



# Planning Committee

Thursday, 12th September,  
2024

## MINUTES

### Present:

Councillor Andrew Fry (Chair), Councillor William Boyd (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Brandon Clayton, James Fardoe, Bill Hartnett, Jen Snape, Gemma Monaco, Sharon Harvey and Sachin Mathur

### Officers:

Helena Plant, Charlotte Wood, David Kelly, David Edmonds, Amar Hussain and Sukvinder Agimal (of Worcestershire County Council, Highways)

### Democratic Services Officers:

Gavin Day

### 13. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors David Munro and Juma Begum with Councillors Sharon Harvey and Sachin Mathur in attendance as substitutes respectively.

### 14. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

### 15. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on 18<sup>th</sup> July 2024 and 15<sup>th</sup> August 2024 were presented to Members.

#### **RESOLVED that**

**the minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on 18<sup>th</sup> July 2024 and 15<sup>th</sup> August 2024 were approved as true and accurate records and signed by the Chair.**

### 16. UPDATE REPORTS

The Chair Announced that there was an update report in relation to Agenda items 5 and 6 (Minute No17 and No18).

Chair

Members were given a few minutes to read the report, after which Members indicated they were happy to proceed and moved that the Update reports be noted.

The Chair also announced that Agenda item 8 (minute No19) had been deferred to a future Planning Committee meeting, pending the assessment of a late representation submitted.

**17. 23/00543/FUL - CONWIL, DAGNELL END ROAD, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B98 9BD**

The application was being reported to the Planning Committee because eleven (or more) objections had been received and the recommendation was for approval. Additionally, part of the land which was subject to the application, was within the ownership of Worcestershire County Council (WCC). As such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 5 to 16 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for Conwil, Dagnell End Road, Redditch, Worcestershire, B98 9BD and sought the demolition of an existing dwelling and the erection of 6 houses with associated access, parking and landscaping.

Officers drew Members attention to the site location plan detailed on page 7 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack; the area of land which was in ownership of WCC that needed to be sold to accommodate the development was identified. Officers further detailed that the development site was not specifically designated as land for housing in the Local Plan. However, as there was an existing dwelling on the site, which would be demolished if approval was given, the site use was deemed acceptable.

The Protected trees were identified by Officers using the Proposed Site Plan image on page 8 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack. Officers further identified the access to each property and it was noted that dwelling number 5 would have a different point of access to plots 1-4 & 6.

Construction traffic for the development would predominately access from the north of the site from the entrance off of Dagnell End Road, as detailed under the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), this was confirmed by the applicant and would be secured under Condition 16 detailed on pages 33 and 34 of the Public Reports pack.

At the invitation of the Chair, Karen Ashley, an interested party and Councillor Monica Stringfellow, Ward Member, spoke in objection to the development. Altime Elias, the Applicant's Agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The following was clarified after questions from Members:

- That Dagnel end road could not be used as the access for all the dwellings due to restricted viewing distance cause by the protected trees.
- Previous applications for the site were rejected due to a number of reasons which included the loss of open space, the use of the land, access problems and that the loss of open space did not outweigh the proposed development.
- Ecological surveys had been carried out, no concerns were raised and there was no objection from consultees, subject to suitable Conditions.
- All access for construction traffic was to be via Dagnel End Road which would be safely managed by the use of Banksmen and/or Temporary traffic lights. As the disruption would only be during construction, Officers deemed that the measures were acceptable.

The WCC, Highways Officer in attendance clarified for Members that it would not be possible to attain the required safe viewing distances for access/egress onto Dagnel end road for all the dwellings. The westward viewing distance was acceptable; however, tree obstructions prevented a safe viewing distance eastwardly. It was further noted by Officers that even with a speed reduction, it would not be possible to attain the required viewing distances. However, due to the current access for the property on the site, which was off Dagnel End Road, Officers deemed it acceptable for a single dwelling to retain this access point.

Officers confirmed that the proposed access onto the development via Berkswell Close was assessed and deemed suitable and that no problem areas which would hinder the access for emergency or refuse vehicles were identified.

Members then debated the application which Officers recommended for approval.

Some Members expressed a concern with the application and the impact that it would have on Berkswell close, however, after lengthy debate, Members accepted that without objections from the relevant consultee and with access via Dagnel End Road not being viable, there were no grounds to refuse the application on highway matters.

The concerns in regard to access notwithstanding, Members generally expressed supported the application 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:**

- a) **Conditions and Informatives outlined on pages 29 to 35 of the Public Reports pack**
- b) **amendments to Conditions 2 and 14 as detailed on page 5 of the Update Reports pack.**

With the approval of the Chair, there was a short adjournment between 20:08 and 20:16 hours.

**18. 24/00631/FUL - LAND AT BATTENS CLOSE, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B98 7HY**

This application was being reported to the Planning Committee because the number of objections received exceeded that which could be considered by Officers.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 17 to 25 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for the Land at Battens Close, Redditch, Worcestershire, B98 7HY and sought the change of use of two residential dwellings from class C3 (dwellinghouse) to Class C2 (residential institution).

Officers drew Members's attention to page 20 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack and identified the location for the application. The positions of the local dwellings and school were also highlighted by Officers.

There were no alterations to either dwelling proposed in the application, the application only sought to change the Class use from C3 to C2.

It was proposed that the dwellings would each have 1-2 children between 7 and 17 years of age living on site. There would be a shift pattern for the carers, the day shift would be 08:00 to 20:00 hours, changing over with a night shift 20:00 to 08:00 hours. There would be regular inspections by Ofsted to assess the running of the residential institution.

In addressing the concerns raised during the public consultation, Officers highlighted that the application was only before Members due to the change of use, if the primary carers lived on site, then there would be no change of use and the application would not be before the committee.

It was further addressed that there had not been any objections raised by consultees which included Worcestershire Regulatory Services (WRS) in regard to noise and nuisance.

At the invitation of the Chair, a number of local residents addressed the Committee in objection, Ian Cutts spoke in person, Maurice Court addressed the Committee via a video link and statements by Tim Hingston and Nigel Clarke were read out by Officers. Peter Icke, the Applicant's Agent and Junaid Butt, of TJY Care Ltd. addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The following was clarified by Officers following questions from Members.

- That there would be up to two staff on site in each of the dwellings during the day and the night.
- That there were no proposed gates at the entrance to Battens Close, the gates were situated closer to the property.
- That details for the refuse collection area would be submitted by the applicant and an additional Condition (9) would cover their provision detailed on page 5 of the Update Reports pack.

Members then proceeded to debate the application which Officers had recommended for approval.

A general support for the application was voiced by Members, stating that the Council had a duty to house children in a safe environment. It was also stated that the change of use from C3 to C2 was a small part of the residential homes getting approval and that Ofsted would be in regular contact with the site and would determine if the site was performing adequately and safely.

Members expressed the opinion that although the shift handover could present some disruption, it was not known how the carers would arrive for work and that not all may drive so the impact on local parking was unknown.

The possibility of attaching a Condition to the application to clarify the number of carers on site at any one time was discussed, however, Members expressed the opinion that how the site was run would be a management decision which would be decided in

conjunction with Ofsted and thus a condition would not be advisable.

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:**

- a) **Conditions 1 to 8 as outlined on pages 48 to 49 of the Public Reports pack**
- b) **The additional Condition 9 as detailed on page 5 of the Update Reports pack.**

With the approval of the Chair, there was a short adjournment between 21:08 and 21:13 hours.

**19. 24/00387/FUL - LAND SOUTH OF, ASTWOOD LANE, FECKENHAM, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B96 6HP**

The Chair announced that the application had been deferred to a future meeting of the Planning Committee. The reason for the deferral was to give Officers a suitable amount of time to consider and address concerns raised in a last-minute representation submitted by Feckenham Parish Council.

**20. 24/00576/S73 - HIGHFIELD HOUSE, HEADLESS CROSS DRIVE, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B97 5EQ**

This application was reported to Planning Committee for determination because the application was for major development and as such the application fell outside the Scheme of Delegation to Officers.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 35 to 44 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for Highfield House, Headless Cross Drive, Redditch, Worcestershire, B97 5EQ and sought minor material amendments in relation to Condition 2 of the original planning permission 23/00576/S73

Officers detailed the extent of the amendments proposed in that

- The window frame material was to be changed from aluminium to Dark Grey

- Insulating brick panels would be installed between the windows.
- The retaining walls being changed from Brick to concrete walls with composite and wood cladding.

Officers identified the site location detailed on page 36 of the Site Plans and Presentation pack and highlighted that Officers had designated the North elevation as the front of the site in the report and the South elevation as the back.

The purpose of the amendments was to give the development a look similar to a set of flats rather than an office block which was designed to give it a sleeker less imposing look.

It was clarified following questions from Members, that building regulations would cover the fire-resistant properties of materials, therefore, Conditions would not normally be used to control this as it would duplicate aspects covered under different regimes. However, Officers assured Members that it would be a consideration for building regulations, which would ensure all materials are of a safe and suitable nature.

Members then debated the application which Officers had recommended for approval.

Members were broadly in support the amendments to the design and expressed the opinion that the amendments would enhance the building and development. 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 and informatives outlined on pages 69 to 70 of the Public Reports pack.**

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm  
and closed at 8.00 pm