

Planning Committee

Wednesday, 12th July, 2023

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Peter Fleming (Chair), Councillor Imran Altaf (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Juma Begum, Andrew Fry, Bill Hartnett, Sid Khan, Anthony Lovell, Timothy Pearman and Karen Ashley

Also Present:

Councilors Joe Baker and Kerrie Miles

Officers:

Helena Plant, Amar Hussain (on Microsoft Teams), Paul Lester, Sharron Williams and Max Howarth (of Anthony Collins Solicitors)

Democratic Services Officers:

Gavin Day

18. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Chris Holz with Councillor Karen Ashley in attendance as substitute.

19. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

20. UPDATE REPORTS

The Chair announced that an update report had been published, a copy of which had been circulated to all Members.

Members indicated they were familiar with the contents of the report and were happy to note the report and proceed with the meeting.

Chair

21. 22/01553/REM - PHASE 6 DEVELOPMENT, BROCKHILL EAST, HEWELL ROAD, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE

The application was reported to Planning Committee for determination as the application was for major development 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 5 to 33 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for Brockhill East, Hewell Road, Redditch, Worcestershire and sought reserved matters approval for 109 dwellings and associated works and infrastructure.

Officers detailed that the application was part of a cross boundary development which extended into Bromsgrove District Council (BDC) which was addressed by application (22/01608/REM).

Page 8 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack detailed the phases for the development. Officers confirmed that Phases 1 and 2 had been completed and Phase 3 was in the process of being constructed, Phase 4 had also been approved but construction had not started. Officers further detailed that although Members were being asked to consider Phase 6, Phase 5 had not been submitted by the applicant. Officers commented that Phase 6 was a natural continuation from Phase 4 and comprised mostly 2-5 bed 2 storey dwellings.

Officers drew Members attention to the proposed Tenure Plan detailed on page 13 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack, and identified the location of the affordable housing units, being split between shared ownership and affordable rate properties.

The development followed the topography of the land with care being taken to consider overlooking properties/open space. The property per hectare rate was 32 dwellings which was lower than the previous phases of 37 dwellings per hectare, this had been predominately due to the larger proportion of 4/5 bedroom dwellings in Phase 6.

Officers identified that there was a shortfall of affordable housing in Phase 6 which the applicant assured would be compensated for during subsequent phases. Officers further identified that the overall development had an affordable housing provision of 30% in RBC and 40% in BDC. Officers assured Members there was sufficient protection in the Section 106 Agreement to enforce meeting the required quotas, therefore ensuring the affordable housing targets

were achieved on the site overall. This would be considered under future phases.

Officers drew Members attention to proposed landscaping plans detailed on pages 26-32 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack. Officers further detailed the large amount of green space within Phase 6 which amounted to 77% of the site and included a range of landscaping, biodiversity, recreational and SuDs benefits. The plans also included additional native tree, hedgerow and shrub planting.

Officers detailed that the streets would track through Phases 5 and 6 and around the edge of the district centre to connect to Phase 2 with a carriageway. The applicant provided that the curved shape of the main road would provide traffic calming by reducing the speed of vehicles.

Sufficient parking would be provided for all dwellings on site and the development would provide an additional 22 spaces for visitors. Worcester County Council (WCC) Highways had been consulted and after several iterations had indicated no objections subject to Conditions.

North Worcestershire Water Management (NWWM) had also been consulted and had no objection subject to Conditions.

At the invitation of the Chair, Councillor Joe Baker, Ward Member for Batchley and Brockhill, addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Miss Harriet Jarvis, on behalf of the developer, also addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Officers clarified the following points after questions from Members.

- That the Terms “Flats” and “Maisonettes” in the report were used interchangeably and were both referred to the same properties, Officers indicated these to members shown in red on page 14 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.
- The relevant payments had been received in line with the Section 106 Agreement, however, as a result of the Phase 6 application, further payments may be required.
- That all the concerns raised by WCC Highways, had been addressed in their entirety and WCC Highways had no objection to the application subject to Conditions.
- The Section 106 Agreement outlined money to be supplied to WCC Highways for the provision of a bus route, however, the plan for the route and accompanying bus stops had not been decided.
- That subsequent Phases would develop the road network and complete a through road for the whole development.

- All properties would be fitted with electrical vehicle charging points.

Members then proceeded to debate the application.

Members thanked Officers for their correspondence prior to the Committee meeting clarifying a few queries that they had. Members were pleased that the developer had decided to include an additional 22 visitor car parking spaces. However, Members were still concerned that there may not be enough parking and that people would still need to park on the road which would lead to difficulties with larger vehicles getting past.

Members expressed that they would like to have known about the future development which might take place as that could impact on the current site/application, but respected that it was not always possible.

Members were disappointed that the proposed bus route had not yet been identified, or that any provision had been made in the development for prospective bus stops to accommodate the public getting on/off in safety.

Members appreciated that they had to vote on the application as printed, however, they requested that Officers make note and feedback to the developer the concerns raised during the debate.

Members were reminded that they could only have regard to material planning considerations, it was reiterated by Officers that matters regarding the applicant's history, previous development phases or the overall housing provision within the Council were not Material Planning Considerations.

It was noted that Councillor Khan left the meeting for part of the debate between 20:03 to 20:06 hours, therefore, he took no part in the vote or decision on the application.

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 18-21 of the Public Reports Pack.

22. 23/00596/FUL - BIRCHENSALE MIDDLE SCHOOL, BRIDLEY MOOR ROAD, REDDITCH, B97 6HT

This application had been reported to the Planning Committee as the site was owned by Worcestershire County Council (WCC). 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 35 to 47 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for Birchensale Middle School, Bridley Moor Road, Redditch, B97 6HT and sought extension to its existing buildings and external works.

Officers drew Members attention to the Update Report and clarified that there would be an increased intake of up to 30 additional student a year going into year 5 and there would not be an immediate intake into years 6-8. When the new students had progressed through the school, and new pupils had joined into year 5, the overall school placement capacity would eventually increase by 120 spaces by 2027. Officers also drew Members attention to the additional Condition 10 detailed on page 6 of the Update Reports pack, to be added to the original Recommendation.

The Site Location Plan outlined on page 39 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack identified the proposed areas of development. The application proposed a two-storey extension to the southern classrooms which would generate an additional 6 Classrooms. There would further be an extension to the school Hall to accommodate the increased number of pupils during lunchtime, and an extension to the existing sports hall.

Due to the extension of the sports hall and the increased school capacity, the carpark area would also be refurbished and extended. Officers detailed that parking spaces would increase from the current 34 up to 52 spaces. Officers further detailed that the carpark expansion encroached on to some Primarily Open Space, However, the area in question was not normally used for sport or recreation and as the carpark expansion would be necessary for the development, the loss of the small area of open space was deemed acceptable.

Officers outlined that the Councils policy was to support the Local Authority to provide sufficient school spaces for children. Officers further detailed that WCC Highways and NWWM raised no objections subject to suitable Conditions being attached.

Officers clarified the following points after questions from Members.

- That the school would remain open during the development, and it was not planned to be completed during the school holidays.
- That there was no Condition for a construction management programme to be submitted prior to the commencement of the development.
- The carpark extension would be a tarmac finish with appropriate drainage.

Members then debated the application.

Members discussed incorporating a construction management plan as an additional Condition to the recommendation, this was to ensure a safe environment for the children with as little disruption to their education as possible.

Members also discussed adding a Condition for “Wheel Cleaning” to be mandatory for construction work, this was to ensure the disposal of mud onto the local highways would be mitigated.

Members were satisfied that the loss of the green area was necessary for the development and the need to provide more school places for children.

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;

- I. Conditions 1-9 as outlined on pages 29-32 of the Public Reports Pack;**
- II. The additional Condition 10 outlined on page 5 of the Update Reports pack;**
- III. An additional Condition 11 requiring a construction plan be submitted prior to the commencement of the development;**
- IV. An additional Condition 12 requiring a wheel cleaning policy to be implemented.**

23. 22/01325/FUL - TOWN HALL, WALTER STRANZ SQUARE, REDDITCH

This application had been reported to the Planning Committee as the landowner of the site 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 49 to 62 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch and sought a non-material amendment to the new public NHS entrance at ground floor level and localised landscaping works.

Officers detailed to Members that the original application 22/01325/FUL came before planning Committee in December 2022, however, as construction progressed it had been identified that the internal/external levels previously assumed no longer worked with the original proposal.

To address the increased difference in levels, a non-material amendment was put forward by the developer to change the shallow ramp to a small flight of steps and an accompanying platform lift for those with mobility issues.

Officers drew Members attention to page 60 and 61 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack to give a visual indication of what the site could look like. Officers further identified the dwarf wall which needed to be constructed.

Officers clarified the following points after questions from Members.

- The variety of tree to be planted (Hornbeam) had been decided upon in consultation with the Arboricultural Officer and consideration was given to the potential future impact of the adjacent sculpture at that time.
- In the event of the lift breaking down, visitors to the NHS area of the site would be able to enter via existing Town Hall entrances which had sufficient mobility solutions and ramps.

Members then considered the application.

Members were concerned that the lift would eventually break down and cause disruption, Officers assured the Committee that the application represented the neatest solution to the issue and that if the developer continued with a ramp approach, due to the difference in levels, the ramp would come out a substantial distance and intrude into the square, Officers further assured the Committee

that the lifts were not prone to malfunction or maintenance issues and that they would not expect problems to arise frequently.

On being put to a vote it was

RESOLVED that

permission be GRANTED for the non-material amendments shown on External Works Detailed Plan Dwg. No. (90)002 Rev. C1, and External Works Plan Dwg. No. (90)001Rev. C5.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 8.56 pm