



Planning Committee

Wed 10 Mar
2021
7.00 pm

Virtual Meeting

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

*making
a
difference*

www.redditchbc.gov.uk

If you have any queries on this Agenda please contact

Sarah Sellers

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

Tel: (01527) 64252 (Ext. 2884)

email: sarah.sellers@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

GUIDANCE ON VIRTUAL MEETINGS AND PUBLIC SPEAKING

Due to the current Covid-19 pandemic Redditch Borough Council will be holding this meeting in accordance with the relevant legislative arrangements for remote meetings of a local authority. For more information please refer to the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police Crime Panels meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.

The meeting is open to the public except for any exempt/confidential items. Where a meeting is held remotely, “open” means available for live viewing. Members of the public will be able to see and hear the meetings via a live stream to the Council’s YouTube Channel which can be accessed using the link below:

[Link to view live stream of Planning Committee](#)

Members of the Committee, officers and public speakers will participate in the meeting using Microsoft Teams, and details of any joining instructions will be made available separately.

If you have any questions regarding the agenda or attached papers please do not hesitate to contact the officer named below.

PUBLIC SPEAKING

The usual process for public speaking at meetings of the Planning Committee will continue to be followed subject to some adjustments for the smooth running of virtual meetings. For further details a copy of the amended Planning Committee Procedure Rules can be found on the Council’s website at:

[Link to view amended Planning Committee Procedure Rules](#)

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

- 1) Introduction of application by Chair
- 2) Officer presentation of the report
- 3) Public Speaking - in the following order:-
 - a) Objectors to speak on the application
 - b) Supporters to speak on the application
 - c) Ward Councillors
 - d) Applicant (or representative) to speak on the application
- 4) Members’ questions to the Officers and formal debate / determination.

Speakers will be called in the order they have notified their interest in speaking to the Democratic Services Team and invited to unmute their microphone and address the committee via Microsoft Teams.

Each individual speaker will have up to a maximum of 3 minutes to speak, subject to the discretion of the Chair.

Each group of supporters or objectors with a common interest will have up to a maximum of 10 minutes to speak, subject to the discretion of the Chair.

Notes:

- 1) Anyone wishing to address the Planning Committee on applications on this agenda must notify the Democratic Services Team on 01527 64252 Extn.2884 or by email at sarah.sellers@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk before 12 noon on Monday 8th March.**
- 2) Advice and assistance will be provided to public speakers as to how to access the meeting and those registered to speak will be invited to participate via a Teams invitation. Provision has been made in the amended Planning Committee procedure rules for public speakers who cannot access the meeting by Teams, and those speakers will be given the opportunity to submit their speech in writing to be read out by an officer at the meeting. Please take care when preparing written comments to ensure that the reading time will not exceed three minutes. Any speakers wishing to submit written comments must do so by 12 noon on Monday 8th March.**
- 3) Reports on all applications will include a summary of the responses received from consultees and third parties, an appraisal of the main planning issues and a recommendation. All submitted plans and documentation for each application, including consultee responses and third party representations, are available to view in full via the Public Access facility on the Council's website www.redditchbc.gov.uk**
- 4) 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. 4 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.**
- 5) Although this is a public meeting, there are circumstances when the committee might have to move into closed session to consider exempt or confidential information. For agenda items that are exempt, the public are excluded and for any such items the live stream will be suspended and that part of the meeting will not be recorded.**
- 6) Late circulation of additional papers is not advised and is subject to the Chair's agreement. The submission of any significant new information might lead to a delay in reaching a decision. The deadline for papers to be received by Planning Officers is 4.00 p.m. on the Friday before the meeting.**



Planning

COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 10th March, 2021

7.00 pm

Virtual Meeting - Microsoft
Teams

Agenda

Membership:

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

1. Apologies
2. Chair's Welcome
3. Declarations of Interest

To invite Councillors to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and / or Other Disclosable Interests they may have in items on the agenda, and to confirm the nature of those interests.

4. Confirmation of Minutes (Pages 1 - 4)

5. Update Reports

To note Update Reports (if any) for the Planning Applications to be considered at the meeting (circulated prior to the commencement of the meeting)

6. Application 20/01608/FUL - 2 Edenfield Close Redditch B97 6TP - Mr N Dhasi (Pages 5 - 10)

7. Consultation on Planning Application reference Bromsgrove District Council 20/0150/FUL and Stratford-on-Avon 20/03396/FUL - Redditch Gateway Land Adjacent to the A4023 Coventry Highway (Pages 11 - 16)

Please note that this report is for consultation only and there is no public speaking.

This page is intentionally left blank



Planning Committee

Wednesday, 24 February 2021

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 and Amar Hussain

Democratic Services Officer:

Sarah Sellers

93. CHAIR'S WELCOME

The Chair welcomed the Committee members and officers to the virtual Planning Committee meeting being held via Microsoft Teams. 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.

The Chair announced that agenda item 6 (Application ref 19/01264/FUL) had been withdrawn from the agenda by officers.

94. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

95. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

.....
Chair

Planning

Committee

Wednesday, 24 February 2021

96. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON 10TH FEBRUARY 2021

RESOLVED that

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 10th February 2021 be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

97. UPDATE REPORTS

There was no update report for the meeting.

98. APPLICATION 19/01264/FUL - ROCKHILL FARM ASTWOOD LANE FECKENHAM REDDITCH B96 6HG - MR GORA

This application was withdrawn from the agenda by officers as further information was needed. Members were advised that the application would be deferred to a future meeting of the Committee.

99. APPLICATION 20/01628/FUL - FORMER CONCRETE YARD UNIT 35 ENFIELD INDUSTRIAL ESTATE ROAD ENFIELD REDDITCH B97 6BY - EDR LTD

Erection of 3 new commercial units

Officers presented the application and outlined the changes proposed and referred Members to the status of the site as being within an existing employment area.

Permission had already been granted separately for site levelling works which had been commenced. Demolition of the existing concrete batching plant at the site had also been approved, but those works had not been implemented yet.

The proposed units would be lower in height (6.5 metres) than the existing structures (13.5m). The location of the site close to properties on Marton Close was noted. There had been extensive consultation with nearby residents and only one representation had been received.

In responding to questions from Members, officers clarified that at this point in time it was not known whether the end use at the site would be light industrial, general industrial or storage and distribution. Officers had considered this carefully and were mindful that noise mitigation measures would be required if the final use was one of light industrial (Use Class B2). For this reason Condition 10 requiring the installation of an acoustic fence, would only become applicable in the event of a B2 use either upon construction of the new units, or at any point in the future. The

Planning

Committee

Wednesday, 24 February 2021

plans detailed where on the site such an acoustic fence would be constructed if in the future one was required.

In debating the application Members welcomed the scheme which would enable the improvement of the site that had been out of use for some time.

RESOLVED that

Having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions and informatives set out on pages 14 to 16 of the agenda.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 7.35 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE****10th March 2021**

Planning Application 20/01608/FUL**Rear ground floor extension and first floor extension above existing garage****2 Edenfield Close, Redditch, Worcestershire, B97 6TP.****Applicant: Mr N Dhasi
Ward: Batchley And Brockhill Ward****(see additional papers for site plan)**

The case officer of this application is Tara Ussher, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on Tel: 01527 64252 Ext. 3220 Email: tara.Ussher@Bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk for more information.

Site Description

This application relates to an existing residential property situated within Batchley and Brockhill Ward. Edenfield Close is a short cul-de-sac accessed off Dairy Lane comprising of detached two storey dwellings in a variety of designs. These properties are accessed directly off the close or off associated service roads, with modest front garden areas and parking provided by a mixture of driveway spaces and garages.

The application site, which is an existing 3 bedrooomed property, is located on the northern side of the close with neighbours No.1 to the west and No.3 to the east. Number 4 Dairy Lane and No.4 Edenfield Close are sited to the rear of the dwelling

Proposal Description

This Full Planning application seeks permission for a ground floor rear extension and first floor extension above the existing garage.

To the rear an extended kitchen/family area will be provided at ground floor. The proposed first floor extension will add a new bedroom. This area will be served by a projecting dormer window to the front elevation.

The resulting dwelling would remain a 3 bedrooomed unit. Parking is indicated as being provided on the drive, in front of the garage. A parking space was shown in front of the dwelling when the application was originally submitted. This space has been omitted during the application process as it was non-compliant with highway standards.

Relevant Policies:**Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4**

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

Policy 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy 20: Transport Requirements for New Development

Policy 39: Built Environment

Policy 40: High Quality Design and Safer Communities

Others

Redditch High Quality Design SPD

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

Relevant Planning History

20/00603/FUL	Two storey rear extension and a first-floor side extension	Refused	12.11.2020
--------------	--	---------	------------

(Currently the subject of a live Householder Appeal to the Planning Inspectorate)

Consultations**Cadent Gas Ltd**

Draws attention to location of the *WM1213* Cadent Gas High Pressure Pipeline which is subject to easements. The works will not affect the asset advises clarify with Health and Safety Executive to review the plans as they may have a larger consultation distance.

Cllr Monaco

Notes that this property still only has 2 spaces and the one on the front is not at the correct angle to the road which was highlighted by Highways on the last submission as being non-compliant

Notes that the boundary on the 1st floor extension above garage is adjoining the boundary of No3 still, albeit no openable window this time over the boundary. Questions how the agreement on access for this will be achieved as presumably scaffolding would need to be provided on the external side still

Considers an improvement to the last application, still has concerns over this application in its revised format

Cllr Nazir

No comments received to date

Highways Redditch

No objection subject to the removal of the proposed car parking space.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Public Consultation Response

17 letters have been received in objection to the application.

Comments received are summarised below:

- Concerns raised that the dwelling will be used as an HMO property in the future.
- Permitted development rights to be removed as it may be possible for a bedroom be added as there is space on the landing, and a possible conversion of the garage to yet another bedroom on the ground floor a condition is necessary to avoid further overdevelopment.
- The provision of one new bedroom will mean greater demand for car parking spaces and will lead to parking problems.
- Proposals would result in overlooking to the detriment of privacy to neighbouring properties.
- Proposals would result in a loss of light to neighbouring dwellings
- Development is too large for the plot size, over development of the site
- Proposed development too close to dwelling at rear
- Visual impact – over dominance of application site.
- Privacy, overlooking into rear and side gardens of neighbouring properties.
- Blocking sunlight to gardens, privacy of neighbouring properties with overlooking gardens.
- The proposed development is over-bearing, out of scale and out of character in terms of its appearance compared with the existing properties in the vicinity.

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

Assessment of Proposal

The application site is situated within a residential area of Redditch where there is a general presumption in favour of domestic extensions, subject to satisfying the relevant policies of the development plan.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

This application raises two issues; the impact of the extensions on the character and appearance of the street scene and any neighbour impacts, and the parking arrangements associated with the development.

Design and neighbour impacts

Planning applications for extensions and alterations to dwellings are expected to be of a high-quality design that reflects or complements the character and appearance of the local area as set out by policy 39 of the Local Plan. Guidance contained within the Councils SPD 'High Quality Design' is expected to be incorporated within development proposals.

The proposed first floor side extension above the existing garage has been set down from the ridge of the existing roof by 700mm and will have a pitched roof, which will use matching roof tiles to create a visual link between the proposed extension and the original house. The extension will be served by a new dormer window on the front elevation which will extend forward from the roof plane. Whilst this dormer is of some depth, it is noted that this style of window in this position is not uncharacteristic in Edenfield Close. The absence of a dwelling abutting the application site immediately to the east means the development does not appear unduly cramped in the street scene. Overall Officers are of the view the extension remains subservient to the original dwelling, such that the scale and massing of the original dwelling would continue to dominate, thus retaining the characteristic appearance of the dwelling and complying with guidance set out within the Councils 'High Quality Design' SPD.

Number 3 Edenfield Close is positioned to the east of the application site with the rear elevation and garden of this property facing the application site. There will be a separation of 10m between the main rear elevation of number 3 and the resultant side elevation of the application site, slightly below the 12.5 metres advocated in the high-quality design SPD. However, noting the staggered nature of the side elevation of the application site and the open aspect to the south of number 3's garden, this arrangement is not considered unduly harmful to outlook. No additional over shadowing would occur because of the side extension and the privacy of number 3 is protected as there are no new windows proposed on this side elevation.

The impact of the rear extension on number 3 also requires consideration. It is noted that the siting of an existing detached garage to the east of the site will obscure in part the ground floor. The separation distance to the dwelling of 10m and the other wise open aspect of the garden is noted and, it is concluded that this part of the scheme will not create an overbearing impact on the dwelling or amenity area of number 3.

Turning now to the extension to the rear. The proposed single storey rear extension has a depth of 3.7m and seeks to add a kitchen/family area. It should be noted that this part of the scheme has a strong permitted development fall back given its location and scale.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

Number 1 Edenfield Close, to the west of the site has an existing conservatory on the rear and the proposed single storey rear extension will project marginally further out than this feature, however there will be a separation distance of 5m from the side of the extension to the conservatory. This arrangement is not considered to be harmful to amenity by virtue of overbearing, overshadowing or privacy issues.

The rear of the application site looks on to the rear garden of No 4 Diary Lane. There will be between 6.2m and 7m separation between the rear of the resultant dwelling and the garden area of number 4 at ground floor. Given the single storey nature of the development to the rear and the presence of an intervening fence, this arrangement is not considered harmful. Consideration has also to be given to what could be erected along this rear elevation using Permitted Development rights.

There is no direct rear to rear separation to an opposing dwelling due to the layout of the area.

In conclusion, officers are satisfied that the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of nearby dwellings would not be prejudiced, taking into consideration the matters of loss of light, overbearing or overshadowing and loss of privacy and that the design and scale of the development are acceptable in this location.

Parking Provision

The Highway Authority has undertaken a full assessment of this planning application and stated that they have no objection subject to the removal of the proposed car parking space as shown on drawing reference (2EC PL_3 Rev 8) as the space indicated on that plan was not policy compliant due to positioning.

Drawing number 2EC PL_3 Rev 9 has now been submitted showing the amendment.

It is noted, unlike the previous application on this site (20/00603/FUL), that the development does not increase bedroom numbers and remains a 3 bedroomed unit. There is therefore no additional demand on parking because of the scheme. With respect to the representation about limiting by condition the ability to convert the garage or other parts of the dwelling to an additional room, such a condition is considered excessive given the scale of the proposal and not compliant with the necessary tests.

Representations are also made about the potential use of the dwelling in the future. Members will be aware that applications can only be judged on the merits of the development before them and not on hypothetical situations which may or may not occur in the future. There are separate processes available for those eventualities.

In conclusion the proposed application is considered to comply with the provisions of the development plan and would constitute a sustainable form of development in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

RECOMMENDATION:

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

- 1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of the grant of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and drawings:

2EC PL_1 REV 3 LOCATION SITE PLAN
2EC PL_2 REV 1 EXISTING FLOOR PLAN
23C PL_3 REV 9 PROPOSED FLOOR PLAN
2EC PL_4 REV 1 EXISTING ELEVATION
2EC PL_5 REV 1 EXISTING ELEVATION
2EC PL_6 REV 4 PROPOSED ELEVATION
2EC PL_7 REV 3 PROPOSED ELEVATION
2EC PL_8 REV 3 EXISTING AND PROPOSED PLAN

Materials in accordance with Question 7 of the application form

Reason: To provide certainty to the extent of the development hereby approved in the interests of proper planning.

Procedural matters

Given the type of application and number of objections received, the application could have been considered under the Council's revised Scheme of Delegation (Nov 2020). However, in this instance the Chair has requested the application be referred to Planning Committee for consideration.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**10th March 2021

Planning Application Consultation Response to Bromsgrove and Stratford-on-Avon District Councils

Reference: Bromsgrove Planning Application No. 20/01502/FUL
Stratford-on-Avon Planning Application No. 20/03396/FUL

Site at: Redditch Gateway,
Land Adjacent to the A4023 Coventry Highway.

Proposal: Internal works to facilitate a new mezzanine level in the storage and distribution building approved under the reserved matter consent 19/00619/REM (Bromsgrove) and 19/01545/REM (Stratford-on-Avon)

Applicant: Momentum Projects Ltd

Ward: Alvechurch South Ward
Closest Redditch Ward: Winyates

The author of this report is Helena Plant, Development Management Manager, who can be contacted on Tel: (01527) 881335
Email: h.plant@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk for more information.

1.0 Purpose and scope of report

- 1.1 Redditch Borough Council has been invited to comment by both Bromsgrove District Council and Stratford-on-Avon District Council upon the above-mentioned application.
- 1.2 The Planning Applications are due to be considered by Bromsgrove District Council's Planning Committee and Stratford-on-Avon District Council's Planning Committee in due course. This response would inform the decision making of those Councils.

2.0 Procedural Matters

- 2.1 This matter is reported to members because whilst the revised scheme of Delegation enables consultations requests from adjoining LPA'S to be responded to by officers in conjunction with the Chair of Planning Committee, on this occasion the Chair has exercised discretion and has requested the matter be considered by Planning Committee.
- 2.3 **What should local planning authorities expect from a statutory consultee in terms of a response?**

When consulted in the circumstances set out in Article 22 of the Development Management Procedure Order, consultees are under a duty to provide a "substantive response" (as defined in that Article). Local planning authorities must provide such consultees with the information that will enable them to provide a

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**10th March 2021

substantive response.

The substantive response will need to include reasons for the consultee's views so that where these views have informed a subsequent decision made by a local planning authority the decision is transparent. A holding reply would not be acceptable as a substantive response.

2.4 How long do statutory consultees have to respond to a consultation?

Where a "substantive response" is required, statutory consultees must provide it-

a) within the period of 21 days beginning with the day on which - (i) the document on which the views of consultees are sought, or(ii) where there are several documents and they are sent on different days, the day on which the last of those documents is received, or

b) such other period as may be agreed in writing between the consultee and consultor.

2.5 What happens where a statutory consultee considers that it does not have the information it needs to provide a substantive response?

It is important for statutory consultees to inform the local planning authority without delay if they require additional information, and that they have procedures in place to enable this to occur as soon as possible after they receive a consultation. It is not acceptable for a statutory consultee to wait until the 21-day period would otherwise have come to a close to notify the local planning authority that it believes it does not have enough information to provide a substantive response.

Where a statutory consultee requests additional information it will need to set out clearly and precisely what the additional information is and the reasons why it is required.

2.6 What happens where a statutory consultee is unable to meet the deadlines for responding?

Local planning authorities are expected to determine applications for planning permission, within a time period of 5, 8, 13 or 16 weeks (depending on the type of development). Statutory consultees should be aware of the risk that, should they fail to respond within a specified time period, a local planning authority may proceed to decide the application in the absence of their advice.

2.7 Is it possible for the statutory consultee to negotiate an extension to the deadline for representations?

It is important for statutory consultees to do all they can to meet the deadline for representations. It should not usually be necessary for an extension to be proposed.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE****10th March 2021**

Extensions of time which are negotiated between the statutory consultee and the local planning authority will not affect the applicant's right to appeal against non-determination. In considering whether to agree to any proposed extension, local planning authorities will therefore need to consider the views of the applicant and the likely impact on the overall time taken to reach a decision.

3.0 Planning History

- 3.1 This application follows the approval of the reserved matters application for a use class B8 (storage and distribution) building with ancillary floorspace including use class B1 (offices) (ref. Stratford reference 19/01545/REM, Bromsgrove reference 19/00619/REM).

4.0 Site Description

- 4.1 The Redditch Gateway development site is separated by the A4023, dividing the site into north and south parcels. The proposed development would be located within the northern parcel, west of the A435.
- 4.2 The application site straddles the administrative areas of Bromsgrove and Stratford-on-Avon Districts only. The majority of the proposed mezzanine would be within the administrative area of Bromsgrove.
- 4.3 Located to the north east of the Application Site is Gorcott Hall (Grade II Listed Building), to the west is the established Ravensbank industrial estate, to the south is the A4023 and beyond that is the residential area of Winyates Green.

5.0 Proposal

- 5.1 The proposed works involve the installation of an internal mezzanine platform within the new warehouse facility, upon which construction is well advanced following detailed planning permission previously being granted.
- 5.2 The main new mezzanine would be steel framed, with a concrete deck and would be located within the existing facility. Surrounding the main concrete deck mezzanine extending to 15,678m² would be an additional lightweight mezzanine of 8000 m² which would be constructed from steel and have a mixture of open grate steel deck flooring and floor boarding depending on the location and operation specific to that area on the lightweight mezzanine. The main mezzanine would be accessed via 6 internal steel staircases and one goods lift.
- 5.3 The mezzanine floorspace would be used for B8 purposes as with the rest of the warehouse unit.
- 5.4 The purpose of the application is to improve the internal function of the approved warehouse building through the installation of an internal mezzanine level

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE****10th March 2021**

- 5.5 The building's external envelope would remain unaffected as part of the internal mezzanine's installation. Furthermore, there are no external changes proposed to site as a consequence of the proposal for the introduction of the new internal mezzanine.
- 5.6 Were it not for the fact that the developer wishes to preserve the ability to construct the residual quantum of floorspace approved at the outline stage on the southern parcel, it would have been possible for the developer to add the mezzanine to the completed building on the northern parcel without the need for planning permission. Consequently, a separate permission has been sought for the mezzanine in order to avoid the need to seek a variation to the extant permission.

6.0 Officer Appraisal

- 6.1 LP Policy BP16 (Sustainable Transport) states that developments should comply with the Worcestershire County Council's Transport policies, design guide and car parking standards, incorporate safe and convenient access and be well related to the wider transport network. Developments which generate significant travel demands must include a transport statement and have easy access to existing and proposed public transport links. The Policy further advises that the Council will encourage the use of travel plans, where applicable, to secure the provision of sustainable travel choices, both to new developments and extensions of existing sites regardless of use.
- 6.2 The Transport Statement (dated November 2020), submitted in support of this application, confirms that the Proposed Development would not lead to unacceptable transport impacts. Even assuming the mezzanine attracted additional traffic at the same level as the ground floor area, the increase in traffic would not be significant or material to the traffic capacity testing undertaken and agreed in the Transport Assessment at the outline application stage and reserved matters stage for the Redditch Gateway site. This outcome was found to be the same for sensitive assessments for future development scenarios on the site as well.
- 6.3 Condition 25 pursuant to the S73 consent for the Redditch Gateway development requires the submission of a Travel Plan prior to the first occupation of any building through reserved matters. A Travel Plan is currently being prepared which will include the application site and therefore the applicant does not propose to submit one as part of this application. In terms of parking, LP Policy BP16 directs to guidance set out in Worcestershire County Council's design guide.
- 6.4 The WCC Design Guide advises that commercial operators should have a good understanding of the needs of their business and will determine how land under their control can be managed. The applicant should provide a minimum parking provision for each development along with an evidence base to demonstrate the appropriateness of the provision. Trip rates accumulation should either be derived from first principles or from existing data, for example; TRICS or

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**10th March 2021

comparison to facilities of similar size and geographic circumstance.

6.5 For other user needs in non-residential, the WCC Design Guide advises that the following parking ratios are required:

- Disabled Parking (minimum standard) – 4 + 3% of total car park (201 – 500 spaces)
- Cycle Parking – 1 space per 40 sq.m GFA
- Motorcycle Parking – 1 space per 10 parking spaces
- Electric Vehicle Charing - Initially 5% of the total parking spaces plus a further 5% at an agreed trigger. The site currently benefits from a total of 469 car parking spaces (22 of which will be disabled spaces and 48 will be electric), 47 motorcycle spaces and 60 bicycle spaces, as approved under the reserved matters consent.

6.6 Whilst the proposal sees an uplift in the amount of B8 floorspace, the Transport Statement considers the level of car parking to be appropriate for the number of employees forecast and for the operation of the site with the mezzanine. It demonstrates that the car parking provision allows for flexibility during the peak periods and shift changeover times when there could be delay within the car park as drivers look for and manoeuvre in and out of spaces.

6.7 In all, it is considered that the proposed development would have no impact on the safety or operation of the site and the local highway network and meets the requirements of LP Policy BP16 and the WCC Design Guide.

6.8 The proposed development is considered to accord with the planning policies contained in the Bromsgrove District Plan and NPPF which are not outweighed by any other material considerations.

7.0 Conclusion

7.1 The Proposed Development would see an uplift in employment floorspace which would be used for B8 purposes to support the function of the warehouse and operational requirements of the future occupier. There are no internal works beyond those being proposed and there are no external changes to the warehouse building or wider site. The proposal for the internal mezzanine level should therefore be granted without delay in accordance with paragraph 11 of the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION:

That RBC raise no objection to the applications cited above, and Members endorse a response to that effect to both LPAs.

