a first floor which included front and rear dormer windows. The resultant dwelling would comprise of a 4 bedroom house with a playroom and changing room. Therefore, this proposal to convert a bungalow into a two storey house, with a greater separation distance, was **not** limited to a dormer construction with no first floor. Furthermore, there are no planning policies which seek to protect/retain bungalows.

Should permission be granted for the development, your officers would recommend a condition be attached to the permission that would remove 'Permitted Development Rights' (S2, Part 1, Class E) from the dwelling which would prevent the occupiers erecting a rear garden shed for example without the prior written consent of the LPA. Such works may otherwise be permitted, without requiring planning permission under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order 1995 (as amended)).

The proposed five bedroom dwelling would result in a requirement under the current adopted parking standards for the provision of 5 spaces, and these could be accommodated within the existing layout and there is

therefore no cause for concern in this regard. These would be within and in front of the existing garage accommodation.

Conclusion

It is considered that the proposal is fully compliant with the relevant planning policies and guidance, and would be unlikely to cause any significant detrimental impacts to the amenities of surrounding residents or to the visual amenities of the area and as such the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

Recommendation

That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Development to commence within 3 years
 - 2) Sample materials to be submitted
 - 3) Landscaping scheme and boundary treatment to be submitted
 - 4) Landscaping scheme and boundary treatment to be implemented
 - 5) Drainage details to be submitted
 - 6) Limited working hours during construction
 - 7) Removal of PD rights
-

2008/149

**RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION: OUTDOOR SEATING AREA WITH
ELECTRONIC AWNING
ASTWOOD BANK CLUB, 5A DARK LANE, ASTWOOD BANK
ASTWOOD BANK CLUB**

Site Description

Site consists of a club building that is attached to The Coach House. Car parking and vehicular access exists at the front of the site. Houses face the side of the club building and car parking area. Last year a simple roof structure of a similar design to a car port, made from timber and perspex has been attached to the existing fencing and wall of the club house. This structure has been erected to the north of the building creating an enclosed and covered area. It is understood that this was intended to be used as a dry store area for the barrels.

More recently, another area has been created at the side of the main entrance of the building comprising of a raised decked area with balustrading and electronic awning. Tables / chairs and heating facilities are provided in this location. It is intended that this area be used as a smoking area.

Proposal Description

Retrospective permission is sought for a treated decking area with balustrading and electronic awning, lights and heater to provide an outdoor smoking area for the club. This is positioned at the side of the main entrance to the club.

Relevant Key Policies

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 3

B(BE).13	Qualities of Good Design.
S.1	Designing Out Crime.
B(NE).4	Noise

Consultees' Comments

Neighbour consultation

2 letters of objection.

- 1) Do not object to the erection of the structure but do object on the grounds of amenity, the use of the structure as an outside seating area or area of congregation of any sort. No objection to the purpose originally stated by the club for the shelter to store barrels. Objector lives diagonally opposite shelter approximately 12 metres from the club. The shelter has been used as a seating and smoking area and caused significant disturbance particularly later in the evening. Having viewed the plans and realising that the

application relates to a smoking area at the side of the main entrance, objector states no objection to this area being used for smoking but requests that it be limited, so not used after 10.30pm. This condition would tie in with a similar condition on their licence.

- 2) Objector lives in building adjacent to club (Coach House) and writes with respect to the outdoor seating area. This was built last year and immediately there was a noticeable increase in noise and disturbance particularly at weekends and later in the evening. There does not appear to be any control on noise from the outside area. Objector feels it is unreasonable to be kept awake at night or woken up at night by loud talking. During the winter, also suffered from smoke and noise from the members using the so-called barrel shelter for smoking.

Highway Network Control

No comments submitted.

Crime Risk Manager

No comments submitted.

Environmental Health

No concerns in relation to the location of the smoking area, however, would recommend conditions with respect to:-

The smoking area shall not be occupied after 23:00.

Music from the building shall not be audible in the smoking area.

Artificial light shall not cause a nuisance to nearby residential properties.

Assessment of Development

This application has been submitted as a result of an enforcement complaint. It would appear that the main issue is really to do with a roof shelter that has been built to the north of the building that is adjacent to one of the objector's property and opposite the other objector's property.

It is understood that the roof shelter was created to provide a dry covered storage area for the barrels. However, since the smoking ban, this area has become an outdoor smoking facility for patrons of the club. This was further encouraged with the provision of foldable garden chairs and an outdoor wall heater.

In addition to this, a decked area with awning has now been created on site and provides a more attractive environment for patrons to use for smoking / drinking within the site. This facility is situated at the side of the main entrance to the building.

This application only seeks retrospective planning permission for the decked area at the side of the main entrance and does not include approval for the roof shelter to the north of the club building.

The objections submitted relate to issues raised as a result of the roof shelter being used as an informal smoking / drinking area. The objections submitted do not refer to any issues raised in relation to the decking area being used. In addition, residents closer to the decking area have not objected to the development and as such it can be assumed that using the decking area for drinking / smoking purposes is not causing a nuisance to the occupiers in general. Comments from Environmental Health confirm that they have no objection to the proposal but recommend conditions.

To ensure that the roof shelter to the north of the building is not used in this way and in order to resolve neighbours' concerns, it is considered appropriate that the applicant remove the roof shelter to prevent this area being used as a smoking / drinking area and to encourage people to use the formal decking area instead. A suitable condition is proposed to ensure that the roof shelter and associated paraphernalia be removed as soon as possible.

It is also considered appropriate that the heaters erected on the wall of the decking area be removed in accordance with the Council's Climate Change guidelines that are now being encouraged on development proposals.

Recommendation

That having regard to the provisions of the development plan and other material consideration, that planning permission be approved subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The covered structure to the north of the building and its associated paraphernalia (chairs, heaters, additional fencing etc) shall be removed within 3 months from the date of the decision notice to prevent the area from being used as an informal outdoor smoking / drinking area**
- 2 The existing heaters erected on the wall for the decking area shall be removed within 3 months from the date of the decision notice. No other forms of heating facilities shall be used in the decking area thereafter.**
- 3 No customer shall be permitted to be on the decking area hereby permitted outside the hours of 10.00 to 23.00 each day.**
- 4 No sound reproduction or amplification equipment, whether mechanical or electrical, shall be installed outside the building or used adjacent to the external doorway leading to the decking area.**
- 5 Development does not include the approval of any additional lighting to that which currently exists on the decking area. Details of any additional lighting shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the LPA.**

Planning**Appendix 2**

Committee

15th July 2008

2008/182

**PART CHANGE OF USE TO B2 (GENERAL INDUSTRIAL) USE
UNIT 17 OXLEASOW ROAD, EAST MOONS MOAT, REDDITCH
MR P SMITH – PJS MOULDINGS****Site Description**

Unit 17 is located within the East Moons Moat Industrial Estate and lies to the northern side of Oxleasow Road which runs in an East to west direction and itself is reached off Alders drive, further to the East. The existing rectangular steel portal framed warehouse building has brick and blockwork walls to approximately 3 metres in height with profile steel sheeting to eaves beneath a pitched roof. Two roller shutter doors provide loading to the Warehouse from the secure yard to the Northern elevation. The building itself at present is split internally into Offices (approximately 20% of the building), with approximately 80% of the building being used for Warehousing. Externally, within the building's curtilage, there are 18 demarcated car parking spaces to the (West) side elevation which serves as the main staff car parking area. A further 7 car parking spaces are located within the yard area to the North of the building.

The site measures 0.72 hectares in area.

Proposal Description

The application seeks permission to change part of the building from B1 (Offices) to B2 use, which would enable part of the building to be used for general Industrial purposes. There would be no change to the amount of floorspace currently being used for storage, and no changes to the exterior of the building.

Relevant Key Policies**National Policies**

PPG4 Industrial and commercial development and small firms

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 3

E(EMP).3	Primarily Employment Areas
E(EMP).3a	Development Affecting Primarily Employment Areas
C(T).12	Parking Standards

Relevant site planning history

The following applications are relevant in the consideration of the current planning application:

88/827 Change of Use to Class B1, B2, B8
Approved 11.1.1989

97/171 Change of Use to Class B2 (General Industrial)
Approved 14.7.1997

Consultation Responses***Neighbour Consultation / Site Notice***

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

No representations have been received.

Worcestershire Highways Network Control (former Highways Partnership Unit)

No objections.

RBC Environmental Health Officer

Have recommended that conditions be attached to any approval in respect to noise, lighting and drainage.

RBC Economic Development Unit

Supports the application.

Assessment of proposal

The main issues in the determination of this application are considered to be the principle of the development, and an assessment of the demands that the proposal may or may not have on existing 'in curtilage' parking provision within the site.

1. The principle of development

The existing occupant is a ladies clothing design firm. Part of the Unit (621 metres squared) is used as Offices by the firm's design team. The remainder (2,432 metres squared) is used as Warehousing / Storage. The current occupiers are shortly to be moving to a Unit within the North Moons Moat Industrial Estate.

Members will note that Planning Permission was granted in 1989 for the building to be used for uses falling within Classes B1, B2 and B8 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order. Given this, and the fact that the site is located within a Primarily Employment area as designated within the B.O.R. Local Plan, the principle of a proposed change of Use to B2 use is fully acceptable. Whilst a change of use from B2 (General Industrial Use) to B1 (Offices) can be permitted without an applicant needing to apply for planning permission under the UCO, planning permission IS required to change from B1 to B2. The B2 use, granted in 1997, has effectively been 'lost' by virtue of the current company occupying and using the building for B1 and B8 purposes only, hence the need for the proposed occupier to apply for planning permission.

2. Impact upon parking provision

Members will be aware that Appendix H, within the B.O.R Local Plan contains standards for car parking and that these are MAXIMUM standards. Members will also be aware that under these standards, significantly greater numbers of car parking spaces are required where those uses are B1 or B2 as opposed to B8. Whilst the principle of a B2 use is fully supported by Your Officers, it is important to assess the impact the proposal may have upon available car parking provision within the site.

Your Officers have calculated that according to maximum car parking standards, the existing user would need to provide 25 no. car parking spaces for the existing 621 metres squared of existing office space. A further 10 spaces would need to be provided for the Warehousing element. Only 25 spaces are available within the curtilage – a shortfall of 10 spaces.

The company proposing to locate at the site, PJS Mouldings, are currently based in Birmingham and have stated that they need to move to larger premises to expand and to cope with orders they already have in place. They state that 6 of their current employees will move to Redditch, and that they will need to employ a further 14 employees from the local area. Your Officers would therefore suggest that the current provision of 25 spaces on the site is likely to be sufficient to cope with demand for car parking.

The applicant's proposal would be to separate the building as follows:

Offices	100 metres squared	(4 spaces required)
B2 Use	600 metres squared.	(14 spaces required)
B8 Use	2354 metres squared	(9 spaces required)

Based on the above proposal, maximum standards would dictate that 27 spaces would be required at the site. Current provision misses this standard by 2 spaces.

Your Officers would suggest that in practice, car sharing, and walking to work would take place having regard to what is likely to happen in reality and experience of practices on other similar sites.

Although the existing user fails to comply with the maximum standards, from your Officers numerous visits to the site, no parking problem exists at present. Your Officers have also noted from site visits and as shown on the submitted plan, that several other large communal car parking areas exist immediately opposite the main entrance to the building and further to the North, although these will be in separate ownership. Your Officers, the Council's Enforcement Officer, and the highways engineer have not received any complaints arising from on-street parking nor any resultant highway safety concerns.

Approval of the proposal would, in your Officer's opinion, be unlikely to result in any on-street parking which would impact detrimentally upon highway safety.

To refuse planning permission, would, in this case, be considered unreasonable having regard to the planning history of the site. Refusal would also effectively prevent any proposed general industrial user from occupying the building and therefore potentially result in long term 'non-use' of the Unit. However, in expectation of Members' concerns regarding the potential for on-street parking and highway safety concerns, notwithstanding comments received from highways, your Officers have recommended that a condition be attached to any consent, should members be minded to approve, which would restrict the amount of floor space which could be given over to uses other than B8 within the building. Similar conditions have been used on other sites where members have raised likewise concerns. No other conditions are deemed to be necessary or relevant having regard to the provisions of Circular 11/95 (Use of Conditions in Planning Permission).

Recommendation

That, having regard to the development plan and to other material planning considerations, it is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions.

- 1) Development to commence within 3 years.
- 2) At no time shall an area greater than 700 metres squared in area be used for purposes falling within Use Classes B1 and B2 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes Order) 2005.

Reason: Limited in-curtilage parking exists within the site. Approval of a wholly B1 or B2 consent is likely to result in parking outside of the curtilage and on-street which would result in detriment to highway safety.

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee

All Wards

15th July 2008

5. NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK – UPDATE ON CHANGES

(Report of the Acting Director of Environment and Planning)

1. Purpose of Report

To inform Members of changes to the national planning policy framework. The creation, consultation and adoption of the Development Plan has a direct impact on this Committee, as it implements the plan through the decisions that it makes.

2. Recommendation

**The Committee is asked to RESOLVE that
the report be noted.**

3. Financial, Legal, Policy and Risk Implications

Financial

3.1 None identified.

Legal

3.2 None identified.

Policy

3.3 This newly introduced Policy will be a material consideration in the determination of Planning Applications where appropriate, and will dictate the procedures and processes followed by this Authority when working towards adoption of Local Development Framework documents.

Risk

3.4 There are no perceived increased risks arising from the changes to the policy framework.

Report**4. Background**

In altering the planning system in 2004 and introducing the Local Development Framework (LDF) to supersede the previous Local Plan and Structure Plan documents, a clearer process, which was quicker and allowed for more public and community engagement and involvement was preferred and sought. However, the national target for adopted core strategies has been missed by a significant quantity under the new regulations, and so these are now being revised to increase the speed of the process and allow for the adoption of up to date LDFs as quickly as possible. These procedural amendments have been enacted in secondary legislation, and the new policy guidance contained in PPS12 relates to the implementation of the new regulations.

5. Key Issues

- 5.1 An LDF, and its content, remains very similar to the current system, and consists of a Local Development Scheme (LDS) which is the timetable for delivery of the documents that form the LDF, the Core Strategy and other documentation including a proposals map and a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). These documents should include targets and delivery mechanisms wherever possible, to ensure that the proposed development of the borough occurs. This can include identifying relevant parties and funding.
- 5.2 The new PPS12 begins by setting the context in which local spatial planning should be carried out, noting that the public, private and community sectors should work in partnership wherever possible, as well as with the LSP. It also sets the LDF in context with other strategic frameworks in local government that combine to form a toolkit. It considers the local authority to be a 'place shaper' and the LDF as a tool for taking a strategic approach to meeting local needs. It therefore demonstrates the benefit of spatial planning to local authorities and how it should underpin wider corporate strategies. It highlights issues such as affordable housing provision, green infrastructure, economic growth, regeneration and safeguarding environmental assets as cross-cutting but vital projects.
- 5.3 There are five key policy changes included within the revised PPS12, and these are:
- 5.4 To streamline PPS12 into a pure policy document, allowing guidance and procedural information to be separated into other more appropriate documents such as circulars and secondary legislation. This will give the document more focus and a clearer steer on the

policy direction in which the Government is keen for LPAs to progress

- 5.5 To provide greater flexibility to allocate sites within a core strategy. Originally when the new planning system was introduced, the intention was that a separate Development Plan Document (DPD), an Allocations DPD, would follow on from the adoption of a core strategy, however due to delays and the length of time being taken to complete core strategies, this new policy document provides for including allocated sites within a core strategy in order to ensure that a 5 year land supply is identified and monitored.
- 5.6 The new PPS12 also introduces greater flexibility in determining which DPD's each Authority produces rather than dictating which are mandatory and which are optional, as previously. This allows for greater freedom to tailor the LDF to the Borough and its specific needs and requirements. This has also led to a reduction in the complexity of the documents, which improves their clarity and the accessibility of documents to residents and other stakeholders.
- 5.7 The lifespan of the core strategy has been increased from 10 to 15 years. However, flexibility in particular areas remains due to the retained opportunity to produce Action Area Plans (AAPs) for specific areas where regeneration is required, and these can be compiled as and when necessary.
- 5.8 PPS12 also seeks to strengthen the role of the core strategy in terms of infrastructure provision, which forms part of the holistic and partnership working referred to above.

6. Other Implications

Asset Management	-	The Council's land and property interests will benefit equally to those held in other ownerships.
Community Safety	-	No perceived impact.
Human Resources	-	Minimal impact, as the principles of the practice of the Development Plans team remains unaltered.
Social Exclusion	-	No perceived impact – the policy applies equally across the country.
Sustainability	-	This will be a core theme of any LDF document.

7. Conclusion

The overall principles of the plan making system remain unchanged, however some of the details and procedures for compiling documents have been altered in an attempt to clarify, simplify and speed up the plan making process. PPS12 also provides clear focus on particular elements of the planning system for consideration when compiling spatial planning documents.

8. Background Papers

PPS12 (Creating strong safe and prosperous communities through) Local Spatial Planning. The full PPS12 document can be downloaded from :

www.communities.gov.uk/planningandbuilding/planning/planningpolicyguidance/planningpolicystatements/planningpolicystatements/

Paper copies can be obtained from Ailith Rutt (Development Control Manager).

9. Consultation

There has been no consultation other than with relevant Borough Council Officers.

10. Author of Report

The author of this report is Ailith Rutt (Development Control Manager), who can be contacted on extension 3374 (email: ailith.rutt@redditchbc.gov.uk) for more information.

11. Appendices

None.

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee

Various Wards

15th July 2008

6. ENFORCEMENT OF PLANNING CONTROL – UPDATES

(Report of Acting Director of Environment and Planning)

1. Purpose of Report

To inform and update the Committee on the result of enforcement matters authorised for the period from April 2007 to March 2008, and on enforcement activity in general for that period, as detailed in the Appendices attached to this report.

2. Recommendation

The Committee is asked to RESOLVE to

note the information contained in the report.

3. Financial, Legal, Policy and Risk Implications

Financial

3.1 There are no financial implications in the reports.

Legal

3.2 Legal implications are as detailed in the reports and as set out in the following Acts:-

Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
Planning and Compensation Act 1991.

3.3 In terms of the exempt elements of the report, and the “public interest” test for exempt consideration, Officers consider that it is rarely likely to be in the public’s best interest to reveal information which is the subject of possible subsequent legal action (S.100 I of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order, 2006 refers).

3.4 Under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights, everyone has the right to respect for his/her private and family life, home and correspondence.

3.5 Interference with this right is only allowed in limited circumstances where it is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society for, among other things, the protection of the rights and freedom of others. A balance needs to be drawn between

Executive Committee

15th July 2008

the right to develop land in accordance with planning permission and the rights under Article 8 of adjacent occupiers.

Policy

3.6 None identified.

Risk

3.7 None identified.

4. Other Implications

Any Community Safety, Human Resources or Social Inclusion implications will be detailed in the attached schedule.

Social Exclusion: Enforcement action is taken equally and fairly in accordance with the Enforcement Concordat, regardless of the status of the person or organisation, or the subject of enforcement action.

5. Consultation

There has been no consultation other than with relevant Borough Council Officers.

6. Author of Report

The author of this report is Iain Mackay (Planning Enforcement Officer), who can be contacted on extension 3205 (email:-iain.mackay@redditchbc.gov.uk for more information).

7. Appendices

Appendix 1 - Information Report.

Appendix 2 - Enforcement Report.

Appendix 3 - Enforcement Statistics.

ENFORCEMENT - INFORMATION REPORT

Report of Enforcement Activity
Period from 1st April 2007 to 31st March 2008

(All Wards)

1. Background / Key Issues

- 1.1 From time to time, your Committee is asked to authorise enforcement action with regard to breaches of planning control identified throughout the Borough.
- 1.2 Appendix 2 of this report shows those matters reported to your Committee for authority to enforce, the resulting action and status.
- 1.3 Appendix 3 details general enforcement activity for the period including numbers of cases, notices issued and similar information.

Enforcement Reports 2007-2008					
Month	Address	Issue	Authorised	Status	Date
Apr-07	Nine Days Lane	Erection of Conservatory	Not to take enforcement action	Case closed	01 August 2008
Jun-07	Salford Close	Erection of a fence	Enforcement Notice	Notice issued and appeal won. Fence reduced - case closed	19 June 2008
Jul-07	Merevale Close	Condition of property	Section 215 Notice	One conviction at Court. Second case pending	
	Hewell Road, Batchley	Car Sales	Prosecution	Failure to comply with existing enforcement notice. Ceased	16 July 2008
Sep-07	Evesham Road	Damage to protected tree	Prosecution	prosecution delayed pending assesment of tree	
Dec-07	Polesworth Close	Car repairs	Enforcement notice	Notice issued. Activity currently ceased, but monitoring	
Feb-08	Feckenham Road	Position of house	Not to take enforcement action	Case closed	26 February 2008
Apr-08	Other Road	Storage of cars	Enforcement notice	Notice issued - compliance pending	
	Redstone close	Tree	Prosecution	Attempting negotiation -pending prosecution	
May-08	British Mills/Clive House	Listed building offence	Listed Building Enforcement Notice + prosecution	Action pending	
	Washford Drive	Prosecution	Breach of condition requiring transporter bay	Action pending	

Executive Committee

Appendix 3

15th July 2008

ENFORCEMENT STATISTICS

Period:	01 April 2007	to	31 March 2008
Complaints received	→→		268
Complaints concluded	→→		256
Enforcement notices issued	→→		4
Stop notices served	→→		0
Temporary Stop Notices served	→→		0
Planning Contravention Notices served	→→		19
Breach of Condition Notices served	→→		10
Section 215 Untidy Land Notices issued	→→		0
High Hedges Remediation Notices served	→→		1
Notices complied with	→→		29
Prosecutions undertaken	→→		1
Convictions obtained	→→		0
Enforcement appeals received	→→		1
Enforcement appeals dismissed	→→		2
Enforcement appeals allowed	→→		0

This page is intentionally left blank