

Planning Committee

Wednesday, 11 November 2020

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Gemma Monaco (Chair), Councillor Salman Akbar (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Tom Baker-Price, Roger Bennett, Michael Chalk, Andrew Fry, Julian Grubb, Bill Hartnett and Jennifer Wheeler

Officers:

Helena Plant, Steve Edden, Amar Hussain, Charlotte Wood and Pauline Ross

Democratic Services Officer:

Sarah Sellers

50. CHAIR'S WELCOME

The Chair welcomed the Committee members, public speakers and officers to the virtual Planning Committee meeting being held via Skype. The Chair explained that the meeting was being live streamed on the Council's YouTube channel to enable members of the public to observe the committee.

51. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

52. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

53. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON 28TH OCTOBER 2020

RESOLVED that

The Minutes of the Planning Committee held on 28th October 2020 be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

.....
Chair

54. UPDATE REPORTS

The Update Report was noted. It was confirmed that officers would go through the detail of the individual updates as part of their presentations.

55. APPLICATION 20/00795/FUL - 101 SALFORD CLOSE WOODROW REDDITCH B98 7UL - MR JOHN BENNETT

First Floor side extension

The Chair introduced this item and explained that although Members had considered, debated and voted on the application at the Planning Committee meeting on 28th October, there had been technical issues with the live stream of the meeting.

Members were reminded that on the last occasion, following the debate, the officer's recommendation to grant planning permission had been moved by Councillor Chalk and seconded by Councillor Baker-Price. The vote had been taken but due to a time lag on the live stream of the meeting the broadcast version had ended prior to the vote being completed.

Following the meeting advice had been sought from the Council's Monitoring Officer with regard to the legal requirements for remote meetings under the relevant regulations. It was noted that under the regulations the meeting needed to be capable of being "heard" by any members of the public watching. As the final part of the vote was not captured on the live stream, and could not be "heard", the Monitoring Officer had advised that the vote on the application should be re-taken in the interests of transparency and to comply with the regulations.

The officer's report for the application had been included in the agenda pack for the meeting and Members were referred to the officer's recommendation on page three.

The Chair explained that as the Members were familiar with the application and had debated it on the last occasion, it was not proposed to re-run the discussion.

The recommendation previously proposed and seconded at the meeting on 28th October was therefore put to the vote.

RESOLVED that

Having regard to the development plan and all other material considerations, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out on pages 3 to 4 of the agenda.

**56. APPLICATION 20/00603/FUL - 2 EDENFIELD CLOSE
BROCKHILL REDDITCH B97 6TP - MR N DHESI**

Two storey rear extension and a first-floor side extension.

Officers presented the application and took Members through the photographs and plans in the Site Plans and Presentation Pack. The position of number 2 Edenfield Close in relation to the adjoining properties on Edenfield Close and Dairy Lane was noted.

Planning permission was being sought to extend the existing three bedroomed dwelling as follows: -

- By adding a 4 metre deep ground floor extension at the rear to run the full width of the dwelling and provide an enlarged kitchen and family area.
- By adding a 2.5 metre deep first floor extension at the rear (above the ground floor extension) to enable internal alterations to facilitate additional bedrooms and en-suite areas.
- By adding a third area above the garage to provide a further bedroom.

The resultant dwelling would have four bedrooms and be served by a garage and a driveway parking space.

Members were referred to the plans showing the existing elevations and proposed elevations. It was noted that the changes at the rear would result in two gabled rooves, with the ground floor element projecting slightly further into the garden beneath the first floor extension.

Of the three sets of windows at first floor level at the rear, the two sets on the outside flank at either side would be obscure glazed to serve en- suites, and the central set of windows would serve a bedroom. The side windows facing on to the boundaries with number 1 Edenfield Close and number 3 Edenfield Close would also be obscure glazed.

It was noted that in a residential area there was a general presumption in favour of development provided that the relevant policy requirements were met. Of relevance to this application was the guidance set out in the Council's SPD High Quality Design.

In assessing the application officers had taken into account that the proposed front extension would be subservient to the host property and in keeping with the character of the area. The extensions to

the rear of the dwelling would have little public visibility and in terms of form and design had been deemed to be acceptable.

Officers had also considered the impact of the development on the residential amenity of the adjoining occupiers with respect to the guidance in the SPD. Consideration had been given to the 45 degree code, the position and nature of the relevant windows, the massing of the extensions in relation to neighbours as well as overlooking and privacy impacts on dwellings and garden spaces.

In assessing amenity officers had been mindful that there was already an element of inter visibility between properties. Together with the fact that obscure glazing would be fitted to a number of first floor windows, officers had concluded that the development would not materially compromise the amenity of the adjacent properties to such an extent that a refusal of the application could be justified.

Members were referred to the issues around parking provision as set out on page 11 of the agenda and the requirement of the Highway Authority that a four bedroomed property should provide three car parking spaces within the curtilage. It was noted that the application site would provide two spaces consisting of the internal garage and one in curtilage parking space. Officers had considered this in the context of the fact that Edenfield Close was a cul-de-sac with no parking restrictions and had concluded that the under provision of parking would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Officers took members through the information set out in the Update Report in detail and Members were asked to note the change to the stated separation distances between the proposed extension and the rear garden of number 4 Dairy Lane, the correction of the plan reference number in condition 3 and the additional neighbour comments received following the preparation of the report. The additional comments did not add any new issues not already considered in the report.

The application was recommended for approval.

The following speakers addressed the Committee under the Council's public speaking rules, the first two in objection and the third speaker in support.

- Mrs Di Hunt – local resident (acting as spokesperson for other local residents)
- Miss Barbara Street - local resident
- Mr Jeetendar Thukral - Planning Agent.

In response to questions from Members officers clarified a number of issues, including that:-

- The option of creating a third parking space in the curtilage had not been pursued on advice from the Highways Authority.
- The distance from the property to the junction with Dairy Lane was estimated to be circa 17 metres.
- Highways were prepared to accept that the internal garage counted as one parking space and its dimensions would meet the relevant standards.
- In theory a condition could be imposed that the garage must be retained as a parking space and not put to any other use, although in practice officers would not normally propose this type of condition due to difficulties with enforcement.
- Some of the recommended separation distances under the SPD had already been breached by the existing layout of the application site and adjoining properties.
- Points made in public speaking about the property becoming a house of multiple occupation in the future were not relevant planning considerations.
- With regard to highways issues, an application should only be refused where there would be a negative impact on highway safety.
- The new windows on the side elevations would be top opening only and any issues of fire safety would be picked up by Building Control.

In debating the application Members referred to a number of matters including insufficient parking provision and whether the development could be said to be overbearing. In considering whether the lack of in curtilage parking constituted a highway safety issue, Members noted that the road could be busy and expressed concern as to the narrowness of the cul-de-sac, proximity to the junction, and existing on street parking. It was considered likely that vehicles from the site would be displaced onto parking on the road.

Other concerns were voiced over the impact of loss of privacy on existing occupiers. There was further discussion regarding granting permission with a condition on the use of the garage for parking, although this suggestion was not seconded.

Following further discussion, a proposal was moved and seconded that planning permission be refused.

RESOLVED that

With regard to the development plan, and to all other material considerations, planning permission be **REFUSED** for the reason set out below:

By virtue of failing to provide sufficient in curtilage parking provision for a four bedroom dwelling, the proposal will result in the displacement of vehicles onto the highway, which is narrow at this point and close to a junction. Such displacement will create an unacceptable impact on the highway contrary to Policy 20 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No 4 (2017).

57. APPLICATION 20/00921/FUL - 36 GRANBY CLOSE WINYATES EAST REDDITCH B98 0PJ - MR JORDAN COOKE

Erection of a two storey side and rear extension

Officers presented the application which sought permission to add a two storey extension to the side of the property and a first floor flat roofed extension to the rear of the property above the existing flat roofed utility room. The extension would provide enlarged kitchen and living accommodation at ground floor level and two new bedrooms and bathroom area at first floor level.

Members were referred to the photograph on page 24 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack which showed the position and layout of the host property, and it was noted that properties on Granby Close have in curtilage or off street parking.

A number of objections had been received as detailed on page 17 of the agenda pack. Officers had carefully assessed the application and found it to be acceptable in terms of design, with the extension being subservient to the host property. Officers were also satisfied that the specific elements of the application would not give rise to any harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the visual amenities of the area.

With regard to parking and highways issues, the increase in size of the property from two bedrooms to four bedrooms would lead to an increased requirement for provision of in curtilage parking. Worcestershire County Council's streetscape design guide would require a four bedroomed property to provide three parking spaces.

The applicant was proposing to add an additional parking space by removing the existing hedge in the front garden to create a third space parallel to the carriageway as indicated on the plan on page 30 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack. Whilst this configuration would achieve a third space, officers noted that technically it was not in compliance with the highways standards as the vehicle in the third space would not be able to enter and exit at 90 degrees from the carriageway.

Officers had therefore gone on to consider the policy requirement that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety. In this regard given that Granby Close was a quiet cul-de-sac with in curtilage parking, very little on street parking and no on street parking restrictions in place, officers did not believe the configuration of parking spaces proposed by the applicant would result in any unacceptable impact on highway safety.

The application was recommended for approval.

In response to questions from Member, officers clarified that the applicant would be required under the conditions to provide the reconfigured parking spaces at the front of the property in accordance with the plan on page 30.

In debating the application Members noted the situation regarding parking provision but believed that this mitigated by the layout of the road which was sufficiently wide with the application site being some distance from the closest junction. It was also noted that traffic in the area was not busy and that there were two off carriage way parking bays located nearby. Overall Members were not of the view that the development would be overbearing or that the parking arrangement would give rise to highway safety issues.

RESOLVED that

Having regard to the development plan and all other material considerations, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out on pages 19 to 20 of the agenda.

58. APPLICATION 20/00947/FUL - LAND OFF BATTENS CLOSE REAR OF 60/70 SOUTH CREST ROAD LODGE PARK REDDITCH B98 7HY - MR BHOGAL

Proposed new two residential dwellings with associated parking and amenity

Officers presented the application which was for the erection of a pair of two storey semi-detached properties. Members were referred to the location plan on page 36 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack and officers explained the current layout of the site and access from Battens Close. The access served a row of 14 garages and the dwellings would be constructed at the western end of the site, beyond the garages on land that was overgrown and currently unused.

With regard to trees, the mature tree line on the northern boundary would be retained together with the group of trees on the southern side of the proposed parking area.

Being located in the urban area of Redditch the principle of development was acceptable and officers were satisfied with the scale, layout and design of the dwellings which would integrate well in the area.

The Highways authority had raised no objections to the parking provision, layout of the turning space or use of the existing access onto Battens Close.

The issues raised in the four letters of objection had been carefully considered, including loss of privacy, but officers were satisfied that the separation distances exceeded policy requirements, as did the size of the proposed rear gardens. The proposed dwellings were not found to be overbearing in terms of height and massing.

Members were referred to a further neighbour representation which had been received since the report was written as set out on page 1 of the Update report, although no new issues not already considered in the report had been raised.

The application was recommended for approval.

At the invitation of the Chair the agent Mr Peter Icke addressed the committee under the Council's public speaking rules.

In response to question from Members officers confirmed that: -

- The Highways Authority had been satisfied with the standard of the surface of the access road, were not requiring the applicant to upgrade it, and that for members to impose this via a condition would not be reasonable.
- The retention of the trees and their protection during any works would be secured through planning conditions.

RESOLVED that

Having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out pages 27 to 31 of the agenda