

Planning Committee

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Timothy Pearman (Chair) and Councillors Imran Altaf, Tom Baker-Price, Alex Fogg, Andrew Fry, Bill Hartnett, Karen Ashley (Substituting for Councillor Prosser) and Emma Marshall (Substituting for Councillor Clayton)

Officers:

Helena Plant, Clare Flanagan, Paul Lester and Sarah Hazlewood.

Democratic Services Officer:

Gavin Day

25. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Clayton and Prosser with Councillors Marshall and Ashley in attendance as substitutes respectively.

Apologies were also received from Councillor Chalk.

26. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

27. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

RESOLVED that

1. The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 22nd June 2022 be approved as a true record and signed by the Chair.
2. The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 13th July 2022 be approved as a true record and signed by the Chair.

28. UPDATE REPORTS

There were no update reports.

.....
Chair

29. APPLICATION - 22/00202/FUL - 55 ALCESTER ROAD, FECKENHAM

The application was being reported to the Planning Committee because an objection had been received from a statutory consultee which had not been resolved through the course of dealing with the application. 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 1-12 of the Site Plans and Presentation Pack.

The application was for demolition of the existing dwelling and construction of a new 4 bedroom replacement dwelling in the same position as the original on the Site of 55 Alcester Road, Feckenham.

Officers drew Members' attention to the image BoRLP Proposal Map as detailed on page 2 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack and highlighted to Members the property's position as being just inside the green belt.

Officers informed Members that there was an existing prior approval detailed on page 8 of the Site Plans and Presentation Pack, this prior approval was for two single storey rear extensions to the property and had been approved under the larger homes scheme. Officers further detailed to Members that this application represented an extant fallback position with regards to development and would thus compare the proposed application to this fallback position.

Officers further compared the two applications highlighting that the proposed application had a smaller footprint than the extant prior approval.

Officers informed the Committee that the property was classified as a non-designated heritage asset. However, due to a number of extensions and modifications to the property, Officers believed the harm to the Council's cultural assets would be low.

In conclusion, having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, Officers recommended that planning permission be granted.

At the invitation of the Chair Mr J Scoffham of J S Architects spoke in support of the application.

Members then asked questions of the Officers.

Members enquired as to the extent to which the property would retain its original features and thus its cultural significance, Officers replied that there had been substantial building work carried out on the property and therefore the property retained very little historical heritage.

Members sought clarification on the table as detailed on page 24 of the Public Reports Pack, Officers explained that the table compared the proposed application to the extant prior approval and that out of the 5 measured criteria, 3 showed that the application had a smaller footprint and thus a lesser impact on the greenbelt.

Members then considered the application which Officers recommended be granted.

Members commented on the property being a non-designated heritage asset, in considering the extent of the modifications Members did not believe that any real heritage aspects had been retained.

Members commended the developers on their plans for a low carbon footprint property. Members also highlighted the commitment to recycle and reuse building materials and waste during demolition and in the construction of the new property.

Members further commented that they did not believe that the application should be compared to the extant prior approval, and expressed the view that they should only consider the current application and not any potential future developments. Officers informed Members that the extant prior approval was a valid fallback position and therefore it would be suitable to compare the application against.

On being put to a vote it was

RESOLVED that

Having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be granted subject to the Conditions outlined on pages 25 to 27 of the Public Reports Pack.

30. APPLICATION - 22/00359/REM - FOURTH PHASE OF PERSIMMON BROCKHILL DEVELOPMENT

The application was being reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the application was for a major development (more than 1000 sq metres of new commercial / industrial floorspace). 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 13-28 of the Site Plans and Presentation Pack.

The application was for reserved matters approval (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for the construction of 72 dwellings and associated works and infrastructure, pursuant to the hybrid planning permissions 19/00976/HYB and 19/00977/HYB (Cross boundary application with Bromsgrove DC 22/00255/REM).

Officers informed Members that this application was a cross boundary application with Bromsgrove District Council and that the phase 4 application went before Bromsgrove District Council's Planning Committee on 15th August 2022, and was approved as per the Officers recommendation. Officers further detailed that the original application for 960 dwellings had been approved by Redditch Planning Committee on 27th January 2021 subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement. The section 106 agreement was signed on 1st November 2021.

Officers drew Members' attention to the Approved Framework Plan as detailed on page 15 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack. Officers highlighted to Members the boundary between Redditch Borough Council and Bromsgrove District Council and also phases 1, 2 and 3 of the development.

During the presentation Officers highlighted the following to Members:

- That there would be 42 market and 30 affordable houses, a breakdown of the house types was detailed on page 30 of the Public Reports Pack.
- That phases 2,3 and 4 would all be subject to the future reserved matters.
- That the concern of the custodial management would be controlled under Condition 39.
- That the applicant would be required to provide a new up to date construction plan after phase 4.
- That there were no highways objections to the application-

Officers detailed to Members how there was a substantial green infrastructure with the project and Officers also considered that the scale was acceptable and appropriate to the area.

In conclusion, having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, Officers recommended that the reserved matters application be granted.

Members then asked questions of the Officers.

Members asked Officers if there was provision for additional off-road parking, Officers responded that there was not, however, Worcestershire County Council, Highways had assessed the parking and had deemed it to be adequate when considering the size of the dwellings.

Members enquired about public transport links with the project, Officers detailed that as part of the prior approval there was a £350k package to improve bus stops/links in and around the wider estate.

Members further enquired about the following points which were not covered in detail as they fell outside of the reserved matters considered:

- EV chargers – covered in outline conditions
- The Community house as detailed on page 33 of the Public Reports Pack.
- Town centre development – Detailed that this would be in a future matters application as the site proposed would be sold to a specialist retail developer.
- Developers not adhering to conditions.

Councillor Hartnett requested a typographical error to be noted on page 29 of the Public Reports Pack, wherein it referred to the administrative boundary of Bromsgrove, and should have read administrative boundary of Redditch, Officers acknowledged the error and confirmed that it was a typographical error.

Councillor Fry requested a typographical error to be noted on page 39 of the Public Reports Pack wherein during the Officers recommendation the report used the terminology “approved” rather than “granted”, Officers acknowledged the error.

Members expressed a view that affordable housing needed to be distributed more evenly throughout the development rather than clustered together. Officers explained to Members that in terms of the affordable units, housing associations requested that properties were together for the ease of the unit’s management, if units were spread evenly throughout the site, it could cause difficulties for a housing association to agree to take over their management.

Members then considered the reserved matter application which Officers recommended be granted.

Members commented that they understood that the purpose of the Planning Committee in this instance was to consider a reserved

matters application; but expressed a view that Members would like the opportunity in the future to discuss other aspects of the development.

Members further commented that with regard to the reserved matters for consideration which were layout, scale, appearance and landscaping they felt that there were no grounds to object to the application.

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

RESOLVED that

The Reserved Matters of Layout, Scale, Appearance and Landscaping be granted subject to the Conditions outlined on pages 39 and 40 of the Public Reports Pack.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 7.56 pm