



Planning Committee

Thu 18 Jul
2024
7.00 pm

Oakenshaw Community
Centre, Castleditch
Lane, B98 7YB

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

*making
a
difference*

www.redditchbc.gov.uk

If you have any queries on this Agenda please contact

**Gavin Day
Democratic Services Officer**

**Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH
Tel: (01527) 64252 (Ext. 3304)
email: gavin.day@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk**

GUIDANCE ON FACE TO FACE MEETINGS

If you have any questions regarding the agenda or attached papers, please do not hesitate to contact Gavin Day (gavin.day@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)

PUBLIC SPEAKING

For this meeting the options to participate will be in person, by joining the meeting using a video link, or by submitting a statement to be read out by officers.

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:

in accordance with the running order detailed in this agenda and updated by the separate Update report:

- 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. Ward Councillors (in objection)
 - c. Supporters to speak on the application;
 - d. Ward Councillors (in support)
 - e. Applicant (or representative) to speak on the application.

Speakers will be called in the order they have notified their interest in speaking to the Democratic Services Team (by 12 noon on Tuesday 16th July 2024) and invited to the table or lectern.

- 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 address the committee.

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 Gavin Day from the Democratic Services Team on 01527 64252 (Ex 3304) or by email at gavin.day@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk before **12 noon on Tuesday 16th July 2024.**
- 2) Advice and assistance will be provided to public speakers as to how to access the meeting and those using the video link will be provided with joining details for Microsoft Teams. 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 Tuesday 16th July 2024**
- 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, re 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.
- 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 day of the meeting.

Further assistance:

If you require any further assistance prior to the meeting, please contact the Democratic Services Officer (indicated on the inside front cover), Head of Legal, Democratic and Property Services, or Planning Officers, at the same address.

At the meeting, these Officers will normally be seated either side of the Chair, who will be seated at the front left-hand corner of the Committee table as viewed from the Public Gallery.



Planning

Thursday, 18th July, 2024

7.00 pm

**Oakenshaw Community
Centre - Oakenshaw
Community Centre**

Agenda

Membership:

Cllrs:	Andrew Fry (Chair)	Sid Khan
	William Boyd (Vice-Chair)	David Munro
	Juma Begum	Jen Snape
	Brandon Clayton	Gemma Monaco
	Bill Hartnett	

1. Apologies

2. 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.

3. Confirmation of Minutes (Pages 7 - 16)

4. 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)

5. 24/00502/FUL - 3 Southcrest Road, Redditch, Worcestershire, B98 7JG (Pages 17 - 24)

6. 23/01108/FUL - Heart of Worcestershire College, Osprey House, Albert Street, Redditch, B97 4DE (Pages 25 - 44)

7. 24/00083/REM - Phase 5 Development Brockhill East, Hewell Road, Redditch, Worcestershire (Pages 45 - 60)

8. 24/00503/FUL - 76 Eathorpe Close, Redditch, Worcestershire, B98 0HQ (Pages 61 - 66)

This page is intentionally left blank



Planning Committee

Wednesday, 20th March,
2024

MINUTES

Present:

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

Also Present:

Councilors Joe Baker, Monica Stringfellow, Emma Marshall and Karen Ashley.

Officers:

Ruth Bamford, Helena Plant, Paul Lester, Karen Hanchett (of Worcestershire County Council, Highways) and Max Howarth (of Anthony Collins Solicitors)

Democratic Services Officers:

Gavin Day and Pauline Ross

69. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence, all Members were in attendance.

70. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

71. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 21st February 2024 were presented to Members.

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 21st February 2024 were approved as a true and accurate record and signed by the Chair.

Chair

72. UPDATE REPORTS

The Chair drew Members' attention to the update report, which had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting commencing.

Members indicated that they had had sufficient time to read the update report and that they were happy to proceed with the meeting.

73. 21/01830/FUL - LAND WEST OF, HITHER GREEN LANE, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B98 9AZ

The application was reported to the Planning Committee because the application required a Section 106 Agreement. 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 43 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for the Land West of Hither Green Lane, Redditch and sought residential development for 214 dwellings, including 2 custom build plots and 66 affordable dwellings. It included vehicular access, play areas, public open space and all other ancillary and enabling infrastructure.

The location of the site was detailed on pages 6 to 9 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack. Officers further informed Members that although the majority of the land (9.47 ha) was designated as primary open space under policy 13 of the Local Plan and part of the site (0.38 ha) is shown as white land. There was no public access to the site and the only access was via the private golfclub.

Officers detailed the proposed layout of the site, shown on pages 17 to 22 of the public reports pack. This included information on housing, including the number and the location of the 66 affordable units which accounted for 30% of the development. Officers further detailed that the proposed development aims to create a well-designed and efficient urban environment with 2 and 2.5-storey dwellings. The development would be laid out in a series of connected parcels, with a clear distinction between the public and private realm. The development had an approximate density of 36 dwellings per hectare.

Members commented that the Borough had a 10.3-year housing supply which was greater than the required 5-year housing supply outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). However, the 5-year figure was a minimum and that there was not a maximum figure in the NPPF. Therefore, regard was given to the

Planning Committee

Wednesday, 20th March, 2024

National picture as a whole where there was a shortage of houses being built.

The development required the removal of some trees which had TPOs attached, mitigation/replanting measures were proposed and the Arboricultural Officer had raised no objection subject to this mitigation.

North Worcestershire Water Management (NWWM) had assessed the application and the impact it would have in regard to flooding from the nearby river Arrow. NWWM had found the risk to be minimal and had not raised an objection or requested a drainage solution Condition. However, Officers included a drainage Condition (13) following advice from the Council's ecologist.

The application had been supported by extensive ecology surveys, the Council's appointed Ecologist (Thompson Ecology) and Natural England were satisfied that the survey effort was sufficient to inform the application for development. A biodiversity metric had been submitted as a part of the proposals. A net gain in biodiversity (+1.84% habitat units, +4.85% hedgerow units) would be provided through biodiversity enhancements on offsite land immediately to the east of the proposed development (the retained golf course).

Members' attention was drawn to the highway access to the site via Hither Green Lane, as detailed on pages 31 to 34 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack. Officers noted that no objection had been raised by Worcester County Council (WCC), Highways, as the development did not contradict any policies and their opinion was that the impact could not be determined as severe enough to warrant an objection to the application, subject to conditions and contributions/improvements to infrastructure identified in the report.

Officers commented that the development complies with Policy 12 Open Space Provision. The development will provide approximately 3.2 hectares of publicly available open space, and this will be retained in prematurity.

It is considered that the amenity value of the site is limited as it is in private ownership and has limited public accessibility.

Following clarification, it has been shown that the golf course will remain open and playable to members and visitors with the reconfiguration and retention of an 18-hole golf course on the remaining site. The previous objection from England Golf has been withdrawn.

Taking the specific circumstances of the case into account, the proposal would provide equivalent open space to offset the loss of designated open space, which itself has limited public accessibility.

In conclusion and having had regard to:-

- The development would provide greater public access across the application site, with 3.4ha (around 35% of the application site) becoming publicly accessible.
- The golf course was proposed to be reconfigured to retain an 18-hole golf course to suit members as well as those visiting the hotel.
- The proposal would make a meaningful contribution to both market and affordable housing. It was recognised that the government's aim was to significantly boost the supply of housing, both market and affordable.
- The proposal would have economic benefits during construction and ongoing support for local services.
- Against these matters, there were several harms and material considerations arising from the proposed development that weigh against the proposal. Both individually and cumulatively, they did not amount to material considerations that outweigh the compliance of the proposals with the development plan as a whole and the benefits of the proposal outlined above.

On balance, Officers recommended the application for approval subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement.

At the invitation of the Chair, the following speakers addressed the Committee under the Council's Public Speaking Rules

**Residents and interested parties in objection to the application
(2 minutes each)**

- Charles Robinson – Representative of North Redditch Community Alliance (NoRCA)
- Councillor Karen Ashley – RBC Councillor
- Councillor Alan Bailes – BDC Ward Member for Alvechurch South
- Councillor Joe Baker - RBC Councillor
- Julian Grubb – Interested Party
- Councillor Adam Rock - Interested Party, Beoley Parish Council (BDC)
- Mike Chalk – Interested Party (Statement read out by Democratic Services)
- Councillor Emma Marshall – in her capacity as a County Councillor at WCC
- Councillor Gemma Monaco – RBC Councillor (Statement read out by Democratic Services)

Ward Member (3 minutes)

- Councillor Monica Stringfellow

In support of the application (18 minutes shared)

- Cathryn Ventham – Agent for the Planning Application (of Stantec)
- Reiss Sadler – Applicant's Economic Consultant (of Marons)
- Josh Norris – Applicant's Highways Consultant (of Mode Transport)

There was a planned adjournment after the public speaking between 20:25 and 20:35 hours.

Having recommended, Officers clarified the following points after questions from Members.

- That the proposed development had a housing density of 35 dwellings per hectare(dph), whereas the current local development on Hither Green Lane was approximately 20dph.
- A noise assessment had been carried out by the relevant consultee (Worcestershire Regulatory Services) and Conditions 24 and 25 were included to address noise concerns, including during the construction phase.
- Although comments were raised during the public speaking in regard to flooding, NWWM who were the expert consultee on matters of flooding had raised no objection to the application.
- In some instances, areas designated as Primarily Open Space have been rolled forward from previous versions of the local plan, so the reason for their designated at that time may not be clear. However, Policy 13 described what was important about open space and sets out a list of factors for Members to consider, these included regard to conservation and wildlife. The report identified that the site was not significant in wildlife terms in relation to some other areas of the Borough.
- It was a point for the Committee to ascertain as to what extent weight should be given to the 5-year provision of housing supply nationally, compared to locally which already had a 10-year supply.
- There would be no impact as to the size of the golf course currently on site in terms of holes, the legal mechanisms detailed on page 72 of the Public Reports pack, required that the reconfiguring of the course would be completed prior to the commencement of any residential development.

Planning Committee

Wednesday, 20th March, 2024

- There would initially be a loss of 9.85 hectares of open space. Once the development was completed there would be 3.4 hectares of publicly accessible open space provided.
- Condition 9 detailed that archaeological surveys needed to be submitted prior to the commencement of building works, if discoveries were made once development had commenced the build plan would be affected accordingly.

Following comments from the public speakers, WCC Highways addressed the concerns raised regarding the highways impact of the development. Officers informed Members that appropriate modelling had been undertaken on a number of highways which could be impacted, including Hither Green Lane, Dagnel End and the A441. Officers had concluded that, although it was accepted that there would be an impact, it could not be described as severe. Therefore, Highways could not raise an objection to the development.

WCC, Highways could not confirm if Diamond Busses, who serviced Redditch had been consulted with in regard to the financial viability of a long-term service for the area. However, Section 106 contributions had been discussed with the County's Transport team who were the relevant consultee, and the contributions would provide an hourly service for 5 years. After the 5-year period, an assessment would need to be undertaken by the provider as to the financial viability of maintaining the service.

The emergency access route was explained in that it was not a reflection of the suitability of the road network, and there was no intent to use the access. However, WCC, Highways sought an alternative entrance/exit route in the event of an accident preventing the use of the regular access, this was a requirement for any larger developments of over 200 houses. The emergency access would be controlled by bollards which could be retracted.

During consideration of this item a vote was taken to continue the meeting after 22:00 hours, this was proposed by Councillor Bill Hartnett and Seconded by Councillor Sid Khan, on being put to a vote it was Carried.

Following the vote and prior to the debate by Members, there was a further adjournment between 21:52 and 21:58 hours.

Having recommenced, Members proceeded to consider the application which Officers had recommended be approved.

Members expressed the opinion that the national state of housing supply should not be a strong consideration for the Borough who already had a healthy supply.

Planning Committee

Wednesday, 20th March, 2024

It was further noted that the application was out of character with the local development, in that the housing was of a much higher density and differed in design to the local dwellings. Concern was also expressed as to the apparent visual differences between the market and affordable units.

Councillor Bill Hartnett proposed an Alternative Recommendation to refuse the application, the Alternative Recommendation was seconded by Councillor Juma Begum. The reasons stated for the refusal were:

1. Redditch council had an adequate supply of housing land, so on balance the Council should prioritise the protection of open space as identified in the Local Plan over the NPPF.
2. The proposed new development was out of character with the existing Hither Green Lane development.

Members expressed a concern regarding the Highways and flooding considerations; however, they accepted that without objections from the relevant consultees these should not form part of any refusal.

The Bio-diversity impact was discussed with the loss of a large amount of open space with its associated habitat, additionally the impact to the green corridor was detailed, Members expressed the opinion that both of these would have a negative impact on the local wildlife. With the agreement of the Proposer and Secunder of the Alternative Recommendation, “**3. The loss of the Primary open space**” was added as a refusal reason for the Alternative Recommendation.

On being put to a vote it was

RESOLVED that

having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, that planning permission be REFUSED, for the reasons as detailed in the preamble above, the detailed wording of which to be determined by the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Leisure services.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 10.22 pm

This page is intentionally left blank



Planning Committee

Wednesday, 17th April,
2024

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Peter Fleming (Chair), Councillor Imran Altaf (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Juma Begum, Chris Holz, Sid Khan (for minute No77) and Timothy Pearman

Officers:

Helena Plant and Amar Hussain

Democratic Services Officers:

Gavin Day

74. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Andy Fry and Anthony Lovell.

75. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

76. UPDATE REPORTS

There were no update reports.

77. 23/01372/FUL - CLUBHOUSE, FECKENHAM FOOTBALL CLUB, MILL LANE, FECKENHAM, WORCESTERSHIRE, B96 6HY

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 5 to 14 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for the Clubhouse at Feckenham Football club, Mill Lane, Redditch and sought the erection of canopy to the south side of the existing Clubhouse to provide shelter for spectators.

Chair

Planning Committee

Wednesday, 17th April, 2024

Officers drew Members attention to the scale and design of the canopy as detailed on pages 8 to 10 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack. It was further detailed that the canopy would extend 2.5 meters from the building and would run the entire length of the building at 12.5m in length.

There would be no ground works as part of the development as the canopy would be attached to the side of the building and the supporting beams would rest on the slabs which were already part of the existing site.

No objections had been received and it was the Officers view that the application proposed a sustainable form of development and was therefore recommended for approval.

There were no questions from Members for Officers and 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 detailed on pages 10 to 11 of the Public Reports pack.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 7.06 pm

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**18th July 2024**Planning Application 24/00502/FUL****Rear first floor bedroom and side two storey garage and bedroom extensions.
3 Southcrest Road, Redditch, Worcestershire, B98 7JG,****Applicant: Mr And Mrs Rashid Khan
Ward: Lodge Park 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

The site is located close to the corner of Southcrest Road and Barlich Way to the west of Studley Road and to the north of the Warwick Highway. The application site is a semi-detached dwelling which is elevated in relation to the highway and therefore occupies a prominent position in the street scene.

The dwelling is a semi-detached property which shares design features with surrounding properties. The street scene is characterised by semi-detached dwellings separated by consistent sized spaces, with larger gaps close to junctions. The host dwelling is typical of this layout, and the gap between it and No. 1 along with its siting on higher ground give it a relatively spacious, open setting. A flat roofed garage is positioned to the south of number 3 with an area of land dividing the dwelling and the garage.

Proposal Description

The existing dwelling is a three bedroomed unit with a rear conservatory and a detached single storey garage. The application proposes the demolition of the conservatory and the garage and the erection of a two-storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. A dormer window is proposed to the rear to enable the roof space to be utilised as accommodation. The resultant dwelling will have a total of eight bedrooms.

The proposed two-storey side extension has an 'L' shaped footprint and adds new family room, playroom, garage and kitchen and utility on the ground floor and provides three new bedrooms and ensuite on the first floor. Part of the development sits behind the main dwelling and thus appears as a two-storey rear extension, this area provides an additional bedroom.

The proposed single-storey rear extension provides a dining area, whilst the dormer window on the rear would run the width of the dwelling, provides an internal stair access and two further bedrooms in the extended roof space.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

As viewed from the front elevation, the main two storey extension sits parallel to the host dwelling. Consequently, the front wall and roof are aligned and are not 'set back' or 'down' in relation to the original. In contrast, the element that contains the garage with bedroom over, is set down in relation to the ridge line, but is not set back.

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

Policy 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy 39: Built Environment

Policy 40: High Quality Design and Safer Communities

Others

National Design Guide NPPF

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

NPPG National Planning Practice Guidance

Redditch High Quality Design SPD

Relevant Planning History

20/01047/FUL	Proposed two storey side extension, demolition of rear conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension. Appeal Dismissed 16.06.2021	Refused	22.02.2021
21/01720/FUL	Erection of Two Storey side and single storey rear extension	Approved	17.03.2022
24/00047/FUL	Side 2 storey and rear single storey extension and loft conversion	Refused	12.03.2024

Consultations**WRS - Contaminated Land**

Worcestershire Regulatory Services (WRS) have reviewed the application for potential contaminated land concerns as part of the weekly planning list check. The records held by WRS indicate the property is located within 250m of a number of areas of former quarrying that have since been infilled with unknown materials. WRS therefore recommend that the applicant is made aware via an advisory note in respect of ground gases. Recommends Landfill near extensions informative for an extension within 250m of landfill.

Public Consultation Response

Three Neighbours consulted on the 29.05.2024 expired 22.06.2024.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

One response received summarised as ;

- Design - We feel that the proposed loft extension, rear first floor bedroom and side two storey garage and bedroom is not of a design which is in keeping with the character and appearance of the rest of the estate. It is a very large extension across the existing house and a new extension at the side and back of the dwelling, where most extensions on the estate are either garage conversions or buildings over the garage. It will change the character of the house dramatically.
- Loss of Privacy - We feel that the proposed loft extension dormer and rear first floor bedroom windows would lead to a significant reduction in privacy in our garden as they would look directly down onto our patio and into our garden.
- Parking - With an eight bedroom house comes the problem with parking in the future. The estate has already become hazardous especially during School dropping off and picking up times, with three schools in close proximity it is difficult to get on and off the estate during these times.
- Future Development - Ultimately, if you allow for this excessive and obtrusive eight bedroom development to take place, you are opening the floodgates for a myriad of similar developments on the estate which will no doubt significantly impact on local urban green space.

Cllr Fry

Requested that the application is considered at planning committee as opposed to being dealt with under Delegated Powers.

Assessment of Proposal

Background

The planning history of this site is material to the consideration of the merits of this application. Members will observe that an application (20/01047/FUL) for a similar proposal to that to be considered here, was refused by the Council and an appeal was subsequently lodged and dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate on 16 June 2021 (Appeal ref APP/Q1825/D/21/3270963).

Following this, application 21/01720/FUL was submitted proposing the erection of a (smaller) two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension. This proposal was considered to overcome the objections raised with respect to appealed application and was therefore granted subject to planning conditions on 17.03.2022. This scheme remains live and capable of implementation.

The applicant then decided to pursue a scheme 24/00047/FUL which was more akin to that dismissed at appeal, but with the addition of a 'box' dormer extension to the rear of

PLANNING COMMITTEE

the dwelling. That application was, because of its similarity to the dismissed appealed application, refused on 12.03.2024.

This current application is a further proposal for a two-storey addition to the dwelling. However, it incorporates additional two storey development to the side of the dwelling and to the rear of the dwelling, beyond that considered under the refused application 24/00047/FUL.

Assessment

Turning to the consideration of the application, the main issue for consideration is the impact of the proposal on the character of the streetscene and whether any harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties would arise. The planning history is relevant to the consideration of these points.

Character and Appearance

The application is for a 'L' shaped two-storey side extension, demolition of rear conservatory and garage, erection of a single storey rear extension and dormer extension roof element to an existing dwelling located within an area of established residential development.

The dwelling is a semi-detached property which shares design features with surrounding dwellings, albeit the associated flat-roofed garage is separated from the main dwelling by a small area of land. The property is elevated in relation to the highway, occupying a prominent position in the street scene.

The proposed single-storey rear extension would project 4 metres from the rear of the existing dwelling and it is proposed that it would provide a dining room. Given its size and siting, this element of the scheme does not cause concern in terms of impact on neighbours, or design or materials. Therefore, this element of the scheme is considered to comply with development plan policies.

The main two storey extension would be constructed, with regard to its ridge line and front alignment, in line with the original dwelling. The portion relating to the garage with bedroom above would also share the same front alignment, but this smaller portion would sit at a lower land level and thus have a lower ridge line, appearing 'set down' in relation to the extended form of number 3 Southcrest Road. The extension, whilst constructed using matching brick and tile materials, would in this iteration of the design, be almost the same total width as the original dwelling.

Applications for planning permission should be assessed on their individual merits and against current planning policies and guidance forming the development plan for the area. Policy 39 of The Borough of Redditch Local Plan (39.2) requires that all development should contribute positively to the local character of the area and should respond to, and integrate with, the distinctive features of the surrounding area. Paragraph 135c of the National Planning Policy Framework encourages good design, that is sympathetic to local character and Paragraph 132 underlines the importance of reflecting

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

local advice, as contained within the Councils High Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

Redditch Borough Council adopted a High-Quality Design SPD to help inform at a more detailed level what good design can look like and this document is a Material Planning Consideration. Comments contained in the SPD are relevant at para 3.3.1:

"Side extensions will be required to be subordinate in size and prominence. To achieve this, extensions should be clearly set down from the ridge of the dwelling and set back from the principal elevation. Each application will be considered on its own merits to ensure that the design of the side extension is appropriate to that property and its surroundings"

Para 3.3.2 states that:

"Extensions should reflect the proportions of the original building. To achieve this, an extension should be of a smaller and less substantial scale than the main building, as over-large extensions can unbalance the proportion and harmony of the host building and can also have a detrimental effect on the street scene as a whole"

Further, at Para 3.1.11 it states that:

"An alteration or extension must consider the impact on the street scene. An alteration or extension must: i) Enhance and strengthen the local distinctiveness of an area, for example reflect the pattern and spacing of buildings; ii) Not normally project forward of the principal elevation, or that fronting the public domain. One exception would be the addition of a porch; and iii) Respect local styles and features to maintain local distinctiveness."

The existing dwelling has a simple frontage, which is reflective of the character in the local area; it has a linear form, created in part by the roof shape and the arrangement of windows. The proposal would reflect this character by retaining those features. However, the now much enlarged mass and scale of the proposed side extension fails to provide a subordinate addition as required by the SPD. Noting also the prominent and elevated position of the extension, it is concluded that the development fails to respect the otherwise relatively spacious character of the immediate area and thus fails to comply with Policy 39 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No 4.

In the appeal decision under reference APP/Q1825/D/21/3270963, the Inspector at paragraph 3 commented that the main issue was the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The Inspector commented at para 4 that: *'Although some dwellings in the area have been extended in various ways, those extensions appear subordinate to the host dwelling in terms of their scale and appearance. As a result, the balance of the semi-detached pairs and the generally consistent character and appearance of the street scene has largely been retained'*.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Inspector at Para 5 commented that the scheme under consideration '*.. would be built flush with the front elevation of the dwelling and the roof would extend at the same ridge height, which would make it prominently visible in this elevated position. The proposed extension would be greater than half the width of the host dwelling and as such would be a bulky and disproportionate addition which would not reflect the proportions of the existing property*'. It is noteworthy that the width of the current proposal is greater than that considered by the inspector.

The Inspector states at Para 6 that: '*Consequently, due to its size, height and bulk, combined with the lack of set back from the front elevation or set down from the ridge, the proposed extension would dominate the existing dwelling and would not appear subordinate to it. Therefore, it would not reflect the locally distinctive character of the existing dwelling or its relatively spacious setting. Consequently, the proposed side extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling*'.

The current proposal fails to mitigate and address the concerns Officer's have previously expressed regarding the impact of development on character and appearance of the area and that of the Inspectors conclusions under reference APP/Q1825/D/21/3270963. It is concluded therefore that the scheme is unacceptable in regard to its impact upon character and appearance.

Residential Amenity

Paragraph 135(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that planning decisions should seek a good standard of amenity for existing and future users of land and buildings. Furthermore, the Borough of Redditch High Quality Design SPD provides further guidance in relation to residential amenity, seeking to protect against adverse loss of light, outlook, privacy, and overbearing impact.

In terms of the impact of the two-storey side extension on the residential amenity of the occupiers of 1 Barlich Way, the siting, scale and position of the additions are such as not to attract concerns with respect to privacy, overlooking, overbearing, or overshadowing impacts. A similar conclusion can be reached regarding the impacts upon 5 Southcrest Road, which is adjacent to the single storey (dining room) element of the development.

Consideration is also required as to the impact of the extensions and the dormer window on the amenity of the occupiers to the rear of the site, number 6 Barlich Way. It is noted that objections have been received regarding the impact on privacy from the occupants of this property.

The Councils SPD recognises that overlooking can be a problem if it allows views into private spaces including outdoor spaces. It identifies a number of factors to be considered including distance, the presence of openings, the relative position of buildings, levels and types of rooms affected (para 4.2.48) The SPD also sets out that rear gardens are expected to be 10.5m in length when serving a two storey dwellings (4.2.29).

PLANNING COMMITTEE

The rear elevation of the existing dwelling, measured at first floor, at its closest, is 11.3m from the boundary with the garden of 6 Barlich Way, with an existing bathroom and two bedroom windows orientated in that direction. As a result of the development one of those bedrooms will be extended, meaning the distance to the boundary is reduced to 9.3m. Whilst the SPD does not state a window to garden boundary distance, the reduction to 9.3m is noted as being below the 10.5m of a standard garden length. It is evident that the garden to 6 Barlich Way is of some length and whilst reducing in width, extends across numbers 3-9 Southcrest Road. However, the orientation of the dwellings means it is the area immediately to the rear of number 6 that is impacted by the new window to the bedroom extension. This fact, combined with the elevated position of number 6 relative to the application site and the lack of intervening screening, means there would be a reduction in the privacy currently enjoyed by occupants there, as a result of this development.

Additional overlooking could occur from the proposed dormer extension and the two bedroom windows it provides (the bathroom window would be controlled to be obscure glazed by condition). Whilst permitted development may allow a roof addition of some form, there are limitations relating to volume and conditions regarding construction, that mean the dormer as proposed is unlikely to be achieved using permitted development. This reduces the weight that could be attached to this potential fall-back position and overall, it is concluded that the proposed extensions, would be harmful to the residential amenity of 6 Barlich Way by virtue of overlooking and loss of privacy.

Other matters

Matters raised through public consultation have been addressed in this report where they relate to design and amenity, whilst matters of the potential for future developments would not be material to the consideration of this application, as each application is considered on its own merits.

Regarding provision of parking for a dwelling of more than 6 bedrooms, the Streetscape Design Guide (2022) requires 4 carparking spaces and 5 cycle spaces in such circumstances. Notwithstanding the conclusions above, these could, if considered necessary, be secured by planning condition.

Conclusions

In conclusion, this two-storey extension is considered harmful to both the character and appearance of the area and to the amenity of residents. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No 4, the Borough of Redditch High Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

RECOMMENDATION: That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be REFUSED for the following reason:

PLANNING COMMITTEE

1. The proposed extensions, by reason of their siting, size and design would have a dominating, disproportionate and adverse effect on the design, character and appearance of the existing dwelling. As such, the development would be contrary to Policies 39 and 40 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No 4, the Borough of Redditch High Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
2. The proposed extension, by reason of its rearward projection, and regarding the dormer addition, its elevated position, would be harmful to the residential amenity of the residents at 6 Barlich Way by virtue of overlooking and reducing the privacy enjoyed in their private garden space. The development would be contrary to Policies 39 and 40 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No 4, the Borough of Redditch High Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Procedural matters

This application is being reported to the Planning Committee at the request of the local ward councillor.

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

18th July 2024

Planning Application 23/01108/FUL

Change of use of existing building from education use (Use Class F1) to 33 supported living apartments (Use Class C2), erection of a three storey 83 bed care home (Use Class C2) with link and ancillary facilities; with associated underground parking, landscaping and ancillary works.

Heart of Worcestershire College, Osprey House, Albert Street, Redditch, B97 4DE

**Applicant: MACC Group Ltd
Ward: Abbey Ward**

(see additional papers for site plan)

The case officer of this application is Steven Edden, Principal Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on Tel: 01527 548474 Email: steve.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk for more information.

Site Description

The site measures 0.69 hectares in area and includes Osprey House, which is a three-storey building, and an associated surface level car park. Osprey House was last used as an education facility (Use Class F1) by the Heart of Worcestershire College, who vacated the site in May 2022, relocating to their Bromsgrove campus. The building has remained unoccupied since. There is existing vehicular access to the site from Albert Street to the west of the Site.

Mature landscaping abuts the shared boundaries. The site is located at a higher level than land to the east with an associated retaining structure in-situ. Beyond the eastern boundary lies a car parking area for Prospect House (a three-storey office block) and the turning head for Fishing Line Road. Beyond the southern boundary is a vacant area of previously developed land accessed from Prospect Hill. Albert Street which stems from Prospect Hill is located to the west. Off Albert Street are a collection of two and three storey commercially occupied buildings that form part of Empire Court, including the 'British Mills' building, which is Grade II listed.

Notwithstanding the commercial nature of the immediately adjoining areas, there is also residential development in the vicinity of the site. There are mostly semi-detached properties off Prospect Hill, Abbey Road, and Clive Road to the west, with Milward Place, a McCarthy & Stone retirement complex, situated on the intersection between Clive Road and Prospect Hill.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

18th July 2024

Proposal Description

Full planning permission is sought for the change of use and conversion of Osprey House into 33 supported living apartments across the existing three floors and the erection of an associated three storey 83 bed care home with link and ancillary facilities, with associated underground car parking.

The applicant states that the proposed care home has been developed with state-of-the-art equipment and facilities, allowing residents to live an enhanced quality of life. The proposal would meet the National Minimum Spatial Requirements as defined in the Care Standards Act 2000, and the Care Quality Commission standards.

Vehicular and pedestrian access into the site would continue from Albert Street to the west and a parking area of 35 spaces (including two disabled bays) would be provided to the front of the proposed development. Further parking is proposed to be provided via an underground carpark that would be accessed under the proposed new care home building providing a further 27 spaces. 10 cycle spaces would be provided at surface level, with a further 14 provided in the basement.

The layout provides shared external amenity space for the care home and the supported living apartments with external patio terraces and seating areas, as well as large areas of green space to the north and south where existing trees are to be retained and supplemented with new tree planting together with garden structures.

The applicant is MACC Care Group Ltd, a company with considerable experience in the operation of care homes for older people who currently operate 12 dedicated care homes in the West Midlands Area.

The application form states that 60 full time jobs would be created across the whole site working to a rotational shift pattern of employment. However, and as stated at para 4.8 of the submitted Transport Statement, only up to a maximum of 30 members of staff would be present on site at any one time, due to the shift pattern and staggered shift changes that would occur.

Relevant Policies:

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4

Policy 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy 2: Settlement Hierarchy

Policy 4: Housing Provision

Policy 5: Effective and Efficient use of Land

Policy 11: Green Infrastructure

Policy 16: Natural Environment

Policy 17: Flood Risk Management

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

18th July 2024

Policy 18: Sustainable Water Management
 Policy 19: Sustainable Travel and Accessibility
 Policy 20: Transport Requirements for New Development
 Policy 23: Employment Land Provision
 Policy 24: Development within Primarily Employment Areas
 Policy 36: Historic Environment
 Policy 37: Historic Buildings and Structures
 Policy 39: Built Environment
 Policy 40: High Quality Design and Safer Communities

Others

Redditch High Quality Design SPD
 National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

Relevant Planning History

2010/040/COU	Change of Use from Class B1 to D1 to education and training use on the first and second floors	Granted	31.03.2010
2009/113/COU	Change of Use from Class B1 to D1 to education and training use on the ground floor	Granted	10.07.2009
1999/139/FUL	Erection of 3 storey office with associated parking	Granted	10.06.1999

Consultations**WCC Highway Authority**

No objections subject to conditions and financial obligations

Comments summarised as follows:

The Care Home has 83 rooms with single beds and the Highway Authority considers that the majority of residents will require assistance to varying degrees but it is unlikely any resident will be able to drive or own a car. Visitors are more likely to take a resident out for short periods.

With respect to the Supported Living proposal, it is understood that these will adults, who can live independently but will require assistant with some tasks. Some of these residents may be able to drive and may own a car, hence the need for some parking provision. Friends and family will visit residents. There is no indication that families with school aged

PLANNING COMMITTEE

18th July 2024

children would occupy the apartments. If this were to be the case a (financial) impact on transport provision would result. Such a matter could be covered by condition.

Albert Street is approximately 4.3m in width and leads to the current car park at Osprey House. Traffic flows are relatively low as Albert Street is a cul-de-sac and forms a junction with Prospect Hill to the west. There would be no alteration to the existing vehicular access into the site. The Highway Authority has no objection to the existing vehicular access being used to serve the development proposals. Whilst Pedestrian access to the site is adequate there are no dropped kerbs, with tactile paving, at the pedestrian desire line. As such, it would be desirable to provide such a facility, especially as many future residents of the site may have mobility issues. The Highway Authority is of the opinion the applicant should contribute towards the costs of improving uncontrolled pedestrian crossing facilities which can be covered by a suitable legal agreement if planning consent were subsequently granted.

The Transport Statement (TS) concludes it is considered that cycling represents a viable option for employees to access the site from surrounding residential areas and the Highway Authority agrees with this assumption. The TS also concludes it is viable for staff to use buses or trains to access the site, as could visitors. The Highway Authority accepts the site offers the choice of sustainable travel options, as an alternative to the private motorised vehicle.

WCC has a duty to consider the transport needs of elderly and disabled residents. A service must be provided for all elderly and disabled residents for those unable to access a bus due to disability. WCC requests a contribution of £5,292.00 towards community transport for this site. This can be secured by an appropriate legal agreement.

The Highway Authority acknowledges educational use is likely to have a more traditional peak period traffic pattern. Traffic associated with a Care Home will be influenced by staff shift patterns. Family and friends tend to visit during the day, evenings or at weekends. Traffic associated with Supported Living sites tends to mainly occur outside peak periods, with visitors tending to visit during the day, evenings or at weekends.

Taking account of the above, the Highway Authority is of the opinion the levels of traffic associated with the proposed use can be accommodated by local highways and there would be no severe / significant impact on the operation of the local highway network. The Refuse and Servicing Strategy contained within the Transport Statement which shows swept path analysis for: a large car, refuse vehicle and fire engine entering the site and turning within the site is considered acceptable to the Highway Authority.

In terms of car parking, 62 spaces are proposed in total.

The development proposes to provide 30 staff spaces, for 60 FTE employees, 21 dedicated spaces for the Care Home and 11 dedicated spaces for the Supported living accommodation, giving a total of 62 car parking spaces. The Highway Authority is of the opinion the proposed car parking provision is acceptable.

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**18th July 2024

Some provision for electric charging of ultra-low emissions vehicles (EVCP) should be provided. As such the Highway Authority would recommend an appropriate condition to this effect in the case of permission being granted.

The Highway Authority has undertaken a robust assessment of the planning application. Based on the analysis of the information submitted, the Highway Authority concludes that there are no justifiable grounds on which an objection could be maintained subject to conditions and financial obligations. Conditions relating to: EVCP provision; Employment Travel Plan, Travel Welcome Pack, Construction Management Plan, and minimum age requirements for supporting living accommodation are recommended.

Financial contributions should be secured via a S106 agreement as follows:
Community Transport contribution: £5,292.00 to be paid prior to first occupation
Pedestrian Infrastructure Improvements: £13,500 to be paid prior to first occupation

Worcestershire Regulatory Services – contaminated land

No objection subject to land remediation conditions

RBC Community Safety Manager

No objection

RBC Conservation Officer

No objection. Comments summarised as follows:

The British Mills complex had originally extended into the site, but the buildings appear to have been demolished by the end of the twentieth century, and Osprey House was subsequently constructed. The applicant has submitted a detailed heritage statement, which also contains a setting assessment, and I would agree with its contents. The remaining 19th century buildings in the vicinity of the British Mills complex contribute to the setting of the listed building, as does the relationship with Prospect Hill which remains legible although it has been partially eroded by later development. The development site with its extensive carparking contributes little to the setting.

The design of the proposed care home wing on the north side of the courtyard would appear to reflect the buildings that once stood on the site and the British Mills complex, being a similar height, with a pair of gable ends fronting the latter at the west end of the site. The proposed materials reflect the historic buildings although it is suggested that all materials are conditioned.

Arboricultural Officer

No objection subject to the imposition of conditions pertaining to: Protection of retained trees in accordance with BS5837:2012 during the construction period; excavations within Root Protection Areas to be carried out by hand in accordance with BS5837:2012

PLANNING COMMITTEE

18th July 2024

North Worcestershire Water Management

Comments summarised as follows:

The proposed development site is situated in the catchment of the Batchley Brook & Hewell Stream. The site falls within flood zone 1 and it is not considered that there is any significant fluvial flood risk to the site. Correctly designed drainage will mitigate any flood risk from surface water on the site and in the surrounding area.

A Flood Risk Assessment and drainage plan has been provided with the application, it provides details of the proposed cellular attenuation system provided for the scheme and the proposed off site flow rate. This has been attenuated to an acceptable level up to the 1 in 100 year storm level with a 40% allowance for climate change. This is supported by accompanying calculations.

Details of the maintenance of all drainage features on the site should be detailed in a management plan / strategy and included in the normal operating procedures of the site. This should also indicate the company / operator who is responsible for this maintenance.

No objections are raised subject to the imposition of a surface water drainage strategy (condition) being imposed to any consent.

NHS Integrated Health Board (ICB)

Herefordshire and Worcestershire Integrated Care Board (ICB) have identified that the development will give rise to a need for additional primary healthcare provision to mitigate impacts arising from the development. The proposed development would be likely to have an impact on the services of 2 GP practices.

The existing practices affected do not have capacity to accommodate the additional growth resulting from the proposed development. Affected practices which are a member of the Primary Care Network (PCN): Nightingales PCN, Kingfisher PCN.

A developer contribution will be required to mitigate the impacts of this proposal. The ICB calculates the level of contribution required in this instance to be £14,400.00, to be paid prior to first occupation of the development.

The ICB requests that this sum be secured through a planning obligation linked to any grant of planning permission.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

18th July 2024

Public Consultation Response

The application has been publicised by writing to adjacent occupiers, by press notice and by site notice.

One letter supporting the application has been received. Comments are summarised as follows:

- Following Covid, staff working from home has drastically reduced the requirement for offices which has meant tenants not renewing their leases and large amounts of office space being available. Much existing office space is currently vacant within the town despite residential conversions from former office use
- Osprey House has been vacant for some years and it is highly unlikely that it would be let again as offices.
- There is a huge demand for residential accommodation, particularly for older persons with a care element. By providing this sort of older person's accommodation it will free up the houses and flats where they are currently living which are often too big for one or two older persons which can then be released onto the market for families.
- The use will provide employment opportunities for staff when operating and will generate significant economic activity during the construction phase. Once up and running the many support services required will directly benefit local businesses.
- The proposal makes excellent use of land close to the town centre
- The use is not likely to be as car dependant as would be the case were the site to be used for office development
- The building is attractive and will improve the appearance of the current site

One letter has been received providing comments which are summarised as follows:

- Whilst the addition of a supported living facility and a care home is much needed and we are not opposing the scheme we ask that an alternative entrance to the site be considered. The planned proposal to use Albert Street as the access road to the development is very narrow and construction vehicles will struggle to pass
- We are concerned about pedestrian and construction vehicle conflict, particularly with respect to persons using existing businesses within British Mills during the construction period
- Mud on the road is also a concern

PLANNING COMMITTEE

18th July 2024

Assessment of Proposal

Principle of development

The application site is located within the Redditch urban area, close to the defined Town Centre boundary. Policy 2 (Settlement Hierarchy) of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 (BORLP4) designates Redditch as the Main Settlement, which should be the focus for development as it provides the highest level of services and facilities provision and offers the most sustainable location for development. In this regard the site is located within a highly sustainable location within easy walking distance of local shops and facilities encouraging sustainable lifestyles for future residents and staff.

Policy 4 (Housing Provision) of the BORLP4 states that the Council will encourage the provision of housing for elderly people and that consideration will be given to the extent that the proposed scheme reflects to the requirements of the Worcestershire Extra Care Housing Strategy 2012-2026. This Strategy estimates that an additional 4,703 units of extra care housing is required across Worcestershire by 2026, with 438 units in Redditch. The delivery of such accommodation is encouraged from private developers, and it is determined that these proposals make a positive contribution to the delivery of this strategy, and thus the proposed development aligns with the requirements of Policy 4.

The site is identified as employment land in the Local Plan where Policies 23 and 24 apply. Nevertheless, the proposed development is not considered to conflict with these policies.

Planning permission for a change of use of the existing building was granted in 2009 (ref 2009/113/COU – ground floor only) and again in 2010 (ref 2010/040/COU - first and second floors). These two planning permissions, which were then lawfully implemented, changed the use from the former Use Class B1 (now effectively Class E(g)) to the former Use Class D1 (now Use Class F1). The lawful education use (Class F1) use continued from this point up until May 2022.

In light of the above, the lawful use of the site is Use Class F1 and therefore for non-employment uses. It has therefore been concluded that the change of use of the site to another non-employment use (in this case C2) would have no material impact upon the delivery of employment land across the Borough as a whole, and therefore does not conflict with the provisions of relevant development plan policies.

The site is no-longer required by Heart of Worcestershire College, and the site was marketed since the College's departure in 2022 with no interest attracted for re-use for an education facility or indeed a designated employment use. The proposed development would ensure that a currently vacant building is maintained and brought back into active use.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

18th July 2024

The proposed development would create employment opportunities during the construction of the build and a variety of positions whilst the care home is in operation and would satisfy a current growing demand/need for this type of accommodation.

The principle of the proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable.

Design and character considerations

The Councils Conservation Officer has been consulted owing to the proximity of the site to the British Mills complex to the immediate west and a heritage statement, which also contains a setting assessment has been submitted.

The care home building would be three storeys responding to the existing building and the prevailing height of other buildings in the near vicinity.

The 'link' between the two main building blocks has been designed to create a break in the elevation, remaining subservient to the two buildings and reducing the overall massing of the development as a whole. The design and scale of the proposed care home wing on the northern side is also considered to reflect that of the buildings that once stood on the site and the proposed materials (red brick walls) under an (artificial slate roof) would also reflect those of the adjacent buildings with fenestration designed to echo the industrial heritage of the surrounding buildings. Specific materials would be conditioned and would need to be agreed in writing by your officers in association with the Councils Conservation Officer.

Existing trees and vegetation to the periphery of the site would be retained and maintained. A comprehensive landscaping scheme has been submitted which the Councils Tree Officer raised no objections to. This proposes the planting of a number of mixed specimen trees. The proposal would also include recreational areas that includes seating areas and raised planters to be used as a 'growing garden', with a greenhouse to the east of the site. The scheme seeks to provide year-round colour, structure and interest with a high percentage of wildlife and pollinator friendly species.

Overall, the design, scale and appearance of the development including its landscaping is considered appropriate within its context.

Residential amenity considerations and response to public comments

Despite the extensive publicity, only one representation has been received raising concerns. The Highway Authority have raised no objections to the proposed means of vehicular access to the site having regard to vehicular and pedestrian safety. An alternative vehicular access to the site via Fishing Line Road to the east would not be practical given the significant level differences across the site and the provision of the existing retaining structure.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

18th July 2024

Whilst some parking is permitted on the northern side of Albert Street, the carriageway has double yellow lines (no parking and waiting at any time) on its southern side and partly to its northern side. There are footways on both sides of Albert Street providing safe pedestrian access.

Your officers appreciate that disturbance during the construction period is an inevitable consequence of granting permission for such new development. However, matters such as noise disturbance and general inconvenience is temporary and not in itself a reason to refuse permission.

A Construction Environment Management Plan condition would be attached to the consent in the event of planning permission being granted to control and manage safe working during the construction period which would cover matters such as the prevention of mud / detritus onto the public highway.

The development comfortably meets the Councils minimum separation distances and your officers are satisfied that no loss of residential amenity including loss of light and privacy would result from granting permission.

The principal amenity space for residents would provide a secure and screened area. The soft landscaping would comprise trees, shrubs, flowerbeds and lawn together with hard landscaping which is considered to be acceptable to your officers including the Councils Tree Officer.

The care home would be monitored by the Care Quality Commission who are the independent regulator of health and social care in England.

With regard to internal amenity space, the care home has been designed to meet the provisions of the Care Standards Act. I have noted that the care standard requirement for single bedrooms is 12m² (excluding the ensuite bathroom) and the proposed scheme solely provides ensuite single bedrooms at between 19-24m². Further, the Care Standards Act require 4.1m² of communal sitting, dining and recreational space per resident and the proposed scheme provides 7.2m² per resident in the care home (not including external areas).

With respect to external amenity space, just under half of the site, amounting to 3927m² would be landscaped which is considered to deliver sufficient external amenity space for its residents. Thus, with respect to amenity considerations, the proposal is acceptable.

Highway safety and parking considerations

A detailed transport statement has been submitted with the application. Worcestershire County Council Highways authority have examined the transport statement together with all submitted drawings including vehicle tracking plans and agree that the access arrangements together with parking provision proposed would be safe and suitable to

PLANNING COMMITTEE

18th July 2024

serve the proposed use. Subject to the imposition of reasonable and relevant conditions together with the delivery of the monies requested by WCC Highways as set out which are considered to mitigate against the impact of the development, the proposals are considered to be acceptable in terms of their highway safety impacts.

Ecology

The applicants have provided a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal which confirms that no protected species will be impacted by the proposed development. Bat and bird box provision would be conditioned in the interests of biodiversity enhancement.

Community Safety matters

Your officers are satisfied that issue of crime prevention/Secured by Design has been appropriately assessed and the configuration of the building is designed to maintain natural surveillance. The main entrance would overlook the access road and car parking area to enable surveillance of the main vehicle and pedestrian routes.

Section 106 Planning obligation

In accordance with Paragraph 57 of the NPPF and Section 122 of the CIL regulations, A planning obligation has been sought to mitigate the impact of this major development, if the application were to be approved. The Planning obligation would cover:

- Contributions to the NHS Integrated Health Board (ICB) towards GP Surgeries
- Contributions to WCC towards the provision of pedestrian infrastructure improvements
- Contributions to WCC towards the provision of Community Transport
- A Section 106 (Planning Obligation) monitoring fee/s

The applicant confirms its agreement to make financial contributions / obligations with respect to the matters set out above.

Planning Conditions

Sections 100ZA (4-6) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires the applicant's written agreement to the terms of a pre-commencement condition. Written agreement to the terms of relevant recommended conditions has been sought and agreed by the applicant.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

18th July 2024

Conclusion

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, requires applications to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The proposed development is considered to be an acceptable use in principle, in this location and the design and scale of the proposed building is considered to be appropriate having regards to character locally. Living conditions, highways impacts, parking provision and the impact on community infrastructure are all considered to be acceptable. Subject to suitable conditions and completion of a legal agreement, the application is considered to be a policy compliant and sustainable form of development. No issues have been identified which would make this application unacceptable in planning terms.

RECOMMENDATION:

That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, authority be delegated to the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Leisure Services to GRANT planning permission subject to:

a) The satisfactory completion of a S106 planning obligation ensuring the following matters are delivered:

- Contributions to the NHS Integrated Health Board (ICB) towards GP Surgeries
- Contributions to WCC towards the provision of pedestrian infrastructure improvements
- Contributions to WCC towards the provision of Community Transport
- A Section 106 (Planning Obligation) monitoring fee/s

and

b) Conditions and informatives as listed below:

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.

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

18th July 2024

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

Site Location Plan (9-) 1: 12 Oct 2023
 Proposed Site Plan - Ground Floor (9-) 2. Rev 3: : 12 Oct 2023
 Proposed Site Plan - Basement (9-) 3. Rev 3 : 12 Oct 2023
 Proposed Basement Plan (00) 2. Rev 2 : 12 Oct 2023
 Proposed Ground Floor Plan (00) 3. Rev 1 : 12 Oct 2023
 Proposed First Floor Plan (00) 4. Rev 1 : 12 Oct 2023
 Proposed Second Floor Plan (00) 5. Rev 1 : 12 Oct 2023
 Proposed Roof Plan (00) 6. Rev 1 : 12 Oct 2023
 Proposed West & North Elevations - Colour (21) 1: Amended 22 Dec 2023
 Proposed East & South Elevations - Colour (21) 2: Amended 22 Dec 2023
 Proposed Courtyard Elevations - Colour (21) 3. Rev 2 : 12 Oct 2023
 Exceedance Flood Routing CS230607-103 Rev A : 12 Oct 2023
 Drainage Strategy CS230607-102 Rev A : 12 Oct 2023
 External Levels CS230607-101 Rev A : 12 Oct 2023
 Topographical Survey 22798-22-01: 12 Oct 2023
 Landscape Layout Plan 2307MAC-OSP-1, 2, 3 and 4 Version E : 12 Oct 2023
 Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) : 12 Oct 2023
 Wharton PEA ref 230801 1734 PEA V1A: 12 Oct 2023
 Secure by Design Statement: 22 Dec 2023

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

- 3) Prior to their first installation, details of the form, colour and finish of the materials to be used externally on the walls and roofs shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development is satisfactory in appearance, to safeguard the visual amenities of the area

- 4) No works in connection with site drainage shall commence until a scheme for a surface water drainage strategy for the proposed development has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall include details of surface water drainage measures, including for hardstanding areas, and shall include the results of an assessment into the potential of disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS). If a connection to a sewer system is proposed, then evidence shall be submitted of the in principal approval of Severn Trent water for this connection. The scheme should include run off treatment proposals for surface water drainage. Where the scheme includes communal surface water drainage assets proposals for dealing with the

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**18th July 2024

future maintenance of these assets should be included. The scheme should include proposals for informing future owners or occupiers of the arrangements for maintenance of communal surface water drainage assets. The approved surface water drainage scheme shall be implemented prior to the first use of the development and thereafter maintained in accordance with the agreed scheme.

Reason: In order to ensure satisfactory drainage conditions that will not create or exacerbate flood risk on site or within the surrounding local area.

- 5) All retained trees or hedgerows and their Root Protection Areas must be protected during clearance and construction phase in accordance with BS5837:2012, using suitable protective fencing and/or ground protection as appropriate. No storage of plant/materials shall take place within the Root Protection Areas of any retained trees. This fencing and /or ground protection shall be constructed in accordance with the guidance in the British Standard BS5837:2012 and shall remain as erected until the development has been completed.

Reason: In order to protect the trees which, form an important part of the amenity of the site.

- 6) Any excavations within tree root protection areas must be carried out by hand and in accordance with BS5837:2012 and all tree management pruning work should be carried out in accordance with recognised good practice by reference to British Standard 3998 (2010)

Reason: In order to protect the trees which, form an important part of the amenity of the site.

- 7) Permanent residents of the supported living apartments shall be aged 21 years or above.

Reason: In the interests of clarity and having regard to Department for Transport School Travel guidance. Any school age residents may be entitled to free school transport and the applicant would be liable for such costs for the first five years.

- 8) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until electric vehicle charging spaces have been provided in accordance with a specification which shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter such spaces and power points shall be kept available and maintained for the use of electric vehicles as approved.

Reason: To encourage sustainable travel and healthy communities.

- 9) The Development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the Applicant has submitted a Travel Plan using Modeshift STARS Business. They

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

18th July 2024

must meet green level accreditation before occupation and bronze level accreditation within 12 months of occupation.

Reason: To reduce vehicle movements and promote sustainable access

- 10) The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the applicant has submitted to and had approval in writing from the Local Planning Authority a Travel Welcome Pack promoting sustainable forms of access to the development. The pack shall be provided to each employee prior to their commencement of employment.

Reason: To reduce vehicle movements and promote sustainable access

- 11) The development hereby approved shall not commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include but not be limited to the following:-

- o Measures to ensure that vehicles leaving the site do not deposit mud or other detritus on the public highway;
- o Details of site operative parking areas, material storage areas and the location of site operatives' facilities (offices, toilets etc);
- o The hours that delivery vehicles will be permitted to arrive and depart, and arrangements for unloading and manoeuvring.
- o Details of any temporary construction accesses and their reinstatement.
- o A highway condition survey, timescale for re-inspections, and details of any reinstatement.

The measures set out in the approved Plan shall be carried out and complied with in full during the construction of the development hereby approved. Site operatives' parking, material storage and the positioning of operatives' facilities shall only take place on the site in locations approved by in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the provision of adequate on-site facilities and in the interests of highway safety.

- 12) Unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, development, other than that required to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of remediation, must not commence until parts 1 to 6 have been complied with:

1. A preliminary risk assessment must be carried out. This study shall take the form of a Phase I desk study and site walkover and shall include the identification of previous site uses, potential contaminants that might reasonably be expected given those uses and any other relevant information. The preliminary risk assessment report shall contain a diagrammatical representation (conceptual model) based on the information above and shall include all potential

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**18th July 2024

contaminants, sources and receptors to determine whether a site investigation is required and this should be detailed in a report supplied to the Local Planning Authority. The risk assessment must be approved in writing before any development takes place.

2. Where an unacceptable risk is identified under part 1, a scheme for detailed site investigation must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to being undertaken. The scheme must be designed to assess the nature and extent of any contamination and must be led by the findings of the preliminary risk assessment. The investigation and risk assessment scheme must be compiled by competent persons and must be designed in accordance with the Environment Agency's "Land Contamination: Risk Management" guidance.

3. If an unacceptable risk is identified under part 2, a detailed site investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken and a written report of the findings produced. This report must be approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to any development taking place. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and must be conducted in accordance with the Environment Agency's "Land Contamination: Risk Management" guidance.

4. Where identified as necessary under parts 2 and 3, a detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to identified receptors must be prepared and is subject to the approval of the Local Planning Authority in advance of undertaking. The remediation scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as Contaminated Land under Part 2A Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

5. The approved remediation scheme, if required under part 4, must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of development, other than that required to carry out remediation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

6. Following the completion of the measures identified in the approved remediation scheme under part 5, a validation report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and is subject to the approval of the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of any buildings.

7. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken and where necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared, these will be subject to the approval of the Local Planning Authority. Following the completion of any measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a validation report must be prepared, which is subject to the

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**18th July 2024

approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of any buildings.

Reason:

To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors

- 13) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, a scheme for the provision of bat roost opportunities and bird nest boxes within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented by suitably qualified personnel to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority prior to the first use of the development approved.

Reason: In the interests of biodiversity and in accordance with the provisions of National Planning Policy Framework

- 14) The development hereby approved shall be used for the purposes specified in the application (Residential Care Home and for supported living apartments) and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Use Class C2 of the schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument amending, revoking or re-enacting that Order).

Reason: The proposals have been considered on the basis of occupation of the development by persons set out under the application and have been determined as such.

Informatives

- 1) The local planning authority have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner to seek solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with this planning application through negotiation and amendment.
- 2) The applicant is advised to be aware of their obligations under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended by the Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000) to avoid disturbance of nesting wild birds and protected species such as bats when carrying out the development

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**18th July 2024

- 3) Cadent Gas Ltd own and operate the gas infrastructure within the area of your development. There may be a legal interest (easements and other rights) in the land that restrict activity in proximity to Cadent assets in private land. The applicant must ensure that the proposed works do not infringe on legal rights of access and or restrictive covenants that exist.

If buildings or structures are proposed directly above the apparatus the development may only take place following diversion of the apparatus. The applicant should apply online to have apparatus diverted in advance of any works, by visiting cadentgas.com/diversions

Prior to carrying out works, including the construction of access points, please register on www.linesearchbeforeudig.co.uk to submit details of the planned works for review, ensuring requirements are adhered to.

- 4) Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)
It is expected that contractors are registered with the Considerate Constructors scheme and comply with the code of conduct in full, but particular reference is made to "respecting the community" this says:

Constructors should give utmost consideration to their impact on neighbours and the public

- o Informing, respecting and showing courtesy to those affected by the work.
- o Minimising the impact of deliveries, parking and work on the public highway.
- o Contributing to and supporting the local community and economy.
- o Working to create a positive and enduring impression and promoting the Code.

The CEMP should clearly identify how the principal contractor will engage with the local community, this should be tailored to local circumstances. Contractors should also confirm how they will manage any local concerns and complaints and provide an agreed Service Level Agreement for responding to said issues.

Contractors should ensure that courtesy boards are provided and information shared with the local community relating to the timing of operations and contact details for a site coordinator in the event of any difficulties.

This does not offer any relief to obligations under existing Legislation.

- 5) Travel Plan Requirements
Worcestershire County Council has published guidance on how it expects travel plans to be prepared, this guidance is freely available from the County Councils Travel Plans Officer. As part of this process the applicant must register for Modeshift STARS Business and ensure that their targets have been uploaded so that progress on the implementation of the Travel Plan can be monitored.

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**18th July 2024

Worcestershire County Council can assist applicants with this process should they need.

Modeshift STARS Business is a nationally accredited scheme which assists in the effective delivery of travel plans, applicant can register at www.modeshiftstars.org

- 6) The applicant should be aware that this permission also includes a legal agreement under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and that the requirements of that obligation must be complied with

Procedural matters

This application is being reported to the Planning Committee because the application is for major development. Further, the application requires a planning obligation. As such the application falls outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

18th July 2024

Planning Application 24/00083/REM

Reserved matters approval (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for the construction of 241 dwellings and associated works and infrastructure, pursuant to the outline planning permissions 19/00976/HYB and 19/00977/HYB (Cross boundary application with Bromsgrove DC 24/00077/REM)

Phase 5 Development Brockhill East, Hewell Road, Redditch, Worcestershire

Applicant: Persimmon Homes Ltd
Ward: Batchley And Brockhill Ward

(see additional papers for site plan)

The case officer of this application is Mr Paul Lester, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on Tel: 01527 881323 Email: paul.lester@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk for more information.

Consideration and Determination of Cross Boundary Application

Two identical applications have been submitted, which include land within two LPA boundaries (Redditch and Bromsgrove).

The consideration of the impacts of a development proposal is not altered by political boundaries and cannot be considered in isolation. Members need to consider the application as a whole, (not just that part of the development within its own administrative boundary) and come to a decision based upon that consideration. However, Members will only be determining the application in so far as it relates to the administrative boundary of Redditch. For reference, this relates to land extending from the approved phase 6 north towards the area for phase 4. The proposed housing and green infrastructure areas are split between both authorities.

The Bromsgrove reserved matters application 24/00077/REM is scheduled to be considered on 9th July Committee Meeting.

Site Description

The application site forms part of the Brockhill allocation, which is a greenfield site extending to circa 56ha and is irregular in shape, comprising heavily grazed improved grassland and large arable field parcels typically subdivided by fencing. The allocation site's boundaries extend adjacent to Brockhill Lane to the west, Weights Lane to the north, the Redditch/Birmingham railway line to the east, Phase I (Pointer's Way) and Phase II (Meadow View) to its south, and Phase 3 and Phase 4 which are a continuation of Phase 2. These phases have been or are being built by Persimmon. To the north of the application site, off Weights Lane, is an area of employment development known as Weights Farm Business Park.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

This phase covers 10.24ha and will be sited within the context of the above, between Phase 4 and Phase 6. Within Phase 5, the site is covered by arable land / improved grassland, with trees present along the existing field boundaries. A gas main line borders crosses the site, requiring a 28m easement. The gas main will divide this Phase and the approved Phase 6, with each scheme being set back the required distance to ensure safe onsite operations.

Proposal Description

Following the granting of the hybrid application for up to 960 dwellings, this application seeks consent for the Phase 5 Reserved Matters and the erection of 241 dwellings and associated works and infrastructure. The proposed dwellings are split between Bromsgrove and Redditch BC boundaries.

The principle of the proposed development (for up to 960 units) has been established through the granting of Hybrid permission 19/00977/HYB. Therefore, the issues for consideration by Members are limited to matters of layout (including internal vehicle access), scale, appearance and landscaping.

A total of 142 market homes are proposed to be provided across the site to provide 30 (21%), two-bedroom dwelling, 51 (36%), 3-bedroom dwellings and 61 (43%) four bed dwellings.

The proposals include the provision of 99 affordable housing units, which equates to 41% of the total dwellings proposed. The affordable housing mix would provide 16 (16%) 1 bed units, 50 (51%) 2 bed units; 31 (31%) 3 bed units; and 1 (1%) 4 bed units. The mix is reflective of the requirements set out by the Housing Strategy Team. The affordable housing tenure is split between shared ownership (32) and social rent (67), These units would be provided in clusters across the whole of the site.

As part of the proposal, mostly 2 storey dwellings are proposed. However, there are also some 2.5 dwellings incorporating dormers.

The Reserved Matters to be considered under this application are:

- Layout - the way in which buildings, routes and open spaces within the development are provided, situated and orientated in relation to each other and to buildings and spaces outside the development. This includes the internal road configuration.
- Scale - the height, width and length of each building proposed within the development in relation to its surroundings.
- Appearance - the aspects of a building or place within the development which determines the visual impression the building or place makes, including the external built form of the development, its architecture, materials, decoration, lighting, colour and texture; and

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

- Landscaping - the treatment of land (other than buildings) for the purpose of enhancing or protecting the amenities of the site and the area in which it is situated and includes-
 - (a) screening by fences, walls or other means;
 - (b) the planting of trees, hedges, shrubs or grass;
 - (c) the formation of banks, terraces or other earthworks;
 - (d) the laying out or provision of gardens, courts, squares, water features, sculpture or public art; and
 - (e) the provision of other amenity features

For clarity, the issue of external access has already been determined and approved, so it is not included in the current application.

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

Policy 1: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development
 Policy 2: Settlement Hierarchy
 Policy 3 Development Strategy
 Policy 4: Housing Provision
 Policy 5: Effective and Efficient use of Land
 Policy 6: Affordable Housing
 Policy 16: Natural Environment
 Policy 17: Flood Risk Management
 Policy 19: Sustainable travel and Accessibility
 Policy 20: Transport Requirements for New Development
 Policy 22: Road Hierarchy
 Policy 31: Regeneration for Town Centre
 Policy 36: Historic Environment
 Policy 37: Historic Buildings and Structures
 Policy 39: Built Environment
 Policy 40: High Quality Design and Safer Communities
 Policy 46: Brookhill East
 Appendix 1 RCBD1 Redditch Cross Boundary Development

Others

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework (2024)
 NPPG National Planning Practice Guidance
 Borough of Redditch High Quality Design SPD (June 2019)

Bromsgrove District Plan

RCBD1: Redditch Cross Boundary Development
 High Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document (June 2019)

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Relevant Planning History

The application site forms part of a larger site that was the subject of a cross boundary hybrid planning applications for the following proposal.

Hybrid applications 19/00976/HYB and 19/00977/HYB for up to 960 dwellings consisting of a full application for 128 dwellings accessed off Weights Lane, new public open space, drainage system, engineering operations associated works and an outline application (with all matters reserved with the exception of access) for the construction of the remaining dwellings with access points off Cookridge Close, Hawling Street and Weights Lane and including a new District Centre, new play facilities, new highway network, public open space, new drainage system and surface water attenuation, engineering operations and all associated works including landscaping.

This was approved at Redditch Planning Committee on 27th January 2021 subject to the signing of s106 agreement. Following the signing of the s106 agreement, the Redditch decision (19/00977/HYB) was issued on 1st November 2021.

The s106 agreement included the following contributions, highways (including bus service and infrastructure), education contribution on a per plot basis, off site open space contribution, Redditch town centre contribution, Bromsgrove and Redditch CCG Contribution and Worcestershire Acute Hospitals Trust.

The condition requirements to be addressed as part of the Reserved Matters submission include the following:

- Condition 6 requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the Framework Plan 8506-L-02 J and the principles described in the Design and Access Statement. Any Reserved Matter application shall include a statement providing an explanation as to how the design of the development responds to the relevant Design and Access Statement.
- Condition 7 requires an external materials plan.
- Condition 16 requires the specification, extent and methodology of cut and fill works.
- Condition 17 requires details of the finished ground floor levels.
- Condition 24 requires details of the hard landscaping.
- Condition 27 requires an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.
- Condition 28 requires details of the mix of type and size of market dwellings.
- Condition 29 requires a plan identifying the number and location of the affordable housing units.
- Condition 30: requires boundary treatment details.
- Condition 31: requires refuse storage details.
- Condition 37: requires details of cycle parking.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

Other Planning History

- Phase 1 (2011/177/OUT): Mixed use development of 171 dwellings, public open space (no matters reserved) and outline application for 4,738 square metres of Class B1 (Business) floorspace and access. Planning consent was granted on 3rd October 2011.
- Phase 2 (2014/256/OUT): Mixed use development of 296 dwellings, play area, Community House and public open space and outline application for up to 3,100 square metres of Class B1 (Business) floorspace and access. Planning consent was granted on 29th March 2017.
- New School: (16/000007/REG3) New two-form entry First School with associated external areas including access road, hard play, grass pitches, forest schools area, and parking. County application planning consent was granted on 13th October 2016.
- Land at Weights Lane (2012/120/OUT) Mixed use development of up to 200 dwellings, 5,000 sqm (gross) Class B1 office floorspace with associated open space and access arrangements. Planning permission was granted on 11th March 2014.
- Land at Weight Lane (reserved matters): (2015/265/RM) Layout, appearance, scale and landscaping for the erection of 200 no. dwellings with associated infrastructure and landscaping and the discharge of conditions 5, 9, 15 and 16 of the outline application reference 2012/120/OUT. Planning Permission was granted 16th December 2015.
- Phase 4 (22/00359/REM). Application 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). Reserved Matters was granted 26th August 2022.
- Phase 6 (22/01553/REM) Application for reserved matters approval (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for the construction of 109 dwellings and associated works and infrastructure, pursuant to the outline planning permissions 19/00976/HYB and 19/00977/HYB.0977/HYB. (Cross boundary application with Bromsgrove DC 22/01608/REM). Reserved Matters was granted 2nd August 2023.

Consultations**Tutnall And Cobley Parish Council**

No comments received

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Worcestershire Archive and Archaeological Service

No objection

WRS - Contaminated Land

WRS have no adverse comments to make for contaminated land subject tired investigation condition.

North Worcestershire Water Management

No objection, subject to drainage plan

Housing Strategy

No objection

Worcestershire Highways - Bromsgrove

No objection subject to conditions

- Site Layout
- Attenuation Basin
- Residential Parking Provision
- Cycle Parking (Condition not required as this duplicates condition 37 of the Hybrid permission)

Arboricultural Officer

No objection

Public Consultation Response

174 letters sent 8th March 2024

Site notices displayed 12th March 2024

Press notice published 15th March 2024

One comment has been received neither supporting nor objecting to the application. They raised concern elements of earlier phases are incomplete and feared Persimmon may leave the development unfinished.

Assessment of Proposal

Phasing

The proposal relates to the fifth of eight phases proposed to complete the Brockhill development (phases seven and eight have not been submitted). The phasing of the development is reflected in the hybrid planning permission. A phasing plan has been approved as part of the discharge of conditions. A copy of this plan is included in the committee presentation.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Layout

The Phase 5 proposals have directly incorporated the ideas of the Framework Plan and Design and Access Statement (DAS) into the layout by mirroring the suggested built form and incorporating areas of green open space along the ridgeline and SuDS basins.

Phase 5 has an average density of 42 dwellings per hectare, allowing for efficient use while being sensitive to the site's landscape and topography. This density is slightly higher than Phases 4 and 6, which have average density of 37 and 32 dph, respectively. However, this density is not inappropriate, as Phase 6 was primarily larger, detached units. This density helps assimilate Phase 5 into the wider site while maintaining its character. The DAS assumes an average density of 41.6dph across the site.

The density also allows for a balanced housing mix across the site with varying sizes in order to accommodate a variety of household types. This provides a hierarchy of dwellings from larger detached properties, through to smaller terraced forms and bungalows,

The development aims to create positive interfaces along the remaining boundaries, with dwellings oriented to offer natural surveillance. This aligns with the DAS, which proposes active frontages along all public open spaces. For example, properties along the southern boundary face towards Phase 6, separated by the gas main easement. This area is identified as a key vista within the DAS and has been treated as such through additional landscaping and footpaths. Other key vistas have been incorporated between Phases 4 and 5, with road users having views over the development and Redditch, and a view up the hill.

The DAS identifies key arrival spaces in Phase 5, including entrances and exits from Phases 4, 6, 7, and 8. The Lambridge house type, a dual-aspect house with a bay window, is used on key corners to signify Phase 5 arrival. A small, paved square is provided in front of Plots 5106-5108, 5124, and 5154-5155, providing a focal node and legibility. The square offers seating and a distinctive character area, while the surrounding houses are rendered to enhance the overall scheme.

The proposed layout is faithful to the masterplan from the outline approval, in its site planning strategy, in its density, and in its detailed layout. The proposal is in accordance with Policy 46 Brockhill East and RCBD1. Overall, the proposed layout is considered to accord with policies 39 and 40, Redditch High Quality Design SPD and the NPPF.

Affordable Housing Provision

The hybrid planning permission imposed planning conditions relevant to the scale of development. Condition 1 of the permission requires the scale of phases to be submitted and considered. The scale or quantum of development is fixed by condition 5 of the Hybrid permission, which limits development to up to 960 homes across all the phases of the site. Phase 3 approved 128 homes, Phase 4 approved 72, Phase 6 approved 109

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

dwellings and this phase proposes 241. This totals 550 and allows up to 410 dwellings to be built under the remaining phases of the development (Phases 7 and 8).

As part of the consideration of the previous reserved matters application (Phase 6), clarification was sought by members regarding the shortfall of affordable housing in that phase. Officers confirmed that the overall percentage of affordable housing on the hybrid site is set out and secured in the s106 agreement and therefore it is considered there is sufficient control in place to ensure overprovision in future phases. Furthermore, it was important to recognise that where a development site is brought forward on a piecemeal basis (such as the phasing in this case), the Council should assess affordable housing targets for each part of the site on a pro-rata basis, having regard to the overall requirements generated by the whole site.

As part of this phase the applicant has increased the provision of affordable housing across the site to ensure this shortfall has been remedied.

The s106 agreement established the principle of affordable housing delivery on the site that Persimmon Homes must adhere to; in Bromsgrove, 40% of the total units constructed must be affordable housing and delivered as 60% social rented and 40% shared ownership properties. In Redditch, 30% of the total homes constructed should be affordable housing. These should be split as 65% social rent and 35% shared ownership properties. This is in line with relevant planning policies for both Councils.

To understand the schedule of accommodation on the layout (drawing ref. PHA29 - PL002L splits the housing mix between Bromsgrove and Redditch districts. The affordable housing mix across the two local authorities is therefore as follows:

Proposed Affordable Housing Mix – Phase 5

	Bromsgrove		Redditch	
	Shared Ownership	Social Rent	Shared Ownership	Rent
1 Bed	0	12	0	4
2 Bed	15	22	2	11
3 Bed	15	12	0	4
4 Bed	0	2	0	0
Sub Total	30 (39%)	48 (61%)	2 (10%)	19 (90%)
Total	78 (40.2%)		21 (44.7%)	

The majority of Phase 5 is located within Bromsgrove and complies with the s106 Agreement criteria by providing 40.2% affordable housing (78 units). This is split 61% Social Rent (48 units) and 39% Shared Ownership (30 units). The 1% discrepancy between these figures and the S106 Agreement requirement is a result of the tenured units being provided in pairs (i.e. semi-detached properties). It is important that these pairs remain as proposed to ensure that the ongoing management and upkeep of the properties by a Registered Provider is appropriate.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

Of the homes located in Redditch, 21 of the 47 units will be affordable (44.4%). This exceeds the obligation by 7 units (14.4%) and therefore demonstrates compliance.

It should be noted that the Phase 6 reserved matters approvals (refs. 22/01608/REM and 22/01533/REM) were granted in August 2023 with 22 affordable housing units (20%). The residential element of Phase 6 is located solely in Redditch, meaning that the parcel was 11 units (10%) short of the requirement (30%). Therefore, the Phase 5 proposals are proposing an affordable housing provision of 21 units (44.4%) in Redditch order to address the shortfall.

On Phase 5, the social rent and shared ownership split differs from that required by the S106 Agreement – within the Redditch parcel, 2 units (10%) will be shared ownership and 19 units (90%) will be social rent. To demonstrate legal compliance, these figures should be 7 units (35%) shared ownership and 14 units (65%) social rent.

As outlined above is an affordable housing balance to consider due to the under provision on Phase 6; Phase 6 was 11 units (10%) short of the s106 Agreement requirement, but the tenure split departed from that specified in the S106 Agreement by providing 12 units (55%) for shared ownership and 10 units (45%) for social rent. Had the tenure split specified in the s106 Agreement (35% shared ownership, 65% social rent) been adhered to, Phase 6 would have provided 11 shared ownership properties and 21 social rented properties.

Therefore Phase 6 overdelivered on shared ownership (by 1 unit) and underdelivered by social rent (by 11 units). The resultant tenure mixes on Phase 5 aims to address this balance by providing 19 social rented units and 2 shared ownership units.

These units would be provided in clusters across the whole of the phased scheme. The Housing Officer has been consulted and agrees that the affordable housing provision, mix and cluster arrangements within the layout are acceptable.

Housing Mix

The DAS requires that building heights be primarily two storeys. This is reflected in the proposals, where primarily 2-storey dwellings mimic local character and occasional 2.5-storey dwellings provide interest and focal points along the street scene.

A range of terraced, semi-detached and detached properties are proposed to create an interesting and attractive setting with varying ridge heights. Four 1 bedroom flats will also be delivered. To generate further appeal along the main and secondary roads, the provision and length of front gardens have been varied. Longer front gardens create a more open scene, whereas shorter gardens or frontage parking create a sense of enclosure.

In conclusion, it is considered the scale of development is acceptable, promoting a good quality design that responds appropriately to the character of the area, in accordance

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

with Borough Local Plan policies 46, RCBD1 and 39 and 40, Redditch High Quality Design SPD and the NPPF. Furthermore, the scale of proposal is considered to comply with the relevant conditions imposed on the hybrid planning permission.

Appearance

The DAS stresses the importance of placemaking and responding effectively to local character. Critical to this will be the use of traditional building materials, particularly the use of colour and boundary details.

The phase will use traditional building material, in particular the use of colour and boundary details. The approach to street pattern, building lines and plot sizes will help ensure that the proposals sit comfortably with the adjoining residential development, along with elevation and design. To achieve this, details include:

- Material palette: multi tone red brick, contrasting brick banding – red brick, anthracite roof tiles, white uPVC windows, black front and garage door, black fascia and soffit and orange brick, contrasting brick banding – red brick, grey slate
- Concrete interlocking roof tiles, white uPVC windows, black front and garage door, black fascia and soffit.
- Weber rough cast silver pearl render on some properties.
- Boundary treatments: 1.8m screen brick walls, 1.8m pier and panel fencing, 1.8m close boarded timber fencing.

The appearance of the units is largely reflective of the surrounding traditional architecture highlighted in the DAS but include detailing in black/anthracite for a slightly more contemporary appearance. For full details are shown on the External Materials Plan which also shows which properties are due to have render. Rendered properties will be feature buildings that provide focal points and vista stops at key points within the scheme, such as around the central paved square and facing out towards the ridgeline.

To ensure the development is fully legible, boundary treatments will define public and private spaces as required by the DAS. These will consist of 1.8m brick walls (brick to match individual plots) at public interfaces such as around the central paved square and key corners along the main roads; 1.8m pier and panel fencing on boundaries fronting key corners along private drives and secondary or tertiary roads or 1.8m timber close board fences to divide gardens. These boundaries help to prevent crime by clearly demarking private land.

The overwhelming majority dwellings face onto the street, with articulation of corners achieved using distinctive materials, bays, and additional windows in habitable rooms, which ensure that blank gables to the street are avoided. This assists in pedestrian way finding through the scheme and the creation of a sense of place. Dual aspect units have been introduced to ensure all elevations make a positive contribution to the public realm and junctions.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

The material information provided to date is satisfactory. Overall, the appearance is considered acceptable and to be in accordance Borough Local Plan policies 46, RCBD1 and 39 and 40, Redditch High Quality Design SPD and the NPPF.

Landscaping and Open Space

The DAS, Framework Plan, and Illustrative Masterplan envision a vast amount of Green Infrastructure (GI) (approximately 57% of the total scheme) and a high-quality public realm. Within Phase 5, where over 44% (11.75ha) of the scheme falls outside of developed land. This figure is lower than the 57% identified above, but reflects the higher levels of open spaces in Phases 4 and 6. Full details of the soft landscaping proposals have been submitted as part of the RM application, these reflect the intentions of the DAS to deliver a range of landscape, biodiversity, recreational, and SuDS benefits; additional native tree, hedgerow, and shrub planting will be utilised to retain and enhance the existing GI network.

In relation to the landscaping around the proposed dwellings, to break up the street scene, street trees and other landscaping features will be included along the main street. This will also provide an attractive route through the scheme. Trees will be used within the private curtilage of some properties to provide structure and create privacy for the residents. Different species and sizes will be used to define the character areas and street hierarchy. A mixture of shrub and herbaceous species will be planted in front gardens to create texture, colour and year-round interest. A landscape management plan will be submitted later as details are reserved by a condition.

Overall, it is considered that this proposal satisfactorily achieves the aims of the Design and Access Statement and development plan policy.

Highways and Parking

As part of the application for reserved matters approval, the Design and Access Compliance Statement outlines that the main street/spine road which routes through Phase 5 from Phase 4 to Phase 6 offers a direct and logical route through the phase (note that the spine road already has planning permission). The carriageway will be 6.1m wide with 2m footways on either side. The Applicant provides that the curved shape of the main road would assist bus movements and provide traffic calming by reducing the speed of drivers.

The Highway Authority is content that the Applicant's General Arrangement Layout (100 Rev A) shows that crossing facilities, with tactile paving, have been provided to ensure a safe route for pedestrians within the site.

As per the provisions of the Streetscape Design Guide, the applicant would provide 1 car parking space for a 1-bedroom unit, 2 car parking spaces for a 2-3-bedroom unit, and 3 car parking spaces for a 4+ bedroom unit. The applicant provides that where properties

PLANNING COMMITTEE

are proposed without garages, a shed in the garden is proposed that would be suitable to store bicycles.

The Highway Authority has been consulted, and several revisions have been made to the plans to ensure the development is acceptable. As a result of these changes, WCC as the Highway Authority, has advised that it has no objection, subject to conditions.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Overall, it is considered that, given the degree of separation, position, and orientation between the proposed dwellings and neighbouring buildings, the proposal would not result in harm to the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties or future occupants of the proposed dwellings, in accordance with the above policies.

In relation to the construction phase of this phase of development, under condition 39 of the hybrid permission, a Construction Environment Management would be required prior to the commencement of the 5th phase.

Ecology

Section 15 of the NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes. As well as promoting the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species.

In line with Policy 16 appropriate mitigation measures must be implemented to ensure protection of the natural environment, with benefits from development to biodiversity captured.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) has become mandatory for major applications submitted as of 12th February 2024. However, reserved matters applications are exempt if the outline application was submitted prior to the February 2024 commencement date.

The outline application (the hybrid scheme) was submitted prior to this date and is therefore not subject to mandatory BNG, which would require a minimum 10% biodiversity gain required calculated using the Biodiversity Metric and approval of a biodiversity gain plan.

Conditions 19 Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEcMP), Condition 20 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEcMP) and Condition 21 Lighting of the hybrid permission ensures that appropriate mitigation measures will be implemented to ensure protection of the natural environment.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Other Matters

WRS Contamination considers that in addition to the contaminated land conditions placed on the permission granted under the hybrid application, an imported soils/soil forming materials be placed on any approval granted as part of the reserved matters.

In relation to drainage Phase 5 the site is in the northwestern side of Redditch. The site is split between two catchment areas, the southern part of the site draining into the Batchley Brook and the northern part of the site draining directly to the River Arrow. The whole site is classified as flood zone 1 by the national Environment Agency fluvial flood mapping. Given its location in the catchment and the distance from any significant water course the fluvial risk to the site is low. Phase 5 is located within the Batchley Brook and Hewell Stream side of the catchments. Some Surface water flood risk is indicated but this is minimal. With respect to surface water runoff flood risk, based on the EA surface water flood risk mapping there are areas of risk indicated across the site. Areas of pooling are generally located around the existing drainage features on such as brooks, ditches and ponds.

NWWM have reviewed the Preliminary Drainage Strategy submitted as part of the application. In principle this is satisfactory subject to a planning condition regarding detailed design.

Conclusions

This is an allocated development site. The reserved matters under consideration are found to comply with the relevant conditions imposed as part of the hybrid permission and to adhere to the masterplan, the principles of the Design and Access Statement and the NPPF. In the planning balance and taking account of material planning considerations, the development is acceptable and, subject to the conditions set out below, is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations that the Reserved Matters of Layout, Scale, Appearance and Landscaping be approved subject to the following conditions:

Conditions:

1. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and drawings:

Site Location Plan (ref. PHA29-PL001L)
Planning Layout (ref. PHA29-PL002L)
External Material Plan (ref. PHA29-PL101C)
Massing Plan (ref. PHA29-PL103C)

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Tenure Plan (ref. PHA29-PL105C)
 Fire Strategy Plan (ref. PHA29-107C)
 Refuse Storage Plan (ref. PHA29-PL109C)
 Site Sections (PHA29-PL400)
 Tree Survey Plan (8506-T-01)
 Tree Retention Plan (8506-T-02)
 Tree Protection Plan (8506-TPP-03)
 Alnmouth (ref. PHA29-PL200)
 Danbury (ref. PHA29-PL201)
 Barnwood (ref. PHA29-PL202)
 Sherwood (ref. PHA29-PL203)
 Charnwood (ref. PHA29-PL204)
 Rivington (ref. PHA29-PL205)
 Kennet (ref. PHA29-PL206)
 Greenwood (ref. PHA29-PL207)
 Kielder (ref. PHA29-PL208)
 Wentwood (ref. PHA29-PL209)
 Rendlesham (ref. PHA29-PL210)
 Dallington (ref. PHA29-PL211)
 Galloway (ref. PHA29-PL212)
 Haldon (ref. PHA29-PL213)
 Knebworth (ref. PHA29-PL214)
 Lambridge (ref. PHA29-PL215)
 Tamar (ref. PHA29-PL216)
 HQI50 (ref. PHA29-PL217)
 Twin Garage (ref. PHA29-PL218)
 Single Garage (ref. PHA29-PL219)
 Drainage and Levels Appraisal (ref. 0421-1C)
 General Arrangement (ref. 0424-100A)
 Section 38 Plan (ref. 0424-102)

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

2. Notwithstanding the approved details, no works or development above foundation level for phase 5 shall take place until a finalised scheme for surface water drainage has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall specifically include: -
 - Detailed drainage design, showing all private foul and surface water connections.
 - A simple index assessment considering the water quality of surface water runoff.
 - Consideration of what SuDS features can be incorporated into the site drainage to provide an appropriate level of runoff treatment.
 - Full details of the proposed balancing area. Included information on any proposed permanent water level, which would improve its value.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

This scheme should be indicated on a drainage plan and the approved scheme shall be completed prior to the first use of the full application hereby approved.

Reason: To prevent the risk of flooding and to improve and protect water quality.

3. Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed scheme for the site layout be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied or brought into use until the submitted scheme, which is broadly in accordance with General Arrangement (ref. 0424-100A), subject to any necessary changes identified during the detailed design process, has been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with Worcestershire County Council Highways, and has been implemented in full.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

4. The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until details of proposed measures to protect the attenuation basins from pedestrian ingress have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The measures shall be constructed and implemented in full accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interest of pedestrian safety.

Procedural matters

This application is reported to Planning Committee for determination because the application is for major development and as such the application falls outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

18th July 2024

Planning Application 24/00503/FUL**Internal alterations to create 1No. ground floor 1-bedroom/2-person and 1No. first floor 2-bedroom/3-person flat.****76 Eathorpe Close, Redditch, Worcestershire, B98 0HQ, ,****Applicant: Mr Gary Waring
Ward: Matchborough And Woodrow****(see additional papers for site plan)**

The case officer of this application is Charlotte Wood, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on Tel: 01527 64252 Ext 3412 Email: Charlotte.Wood@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk for more information.

Site Description

The application site is a 1970's two storey terraced property which lies within Eathorpe Close and forms part of the residential area of Matchborough. To the north of Eathorpe Close lies Ipsley Brook and in close proximity to the east is Matchborough First and to the west is The Kingfisher School.

Eathorpe Close is formed of uniform terraced properties laid out in a linear, planned arrangement. Number 76 Eathorpe Close is a middle terrace, attached to numbers 77 and 75 to the north and south, respectively, and also attached to number 74 to the west by a first floor clad link which has a walkway beneath. The property benefits from a rear garden area on the eastern side which directly abuts a shared parking area. There is a further row of shared parking to the south of the site.

Proposal Description

The property is currently a single four bedroom dwelling, however this application proposes alterations to subdivide the dwelling into a one bedroom flat at ground floor and a two bedroomed flat at first floor level. Few alterations are required to convert the building to flats. Externally, a new front door accessed off the public footpath would be introduced, which would replace an existing window. Internally the stairs leading to the first floor would be enclosed and there would be some internal reconfiguration to create the new living arrangements. The supporting statement provided with the application confirms that the separating floor between the two flats would have acoustic insulation to comply with Building Regulations.

Access to the rear garden space for the ground floor flat would be by the rear dining room door and access for the first floor flat would be by the rear garden gate.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

The supporting statement also sets out that the proposal has been designed in accordance with current Building Regulations, 'Secure by Design' principles and Code for Sustainable Homes.

Relevant Policies :

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4

Policy 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy 2: Settlement Hierarchy

Policy 5: Effective and Efficient use of Land

Policy 19: Sustainable travel and Accessibility

Policy 20: Transport Requirements for New Development

Policy 39: Built Environment

Policy 40: High Quality Design and Safer Communities

Others

National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

National Planning Practice Guidance

Redditch High Quality Design SPD

Relevant Planning History

No Relevant Planning History

Consultations

Highways Redditch

No highways objections raised, however a condition for cycle parking provision has been recommended.

Public Consultation Response

Three neighbour letters were sent in relation to this application; however no representations from members of the public have been received.

Cllr Jane Spilsbury

Requested that the application is considered at planning committee due to the potential highways and parking implications of the proposal.

Assessment of Proposal

Principle of Development

The site is shown as "white land" on the Borough of Redditch Local Plan Proposals Map, indicating that it lies within the main urban area of Redditch. Policy 2 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan no. 4 (BORLP 4) states that Redditch urban area, as the main

PLANNING COMMITTEE

settlement shall be the focus for development as it provides the highest level of services and facilities and offers the most sustainable location. The principle of new residential development or in this case, the subdivision of one dwelling into two flats is therefore acceptable in this location subject to other considerations including character and appearance, residential amenity and highway matters.

Regard should also be had to nationally described space standards set out in the Department for Communities and Local Government's Technical Housing Standards. This document provides minimum internal floor space standards for dwellings of all types and tenures. A one bedroom flat should have a minimum floor area of 39 square metres and a two bedroomed flat should have a minimum floor area of 61 square metres.

In the case of the current proposal, the one bedroom flat at ground floor would measure 49 square metres and would therefore exceed the described space standard. The proposed two bedroom flat would measure 56 square metres and would therefore be slightly under the required standard. Whilst regard is given to the technical housing standards, this document does not form part of the development plan as they have not been adopted as part of a policy in the local plan. In view of this, the standards are given reduced weight. Furthermore, all the necessary facilities for day-to-day living have been provided within the flats and the open plan layout creates a more spacious feel. Whilst the second bedroom within the proposed first floor flat is small, it would be suitable for a child. Unlike some flat developments, outdoor space is also available for the occupiers.

Having regard to the above considerations, the principle of development is supported by officers.

Character and Appearance

Policy 5 of BoRLP4 states that efficient use of land should be sought in new development schemes and Policy 39 of the BoRLP4 echoes this requirement but also states that development should contribute positively to the surrounding environment. Similarly, Policy 40 of the Local Plan expects development to be of a high quality design that reflects or complements local surroundings and materials.

The site is situated within a dense housing estate where the properties are uniform and simple in their appearance with small windows, shallow pitched roofs and white cladded front porches. It is noted that the application site comprises a dwelling that is slightly larger than others due to its first floor link structure which most of the other properties do not have. As the external alterations required to facilitate the subdivision are minor, including the additional new front door, the development would both make efficient use of land whilst also positively contributing to and complementing the local surroundings, in accordance with Policies 5, 39 and 40 of the BoRLP 4.

Residential Amenity

Paragraph 135(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that planning decisions should seek a good standard of amenity for existing and future users of land and buildings. Furthermore, the Borough of Redditch High Quality Design SPD provides

PLANNING COMMITTEE

further guidance in relation to residential amenity, seeking to protect against adverse loss of light, outlook, privacy and overbearing impact.

Given that there would be no extensions to the building as part of the subdivision, there would be no negative impact through loss of light, outlook or overbearing impact. There would also be no additional windows inserted into the building, only the new front door and the windows that currently serve habitable rooms would continue to serve habitable rooms. In view of this there would be no detrimental impact to privacy arising as a result of the proposed development.

The amenity space would be shared between the occupiers of the two flats and would offer a garden of 10 metres in length and 85 square metres in area. The Borough of Redditch High Quality Design SPD (2019) specifies that dwellings should have a garden length of 10.5 metres and an area of 70 sq metres, however the document states that a more flexible approach should be taken with communal amenity space for flats. The SPD also states that amenity space should be suitably sited and in scale with the plot, surroundings and reflect the existing local density. Whilst the shared garden area would be modest, it would reflect the local surroundings and building to plot densities. Given that both flats would benefit from access to outdoor space, and in view of the modest size of the new units and also the relatively close proximity of the site to a public area of open space, the proposed amenity space is considered acceptable.

Based on the above assessment, the proposal raises no concerns in relation to residential amenity.

Highways

Policy 19 of the BoRLP4 encourages development in accessible locations, reducing the need to travel by car and Policy 20 of the BoRLP4 sets out a number of transport requirements for new development including parking standards. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

The Highways Officer has reviewed the proposal and has noted that the host property, similar to all other dwellings in the area, has communal courtyard parking. This pre-existing arrangement will remain the same for the converted flats and the Highways Officer has confirmed that he considers this acceptable in this instance. Having regard to the car parking space standards set out in Worcestershire County Council's Streetscape Design Guide, a one-bedroomed flat should provide one parking space and a two-bedroomed flat should provide two parking spaces, totalling an overall provision of three spaces. With regards to the existing four-bedroomed dwelling, this requires a total of three spaces also. Therefore, whilst the parking area is shared with other dwellings, the parking space requirement for the proposal site would not change as a result of the development and should not have a material impact on local parking pressure.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

As noted earlier in the report, the site is also considered to be in a sustainable and accessible location. Future occupiers would be able to walk to facilities such as schools, a nursery, pharmacy, church, pub, shop and takeaways. The site is also in close proximity to bus stops which offer a regular service to Redditch Town Centre. The future occupiers would therefore be able to carry out day to day living and get to places of work without the need of a car.

Given the nearby shared parking area and the sustainable location of the site, the proposal is therefore considered to be compliant with Policy 19 and Policy 20 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan no. 4. Having regard to paragraph 115 of the NPPF there are also no unacceptable highway safety impacts or severe impacts on the road network resulting from the proposal that would warrant refusal of the application. The Highways Officer has, however, recommended a condition for the provision of cycle parking facilities should planning permission be granted.

Other Matters

No other technical matters have been raised during the course of this application.

Cllr Spilsbury the local ward member raised concerns that parking is limited within the local area and the proposed two flats would likely generate more vehicles than the existing dwelling. This matter has been considered above, where it has been concluded that the proposed flats should generate the same number of vehicles as the existing four-bedroomed dwelling and therefore should not affect the existing parking arrangements. Furthermore it is not considered that the proposal would lead to any unacceptable highways impact that would warrant refusal of this application.

Conclusion

The proposal would create an additional residential unit which would make a valuable contribution towards Redditch's housing stock and would make efficient use of land, as supported by Policy 5 of the BoRLP 4. The proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and external alterations would be relatively minor and would be in keeping with the local surroundings. In view of the minor changes to the exterior of the property, there would be no detrimental impact to residential amenity of neighbours. In view of the provision of outdoor space shared between the two flats, it would provide a good standard of amenity for the future occupiers. Whilst no private parking is provided for the new flats, this is a pre-existing situation, and the proposed flats should not place a greater strain on the shared parking areas than the existing dwelling. The site also lies in an accessible location to services which can be reached by foot or public transport. No objections have been received from technical consultees and no objections have been received from neighbouring residents.

Therefore, having regard to all material planning considerations, including those raised by the local ward member, it is considered that planning permission should be granted subject to conditions.

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:

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:

Site Location/Block Plan at scale 1:500 - job no. 24/30 drawing no. 01
Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations - job no. 24/30 drawing no. 03

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

- 3) The Development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until sheltered and secure cycle parking for one bicycle for the one-bedroom flat and two bicycles for the two-bedroom flat had been provided on site. Thereafter the cycle parking shall be kept available for the parking of bicycles only.

Reason: To comply with the Worcestershire County Council's streetscape design guide.

Procedural Matters

This application is being reported to the Planning Committee at the request of the local ward councillor.