

# Planning Committee

Wednesday, 25th May, 2022

## MINUTES

### Present:

Councillor Michael Chalk (Chair), Councillor Timothy Pearman (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Karen Ashley (substituting for Councillor I. Altaf), Tom Baker-Price, Juma Begum (substituting for Councillor A. Fry), Brandon Clayton, Alex Fogg, Bill Hartnett and Anthony Lovell (substituting for Councillor G. Prosser)

### Also Present:

### Officers:

Helena Plant, Amar Hussain, Steve Edden and Lauren Hemmings

### Democratic Services Officers:

Pauline Ross and Gavin Day

### 1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Imran Altaf, Andy Fry and Gareth Prosser, with Councillors Karen Ashley, Juma Begum and Anthony Lovell in attendance as substitutes.

### 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declaration of interests.

### 3. CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON 16TH FEBRUARY 2022

#### RESOLVED that

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> February 2022 be approved as a true record and signed by the Chair.

Chair

#### 4. UPDATE REPORTS

There was no update report.

#### 5. APPLICATION 22/00163/FUL - 32 PARSONS ROAD, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B98 7EQ - MRS B. HOUGHTON

This application was being reported to the Planning Committee as the applicant was an employee at Redditch Borough Council. As such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Officers presented the report and in doing so drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 1-16 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application sought planning permission for a single storey rear ground floor extension and internal alterations. The proposal involved removing the existing conservatory and replacing it with a single storey extension to accommodate a larger kitchen, a shower room, a utility and a study on the ground floor. The proposal also consisted of internal alterations to the property, converting an existing bedroom on the first floor.

Officers drew Members' attention to the various images on the presentation slides and noted the changes to both the ground and second floor of the property.

The proposed extension would project 4.0m from the rear of the dwelling and would have a width of that of the existing dwelling, a height of 3m from the floor level and 4.3m from the rear garden level. The proposed extension would have a flat roof with one roof light, a small side window, a door opening onto the terrace with steps leading down to the garden and one rear window. A larger window would also be added to the side of the existing dwelling, to replace a smaller existing window.

Officers also highlighted that the existing conservatory would be removed to accommodate the extension and steps would be added leading down to the garden due to the sloped nature of the property, as shown on page 15 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

Members were further informed that the existing property had a brick work finish, whereas the proposed finish to this proposed extension would be rendered. Para. 3.1.5 of the SPD states that extensions should complement the original property and thus matching bricks, roof tiles or other facing materials in form, colour and texture should be used. However, the applicant's agent had

justified the use of render, as detailed on page 6 of the main agenda report.

Officers undertook a site visit on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2022, and it was identified that several other properties down Parsons Road had render that was visible in the street scene. Therefore, in this instance it was deemed that the proposed use of render as a finish to the extension was considered acceptable.

In conclusion Officers felt that the proposal was considered acceptable as the design, scale and appearance were all sympathetic to the main house and the street scene of Parsons Road. Officers recommended that the application be approved.

It was noted that no representations had been made regarding the proposal.

Members then considered the application.

Members felt that it was a very straightforward application and had noted that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee as the applicant was an employee of the Council.

All Members were in agreement with the Officer's recommendation.

**RESOLVED that**

**Planning permission be granted subject to the Conditions and Informatives, as detailed on page 7 of the main agenda report.**

**6. APPLICATION 22/00468/OUT - LAND AT CORNER OF LODGE ROAD AND UNION STREET, SMALLWOOD, REDDITCH, B98 7BP - REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

Officers explained that this application was being reported to the Planning Committee because the applicant was Redditch Borough Council. As such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Officers presented the report and in doing so drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 17-23 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application sought outline planning permission for residential development comprising 2, three bedroomed houses with all matters reserved for future consideration (access, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping).

Officers highlighted that although the matter of access was not for consideration at this stage, an indicative plan had been submitted showing vehicular access off Union Street to the south where four car parking spaces could be created (two for each dwelling).

Officers reiterated that this application was an outline application with all matters reserved, and as such only the principle of development could be considered. The application plans included an indicative layout, however, this was for illustrative purposes only to demonstrate how the site **could** be developed to accommodate the two dwellings and not how the site **would** be developed.

Officers also drew Members' attention to the Arboricultural Officer's comments with regard to the two trees currently on site, a small Hawthorn and a semi mature Silver Birch, being removed, as detailed on page 11 of the main agenda report. The trees were not currently covered by any Tree Preservation Order (TPO) and the Arboricultural Officer had no objection to their removal to facilitate any proposed development.

Members then considered the application which Officers had recommended be approved.

Members referred to the Relevant Planning History as detailed on page 10 of the main agenda report, which highlighted that planning permission was granted on 29.09.1977 for laying out of public space and asked Officers if they were aware what the previous land use was.

Officers responded that prior to this the land had contained several terraced houses that had fallen into disrepair and needed to be demolished, and that at the time the best use of the land was deemed to be public space.

Members also referred to the footpath, as detailed on page 20 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack, and whether this was an official footpath. Officers clarified that this was not an official footpath and thus would not need to be moved as part of any planning application.

Members commented that there was a major problem with fly tipping on this plot of land so therefore welcomed the application to convert the land back to housing.

Members further enquired about the two trees on the plot of land that would be removed and if the Council had a replacement 'tree for tree' scheme. Officers clarified that there was no TPO attached to either of the trees so a developer would not need to consider them.

Members further clarified and discussed if there was a scheme in place to plant a tree elsewhere in the Borough for each tree removed. Officers informed Members that there was no such regulation from a planning perspective and that they had not been aware of a separate Council policy/scheme.

Members then asked if there would be a policy in place, to which the Chair reminded Members that this was a matter for the Council to debate and did not form part of the remit of the Planning Committee.

On being put to a vote, it was

**RESOLVED that**

Having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, that OUTLINE planning permission be granted subject to the Conditions and Informatives, as detailed on pages 15-19 of the main agenda report.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm  
and closed at 7.19 pm