

## MINUTES

### Present:

Councillor Andrew Fry (Chair), Councillor William Boyd (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Brandon Clayton, Claire Davies, Bill Hartnett, David Munro and Jen Snape

### Officers:

Helena Plant and Amar Hussain

### Democratic Services Officers:

Gavin Day

### 27. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sid Khan.

### 28. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

### 29. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2024 were presented to Members.

### **RESOLVED that**

**the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2024 were approved as a true and accurate record and signed by the Chair.**

### 30. UPDATE REPORTS

The Chair Announced that there was an update report in relation to Agenda item 5 (Minute No31).

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 were noted.

**31. 24/00717/OUT - IPSLEY HOUSE, IPSLEY CHURCH LANE, IPSLEY, REDDITCH, B98 0AJ**

This application was reported to Planning Committee for determination because the application was for major development. Further, 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 14 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application sought outline planning permission for the demolition of Ipsley House, Ipsley Church Lane, Ipsley, Redditch, B98 0AJ and the construction of residential dwellings.

Officers clarified for Members that it was an outline application and that they were asked to determine the principle of development and means of access to the site only. All other matters were reserved and would be considered under a later detailed application at a future Committee meeting.

The site location was detailed on pages 6 to 9 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack. The locations of Ipsley Court (to the east), Shottery close (to the North) and St.Peters Church (South east) were also identified.

Although the local plan detailed on page 10 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack identified the land as primary employment space, Officers were satisfied that the site had been suitably marketed with no success. Members were informed that permission had been granted for the conversion of the building to 79 apartments under application 24/00430/CUPRIO

Officers detailed that the existing access shown on page 12 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack would need to be amended, the proposed new access was shown on pages 13 and 14. The reason for the change was to permit room for a public footpath to be included (shown in blue), however, due to nearby tree root systems it was deemed better to move the access slightly to accommodate the addition.

Officers drew Members attention to pages 5 to 7 of the Update Reports pack and highlighted the amendments to conditions 1, 5 and 6. Officers further proposed an additional Condition 13 requiring the submission of details of the mix of type and size of dwellings to be provided prior to the submission of any reserved matters application.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr Steve Williams, an interested party, addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Mr David Fovargue, the applicant's agent, also addressed the Committee in support.

The following was clarified after questions from Members.

- That the application was an outline application and that the only points to be determined were the access to the site and principle of development.
- In line with current guidance of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), there was little that could be done to enforce a passive house standard.
- A detailed planning application would need to demonstrate that dwelling to dwelling separation distances would be in accordance with the Councils Supplementary Planning Document, High Quality Design.
- The development was eligible under the vacant building credit scheme, therefore, there may be no requirement for affordable housing under the full application. However, the specific requirement would depend on the total floor space of the dwellings.
- Condition 7 covered the construction management plan which would have consideration to the operation and activities conducted at St.Peters Church.
- A 10% biodiversity net gain would be required under the full application; however, this figure would not have regard to the demolition of the existing building.

Members then debated the application.

Some Members expressed an opinion that it would have been better to utilise the existing building, however, they accepted that the Borough was also in need of 2-4 bedroom dwellings which would be provided by the development.

The highway access and impact on traffic was discussed by Members, however, Officers noted that Worcestershire County Council, Highways raised no objection to the principle of the development.

Some concern was raised regarding the proposed re- wording of Conditions 1, 5 and 6 as set out in the update report and Councillor Jen Snape proposed an Alternative Recommendation which omitted the wording "with the exception of any demolition works". However, without a seconder the amendment was not carried.

Members expressed the opinion that they could not see any material planning reasons to warrant refusal of the application since

the proposal complied with all relevant policies. Therefore, on being put to a vote it was:

**RESOLVED that**

**having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, authority be delegated to the Assistant Director for Planning and Leisure Services to GRANT outline planning permission subject to:-**

- a) **The satisfactory completion of a S106 planning obligation.**
- b) **Conditions 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 as detailed on pages 31 to 35 of the Public Reports pack.**
- c) **Amended Conditions 1, 5 and 6 as detailed on pages 5 to 7 of the Update Reports pack**
- d) **The additional Condition 13 as detailed in the pre-amble above.**
- e) **informatives as detailed on pages 35 to 37 of the Public Reports pack.**

**32. 24/00740/S73 - DEVELOPMENT SITE AT, WEIGHTS LANE, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE**

This application was being 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 15 to 18 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for the Development Site at Weights Lane, Redditch, Worcestershire and sought the variation of Condition 35 of the hybrid planning permission 19/00977/HYB.

Condition 35 of the hybrid planning permission 19/00977/HYB stated that no more than 128 dwellings shall be occupied until the highway improvements on Dagnel End Road were complete. The application sought to increase that number to 200.

As the hybrid application was between Bromsgrove District and Redditch Borough Councils, approval was sought and required by both. Approval was given by the Bromsgrove District Planning Committee on 15<sup>th</sup> October 2024.

Officers detailed that the Worcestershire County Council (WCC), Highways Section 278 team had assessed the works and advised

that it would not be approved until March 2025. The WCC, Highways team further detailed that the impact of increasing from 128 to 200 dwellings was assessed which was identified to be 22 trips which and was within daily fluctuations. Therefore, there was deemed to be no significant impact and no objection was raised.

Finally, Officers detailed that a section Section 73 notice was not included in the original Section 106 legal agreement, therefore, a supplementary deed would also need to be obtained.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr Danis Miles, a local resident, addressed the Committee in objection to the application, additionally, Ms Elizabeth Wood, the applicant agent, addressed Members in support of the application.

The following was clarified following questions from Members.

- There was no consultation undertaken with local resident, however, one was not required under the application.
- That the 200 dwellings were the maximum permitted to be sold/occupied. It was not a requirement to start work and the work may be complete prior to reaching this value.
- Officers could not comment on/identify the source of the delay, only that the date was arrived at following discussions between WCC, Highways and the applicant.
- Cost incurred by raising the supplementary deed would be covered by the applicant.

During the debate of the application, Members expressed their displeasure that the works had not been completed. However, Members accepted that what was before them was an amendment to Condition 35 and that without objections from relevant consultees and given that BDC had already approved the application, there was no Material Planning reason for refusal.

On being put to a vote it was

**RESOLVED that**

**Delegated powers be granted to the Assistant Director for Planning and Leisure Services to Grant the Hybrid Planning Permission to:**

- a) determine the planning application following the receipt of a suitable and satisfactory legal mechanism and;**
- b) updated conditions relating to 19/00977/HYB and to agree the final scope, detailed wording and numbering of conditions.**

**33. 24/00839/S73 - DEVELOPMENT SITE AT, WEIGHTS LANE, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE**

This application was being 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 19 to 24 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for the Development Site at Weights Lane, Redditch, Worcestershire and sought the variation of Condition 4 (approved plans) of the hybrid planning permission 19/00977/HYB.

Condition 4 was the approved plans for the application, however, following additional assessments on differing ground levels a number of amendments were proposed. Officers drew Members attention to pages 22 and 23 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack which detailed the changes.

A number of two-bedroom dwellings would be changes to 1 bed maisonettes and there would be an orientation change to the last plot. Officers detailed that the overall number of dwellings would not change, nor would the allocation of affordable housing provided by the development.

Officers also detailed that a section Section 73 notice was not included in the original Section 106 legal agreement, therefore, a supplementary deed would also need to be obtained.

The following was clarified following questions from Members.

- That there would be a drop in supplied bed spaces by the development, however there was still a sufficient split between 1/2/3 and 4 bed dwellings over the site.
- That due to the movement of the access of the upper maisonette being at the side of the dwelling, a revised lighting plan may be needed, this was secured under Condition 11.

On being put to a vote it was

**RESOLVED that**

**Having had regard to the development plan and to all other material planning considerations, authority be delegated to the**

**Assistant Director for Planning and Leisure Services to Grant outline planning permission subject to:**

- a) determine the planning application following the receipt of a suitable and satisfactory legal mechanism and ;**
- b) updated conditions relating to 19/00977/HYB and to agree the final scope, detailed wording and numbering of conditions.**

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm  
and closed at 8.10 pm