

Planning Committee

Tue 9 Nov
2010
7.00 pm

Council Chamber
Town Hall
Redditch



www.redditchbc.gov.uk

Access to Information - Your Rights

The Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 widened the rights of press and public to attend Local Authority meetings and to see certain documents. Recently the Freedom of Information Act 2000, has further broadened these rights, and limited exemptions under the 1985 Act.

Your main rights are set out below:-

- Automatic right to attend all formal Council and Committee meetings unless the business would disclose confidential or “exempt” information.
- Automatic right to inspect agendas and public reports at least five days before the date of the meeting.
- Automatic right to inspect minutes of the Council and its Committees

(or summaries of business undertaken in private) for up to six years following a meeting.

- Automatic right to inspect lists of background papers used in the preparation of public reports.
- Access, on request, to the background papers on which reports are based for a period of up to four years from the date of the meeting.
- Access to a public register stating the names and addresses and electoral areas of all Councillors with details of the membership of all Committees etc.

A reasonable number of copies of agendas and reports relating to items to be considered in public must be made available to the public attending meetings of the Council and its, Committees etc.

- Access to a list specifying those powers which the Council has delegated to its Officers indicating also the titles of the Officers concerned.
- Access to a summary of the rights of the public to attend meetings of the Council and its Committees etc. and to inspect and copy documents.
- In addition, the public now has a right to be present when the Council determines “Key Decisions” unless the business would disclose confidential or “exempt” information.
- Unless otherwise stated, most items of business before the Executive Committee are Key Decisions.
- Copies of Agenda Lists are published in advance of the meetings on the Council’s Website:

www.redditchbc.gov.uk

If you have any queries on this Agenda or any of the decisions taken or wish to exercise any of the above rights of access to information, please contact the following:

Janice Smyth

**Member and Committee Support Services Assistant
Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH**

Tel: (01527) 64252 Ext. 3266 Fax: (01527) 65216

e.mail: janice.smyth@redditchbc.gov.uk

Minicom: 595528

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL **PLANNING COMMITTEE**



GUIDANCE ON PUBLIC **SPEAKING**

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 follows:

in accordance with the running order detailed in this agenda (Applications for Planning Permission item) and updated by the separate Update report:

- 1) Introduction of application by Chair
- 2) Officer presentation of the report (as originally printed; updated in the later Update Report; and updated orally by the Planning Officers at the meeting).
- 3) Councillors' questions to the Officers - to clarify detail.
- 4) Public Speaking - in the following order:-
 - a) Objectors to speak on the application;
 - b) Supporters to speak on application;
 - c) Applicant to speak on application.

Speakers will be called in the order they have notified their interest in speaking to the Planning Officers (by the 4.00 p.m. deadline on the Friday before the meeting) and invited to the table or lectern.

- Each individual speaker, or group representative, will have up to a maximum of 3 minutes to speak. (Please press button on "conference unit" to activate microphone.)
 - After each of a), b) and c) above, Members may put relevant questions to the speaker, for clarification. (Please remain at the table in case of questions.)
- 5) Members' questions to the Officers and formal debate / determination.

Notes:

- 1) 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.2, the County Structure Plan (comprising the Development Plan) 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.
- 2) No audio recording, filming, video recording or photography, etc. of any part of this meeting is permitted without express consent (Section 100A(7) of the Local Government Act 1972).
- 3) Once the formal meeting opens, members of the public are requested to remain within the Public Gallery and may only address Committee Members and Officers via the formal public speaking route.
- 4) 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 5.00 p.m. on the Friday before the meeting.
- 5) Anyone wishing to address the Planning Committee on applications on this agenda must notify Planning Officers by 5.00 p.m. on the Friday before the meeting.

Further assistance:

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

At the meeting, these Officers will normally be seated either side of the Chair.

The Chair’s place is at the front left-hand corner of the Committee table as viewed from the Public Gallery.

Welcome to today's meeting.

Guidance for the Public

Agenda Papers

The **Agenda List** at the front of the Agenda summarises the issues to be discussed and is followed by the Officers' full supporting **Reports**.

Chair

The Chair is responsible for the proper conduct of the meeting. Generally to one side of the Chair is the Committee Support Officer who gives advice on the proper conduct of the meeting and ensures that the debate and the decisions are properly recorded. On the Chair's other side are the relevant Council Officers. The Councillors ("Members") of the Committee occupy the remaining seats around the table.

Running Order

Items will normally be taken in the order printed but, in particular circumstances, the Chair may agree to vary the order.

Refreshments : tea, coffee and water are normally available at meetings - please serve yourself.

Decisions

Decisions at the meeting will be taken by the **Councillors** who are the democratically elected representatives. They are advised by **Officers** who are paid professionals and do not have a vote.

Members of the Public

Members of the public may, by prior arrangement, speak at meetings of the Council or its Committees. Specific procedures exist for Appeals Hearings or for meetings involving Licence or Planning Applications. For further information on this point, please speak to the Committee Support Officer.

Special Arrangements

If you have any particular needs, please contact the Committee Support Officer.

Infra-red devices for the hearing impaired are available on request at the meeting. Other facilities may require prior arrangement.

Further Information

If you require any further information, please contact the Committee Support Officer (see foot of page opposite).

Fire/ Emergency instructions

If the alarm is sounded, please leave the building by the nearest available exit – these are clearly indicated within all the Committee Rooms.

If you discover a fire, inform a member of staff or operate the nearest alarm call point (wall mounted red rectangular box). In the event of the fire alarm sounding, leave the building immediately following the fire exit signs. Officers have been appointed with responsibility to ensure that all visitors are escorted from the building.

Do Not stop to collect personal belongings.

Do Not use lifts.

Do Not re-enter the building until told to do so.

The emergency Assembly Area is on Walter Stranz Square.

Declaration of Interests: Guidance for Councillors

DO I HAVE A "PERSONAL INTEREST" ?

- Where the item relates or is likely to affect your **registered interests** (what you have declared on the formal Register of Interests)

OR

- Where a decision in relation to the item might reasonably be regarded as affecting **your own** well-being or financial position, or that of your **family**, or your **close associates** more than most other people affected by the issue,

you have a personal interest.

WHAT MUST I DO? **Declare the existence, and nature, of your interest and stay**

- The declaration must relate to specific business being decided - a general scattergun approach is not needed
- **Exception** - where interest arises only because of your membership of another **public body**, there is no need to declare unless you **speak** on the matter.
- You **can vote** on the matter.

IS IT A "PREJUDICIAL INTEREST" ?

In general only if:-

- It is a personal interest **and**
- The item affects your **financial position** (or conveys other benefits), or the position of your **family, close associates** or bodies through which you have a **registered interest** (or relates to the exercise of **regulatory functions** in relation to these groups)

and

- A member of public, with knowledge of the relevant facts, would reasonably believe the interest was likely to **prejudice** your judgement of the public interest.

WHAT MUST I DO? **Declare and Withdraw**

BUT you may make representations to the meeting before withdrawing, **if** the public have similar rights (such as the right to speak at Planning Committee).



Planning Committee

9th November 2010

7.00 pm

Council Chamber Town Hall

Agenda

Membership:

Cllrs: Michael Chalk (Chair) Bill Hartnett
Nigel Hicks (Vice-Chair) Roger Hill
Peter Anderson Robin King
Kath Banks Wanda King
Brandon Clayton

1. Apologies	To receive apologies for absence and details of any Councillor nominated to attend the meeting in place of a member of the Committee.
2. Declarations of Interest	To invite Councillors to declare any interest they may have in the items on the Agenda.
3. Confirmation of Minutes (Pages 1 - 6)	To confirm, as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 12th October 2010. (Minutes attached)
4. Planning Application 2010/216/FUL and Listed Building Consent Application 2010/217/LBC - 5 Chapel Court (Pages 7 - 10)	To consider a Planning Application and Listed Building Consent Application for a proposed change of use from offices to four self contained one bedroom flats. Applicant: Mr P Eagles (Report attached – Site Plan under separate cover) (Astwood Bank & Feckenham Ward)
5. Planning Application 2010/228/FUL - Abbey Hotel Golf and Country Club, Dagnell End Road, (Pages 11 - 18)	To consider a Planning Application for improvements to leisure facilities at an existing driving range, replacement of single storey range building with two storey building to increase golfing bays to 31, improvements to range green to include lake and lighting system, provision of ancillary car parking, access, landscaping and security measure. Applicant: RSM Leisure Ltd (Report attached – Site Plan under separate cover) (Abbey Ward)

Planning

Committee

9th November 2010

<p>6. Planning Application 2010/231/RC3 - Blythe Close, Crabbs Cross (Pages 19 - 22)</p>	<p>To consider a Planning Application for environmental enhancements through the redesign of existing infrastructure to create additional car parking spaces.</p> <p>Applicant: Redditch Borough Council</p> <p>(Report attached – Site Plan under separate cover)</p> <p>(Crabbs Cross Ward)</p>
<p>7. Planning Application 2010/234/FUL - 15 Hollowfields Close, Southcrest (Pages 23 - 26)</p>	<p>To consider a Planning Application for a first floor side extension, two storey extension to accommodate a lift and internal alterations to provide accommodation for child with disabilities.</p> <p>Applicant: Mr D Hoult</p> <p>(Report attached – Site Plan under separate cover)</p> <p>(Central Ward)</p>
<p>8. Planning Application 2010/244/COU - Unit 9 Matchborough Centre, Matchborough Way (Pages 27 - 32)</p>	<p>To consider a retrospective Planning Application for change of use from A1 (Retail) to mixed A3 (Café/Restaurant) and A5 (Hood Food Takeaway) use.</p> <p>Applicant: Mrs L Paskeviciene</p> <p>(Report attached – Site Plan under separate cover)</p> <p>(Matchborough Ward)</p>
<p>9. Appeal Outcome - Land adjacent to 31 Wheatcroft Close, Brockhill (Pages 33 - 34)</p>	<p>To receive and note a report detailing the outcome of an appeal made against the refusal of a Planning Application in relation to the erection of a proposed three bedroom end of terrace dwelling with associated parking.</p> <p>(Report attached)</p> <p>(Batchley & Brockhill Ward)</p>

10. Exclusion of the Public	<p>During the course of the meeting it may be necessary, in the opinion of the Chief Executive, to consider excluding the public from the meeting on the grounds that exempt information is likely to be divulged. It may be necessary, therefore, to move the following resolution:</p> <p>“that, under S.100 I of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following matter(s) on the grounds that it/they involve(s) the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the relevant paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) of the said Act, as amended.</p>
11. Confidential Matters (if any)	<p>To deal with any exceptional matters necessary to consider after the exclusion of the public (none notified to date.)</p>



Planning Committee

12th October 2010

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Michael Chalk (Chair), and Councillors Peter Anderson, Brandon Clayton, Adam Griffin, Malcolm Hall, Bill Hartnett, Roger Hill, Robin King and Wanda King

Also Present:

M Collins (Standards Committee Observer)

Officers:

R Bamford, S Edden, C Felton, C Flanagan, A Rutt and S Skinner

Committee Services Officer:

J Smyth

38. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors K Banks and N Hicks.

39. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Chalk declared personal but not prejudicial interests in relation to Planning Applications 2010/166/FUL (Land at former Mayfields Works, The Mayfields) and 2010/194/OUT (Upper Norgrove House, Church Road, Webheath), as detailed separately at Minutes 41 and 42 respectively, below.

Councillor Hall declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in relation to Planning Application 2010/166/FUL (Land at former Mayfields Works, The Mayfields) as detailed separately at Minute 41 below.

Councillor B Clayton declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in relation to Planning Application 2010/213/FUL and Listed Building Consent Application 2010/214/LBC (The Cedars Nursing Home, Cedar Park Road, Batchley) as detailed separately at Minute 44 below.

.....
Chair

40. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 14th September 2010 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**41. PLANNING APPLICATION 2010/166/FUL –
LAND AT FORMER MAYFIELDS WORKS, THE MAYFIELDS**

Residential development of 23 apartments
and associated landscaping
Applicant: Mr A Coupe

Mr J Stanley, objector and Mr R Ranford, the Applicant's Agent, addressed the Committee under the Council's public speaking rules.

RESOLVED that

having regard to the Development Plan and to all other material considerations, Planning Permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- 1) the shortfall in parking provision relative to the maximum standard is considered to be so significant that it would be likely to result in the displacement of parking onto surrounding highways where this is an existing on-street parking problem. Therefore, it would be likely to result in a danger to highway safety by exacerbating the existing problem, and would be contrary to Policy CT12 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3 and PPG13; and**
- 2) the lack of provision of affordable housing proposed, despite the supporting information regarding viability, is not considered to be acceptable in this case and would be likely to cause a detrimental impact on the supply of housing of this type in the future, contrary to Policies CS6, CS5 and B(HSG)5 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3 and to the adopted SPG document Affordable housing Provision.**

(This decision was taken contrary to Officers' recommendation for the reasons stated above.)

(Prior to consideration of this item, and in accordance with the requirements of Section 81 of the Local Government Act 2000, Councillor Chalk declared a personal but not prejudicial interest as he was acquainted with one of the public speakers, namely, Mr J Stanley.

During consideration of this item, Councillor Hall declared a personal but not prejudicial interest as he also was personally acquainted with Mr J Stanley.)

**42. PLANNING APPLICATION 2010/194/OUT –
UPPER NORGROVE HOUSE, CHURCH ROAD, WEBHEATH**

Outline Planning Application for residential development
Applicant: Redditch Borough Council

The following people addressed the Committee under the Council's public speaking rules:

Mr D Rose – Objector
Mr M Philpotts – Objector
Mr A Wharby – Objector
Mrs Clulow – Objector
Ms V Kendrick – on behalf of CPRE
Mr B Sinclair – Objector
Mr A Bedford-Smith – Objector
County Councillor D Thain - Objector
Mr McQuaid – Objector
Mr M Williams – Agent for the Applicant

RESOLVED that

having regard to the Development Plan and to all other material considerations, Outline Planning Permission be REFUSED for the following reason:

“The application site forms part of a larger area of land reserved for future development beyond 2011, where decisions on its development before then must have regard for the countryside policies. It is therefore considered that it would be contrary to Policies B(RA)3 and B(RA)2 to allow this development on this site at this time.”

(This decision was taken contrary to Officers' recommendation for the reason provided above.)

(During consideration of this item, and in accordance with the requirements of Section 81 of the Local Government Act 2000,

Councillor Chalk declared a personal but not prejudicial interest as he was acquainted with one of the public speakers, namely, Mr A Bedford-Smith.)

**43. PLANNING APPLICATION 2010/207/FUL –
FORMER METAL PRESSINGS, STUDLEY ROAD, LODGE PARK**

Retention of existing office block,
demolition of existing low level warehousing and
construction of new warehouse with
associated HGV parking area
Applicant: Langdon Industries Ltd

RESOLVED that

having regard to the Development Plan and to all other material considerations, Planning Permission be GRANTED, subject to the conditions and informatives summarised in the main report but subject to Condition 3 being amended to read:

“3. Landscaping to be enhanced within the boundary of the site.”

**44. PLANNING APPLICATION 2010/213/FUL AND
LISTED BUILDING CONSENT APPLICATION 2010/214/LBC -
THE CEDARS NURSING HOME, CEDAR PARK ROAD,
BATCHLEY**

Planning Application and Listed Building Consent
for a two-Storey extension to rear of existing
building to provide nine single rooms and
associated facilities and new visitors car park
Applicant: Mr Robert Delaney

RESOLVED that

having regard to the Development Plan and to all other material considerations,

1) Planning Permission be GRANTED, subject to the conditions and informatives summarised in the main report and the following additional conditions:

“5. Tree protection details to be agreed prior to implementation of car parking to front garden area; and

6. Limit hours of construction”; and

- 2) **Listed Building Consent be GRANTED, subject to the conditions and informatives summarised in the main report.**

(During consideration of this item, and in accordance with the requirements of Section 81 of the Local Government Act 2000, Councillor B Clayton declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in view of the fact that he was acquainted with the applicant.)

45. ENFORCEMENT REPORT 2009/047/ENF AND 2010/070/ENF - GRANGE WORKS, GRANGE ROAD, ST GEORGES

Insertion of UPVC windows into a Listed Building

RESOLVED that

in relation to a breach of Planning Control, namely the insertion of UPVC windows to a Listed Building, authority be delegated to the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services, in consultation with the Head of Planning and Regeneration, to take the following actions:

- 1) **a Listed Building Enforcement Notice, alleging the unauthorised insertion of UPVC windows, be issued; and**
- 2) **legal proceedings be instigated in the Magistrates Court in the event of any failure to comply with the Notice.**

46. ENFORCEMENT REPORT 2007/097/ENF – 63 FELTON CLOSE, MATCHBOROUGH

Condition of property

RESOLVED that

in relation to a breach of Planning Control in respect of the overgrown condition of the front and rear of the property, authority be delegated to the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services, in consultation with the Head of Planning and Regeneration, to take the following actions:

- 1) **the appointment of Contractors to carry out the works specified in the served Section 215 Notice, namely the clearing of all overgrown vegetation from the front and rear gardens, including any growing on the wall of the property; and**

Planning Committee

12th October 2010

- 2) **Legal Services Officers be instructed to take all necessary steps to secure the recovery of all costs incurred by the placing of a charge on the property.**

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 9.00 pm

.....
CHAIR

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

PLANNING APPLICATION 2010/216/FUL AND 2010/217/LBC

CHANGE OF USE FROM OFFICES TO FOUR SELF CONTAINED ONE
BEDROOM FLATS

5 CHAPEL COURT, CHAPEL ROAD, ASTWOOD BANK

APPLICANT: MR P EAGLES

EXPIRY DATE: 12TH NOVEMBER 2010

WARD: ASTWOOD BANK & FECKENHAM

The author of this report is Nina Chana, Planning Officer (DC), who can be contacted on extension 3206 (e-mail: nina.chana@redditchbc.gov.uk) for more information.

(See additional papers for Site Plan)

Site Description

The application site contains a detached building which is a Grade 2 Listed Building built in 1822. The building was originally a Baptist Church and was granted planning consent to be converted into offices in 1990. It is constructed of red bricks, slate tiles and a decorative ridge. The building is rectangular in plan and sits very prominently in the street scene. The front elevation of the building has a recessed open porch area which is supported either side by stone pillars, leading into the premises by means of large timber double doors.

Proposal Description

The applicant seeks Listed Building Consent and Planning Permission for the conversion of the front part of the building to one bedroom apartments. The intention is to have two apartments on the ground floor and two on the first floor. The exterior fabric of the building would remain undisturbed as all the changes would result from internal works.

Relevant Key Policies:

All planning applications must be considered in terms of the planning policy framework and all other relevant material considerations (as set out in the legislative framework). The planning policies noted below can be found on the following websites:

www.communities.gov.uk

www.wmra.gov.uk

www.worcestershire.gov.uk

www.redditchbc.gov.uk

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

National Planning Policy

PPS1 (& accompanying documents) Delivering sustainable development
PPS5 Planning for the historic environment

Worcestershire County Structure Plan

CTC.19 Areas and Features of Historic and Architectural Significance

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3

B(BE).13 Qualities of Good Design
B(BE).14 Alterations and Extensions

Supplementary Planning Guidance / Supplementary Planning Documents

Encouraging Good Design

Public Consultation responses

Responses against

Eight comments received raising the following points:

- Loss of privacy from existing windows to neighbouring residential properties
- Increase in parking in Chapel Road
- Loss of trees
- Disturbance from noise to adjacent businesses
- Waste collection facilities
- Littering and damage to cars
- Devaluation of commercial property

The last two points are not material planning considerations and so cannot be taken into account when determining this application.

Consultee responses

Conservation Adviser

No objections – but suggests a slight change in the layout on the first floor to avoid blanking a window.

Procedural matters

This application would normally be assessed under the delegated powers granted to the Head of Planning and Regeneration, but is being reported to committee as we have received more than two objections.

The works proposed here require planning permission because they do not fall within the Permitted Development Rights granted by the relevant legislation. Listed Building Consent applications should be considered in terms of their impact on the architectural and historic importance of the building and its reason for listed status whilst the full range of material considerations apply to the planning application.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

Assessment of PLANNING APPLICATION proposal

Principle

The building is a Grade 2 Listed Building and lies within Astwood Bank. The principle of converting part of the building to four one bedroom apartments is considered to be acceptable, subject to the consideration of the details.

Design and layout

It is considered that nature of the proposal would be sympathetic to the building and its surroundings, such that it complies with the relevant policy criteria.

Due to its location, separation and orientation, it is considered that this development would cause no harm to the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties, and as such is acceptable.

Car Parking

There is a car park to the side of the building which has sufficient car parking spaces to accommodate cars in relation to the proposal, and therefore there are no concerns raised in this regard.

Bin Storage

There is already allocated space for bin storage adjacent to the car park. This space would be used to store the bins for the proposed apartments.

Trees and Landscape

There are a number of protected trees around the site. Issues have been raised about the loss of trees by objectors. This proposal would not result in any changes to the existing trees and landscaping on the site and therefore there are no concerns raised in relation to these matters.

Amenity Space

Whilst there is a requirement in the Council's Supplementary Guidance on Encouraging Good Design for the provision of amenity space and there is a shortfall of this in relation to this proposal, as there is sufficient parking and bin storage this is considered acceptable in this case and not considered to be of sufficient weight to warrant a recommendation for refusal.

Conclusion

The proposal has been designed sympathetically in relation to the existing building and its location and complies with policies within the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No 3 as well as others.

Assessment of LISTED BUILDING CONSENT proposal

The proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on the existing building, in that the partitioning of the space internally would result in minimal impact on the historic building both in terms of the impact on the fabric of the

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

building, and in terms of the appearance. The proposal does not involve any changes to the exterior of the building therefore there will be no change to the historic fabric and would not have a harmful effect on the appearance of the building from the street and other viewpoints. As such it is considered to comply with the relevant policy requirements and there appear to be no other material considerations to outweigh this.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered likely to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Listed Building and as such is compliant with local and national planning policy and regulatory requirements.

Recommendations

That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, Planning Permission be GRANTED subject to conditions and informatives as summarised below:

1. Development to commence within 3 years
2. As per plans

Informatives

1. Reason for approval

That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, Listed Building Consent be GRANTED subject to conditions and informatives as summarised below:

1. Development to commence within 3 years
2. As per plans

Informatives

- 1 Reason for approval

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

PLANNING APPLICATION 2010/228/FUL

IMPROVEMENTS TO LEISURE FACILITIES AT EXISTING DRIVING RANGE. REPLACEMENT OF SINGLE STOREY RANGE BUILDING WITH TWO STOREY BUILDING TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF GOLFING BAYS TO 31. IMPROVEMENTS TO RANGE GREEN TO INCLUDE LAKE & LIGHTING SYSTEM, PROVISION OF ANCILLARY CAR PARKING, ACCESS, LANDSCAPING AND SECURITY MEASURES

**ABBAY HOTEL GOLF AND COUNTRY CLUB, DAGNELL END ROAD,
REDDITCH**

**APPLICANT: RSM LEISURE LTD
EXPIRY DATE: 7TH DECEMBER 2010**

WARD: ABBEY

The author of this report is Ailith Rutt, Development Control Manager, who can be contacted on extension 3374 (e-mail: ailith.rutt@redditchbc.gov.uk) for more information.

(See additional papers for Site Plan)

Site Description

Existing large site containing hotel and leisure complex buildings to north western corner accessed from Hither Green Lane's western end, with a golf course wrapping around three sides (not the north) with a residential development of around 180 houses located in the middle of the golf course in a horse shoe shape. Within this shape are the first few holes of the golf course, and the remainder are on the outside of the horse shoe, to the south. Most residential properties are either not immediately adjacent to the golf course, or back onto it.

To the centre of the golf course is an existing driving range facility, with a covered area for golfers and a large grassed area to aim for, with markers etc. and to the south of the golf course is open space beyond which is Church Hill North and the Abbey Stadium site.

Proposal Description

This application proposes several elements which combine to form overall improvements to the existing driving range facility, as follows:

- To replace the existing driving range building with a larger, two storey building. The replacement building would be located 7m further forwards, in order to have a lower floor level and thus be set down within the landscape. It would be two storey, with bays at both levels. It would increase provision from 11 to 31 bays, with 15 at ground floor level and 16 at first floor level. There would be an entrance area with WC, stairs to first floor and ball dispensing facilities. The building would be of similar

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

materials to those of the existing hotel complex (brick and tile). The building would be fitted with modern golfing technology to increase the accessibility and appeal of the development to all golfers.

- To alter the green of the driving range by adding a lake to improve the drainage of the whole golf course site, adding greens to practice aiming at and by installing a lighting system. A floating green would be included within the lake, along with a facility for retrieving golf balls that land in the water. The lake would aid the natural drainage of the range, which has had some water retention issues previously at the far end. A bund would be added at the end of the golf range to screen the facility from neighbouring occupiers and help to keep balls within the range limits. The lighting proposed consists of four lamp columns within the parking area, each 6m tall, some within the range building at first floor level shining downwards and 16 low level bollard lights with a very directed beam in the range. This is a modern design of lighting that is proposed in order to minimise any light spill both horizontally and vertically, whilst being effective for its purpose. It is also proposed that the lighting would be illuminated only when necessary, and only between 8am and 10pm.
- The facility would be accessed using the existing track off Hither Green Lane, which would be improved and the sandy surfacing retained for drainage purposes. A barrier entry system well back from the highway would be installed, and an area for parking provided in front of the driving range building, between the existing hotel complex and the range which faces away from the hotel building. This area would accommodate 31 parking spaces and one disabled space, as well as secure covered cycle parking provision.
- Associated landscape improvements are also proposed and no trees are to be lost as a result of this development.

The application is supported by a Design & Access Statement, a planning statement, an ecological appraisal, a photographic schedule, a FRA, a tree assessment report and full details of the proposed lighting scheme.

Relevant Key Policies:

All planning applications must be considered in terms of the planning policy framework and all other relevant material considerations (as set out in the legislative framework). The planning policies noted below can be found on the following websites:

www.communities.gov.uk

www.worcestershire.gov.uk

www.redditchbc.gov.uk

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

National Planning Policy

PPS1 (& accompanying documents) Delivering sustainable development
 PPG17 Planning for open space, sport and recreation
 PPG24 Planning and noise
 PPS25 Development and flood risk

Worcestershire County Structure Plan

SD1 Prudent use of natural resources
 SD2 Care for the environment
 SD4 Minimising the need to travel
 CTC6 Green open spaces and corridors
 T1 Location of development
 T3 Managing car use
 T4 Car parking
 T10 Cycling and walking
 RST1 Criteria for the development of recreation and sports facilities

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3

CS1 Prudent use of natural resources
 CS2 Care for the environment
 CS7 The sustainable location of development
 CS8 Landscape character
 S1 Designing out crime
 BBE13 Qualities of good design
 BBE19 Green architecture
 BNE1a Trees, woodland and hedgerows
 CT12 Parking standards
 R1 Primarily open space

SPD: Designing for Community Safety

The site is wholly within an area designated as Primarily Open Space and within the Arrow Valley Park on the Local Plan proposals map. The site is identified as open space in use for sports provision within the typology of open space in the Local Plan.

Relevant Site Planning History

Appn. no	Proposal	Decision	Date
1987/580	Covered all weather practice and tuition facilities	Granted	15/8/1988

Other applications have been made in relation to the site as a whole, but this is the only one relating to this specific parcel of land.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

Public Consultation Responses

Responses in favour

Three comments received raising the following points:

- Would provide better facilities and allow for more coaching and junior opportunities
- Would mean juniors having to travel less far due to having to play outside education times – currently have to travel out of area out of school/college hours to go to a lit facility in the winter
- Would help to fill a hole in the market locally and meet some of the local demand that currently travels further

Responses against

Four comments received raising the following points:

- Small amount of existing noise disturbance is likely to increase
- Should provide a sound barrier
- Visual intrusion of two storey building at rear of residential properties
- Would cause disturbance in a densely populated area
- Light pollution
- Harm of lighting on local wildlife
- Increased traffic flows in residential area
- There was no lighting before so why allow it now?

Consultee Responses

County Highway Network Control

No objection subject to conditions regarding access and surfacing

Environmental Health

No objection subject to conditions regarding construction times and informatives regarding light and odour.

Landscape and Countryside Manager

No objection

Procedural matters

This application is reported to Planning Committee for determination because it falls within the major category and is recommended for approval.

Assessment of Proposal

The key issues for consideration in this case are as follows:

Principle

The improvement of existing sport and recreation facilities on the edge of settlements is supported in the local plan and the structure plan policies, providing that there are no other harmful effects to outweigh the support of a proposal. Therefore, the principle of the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in this case, and the details are considered below.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

Design and layout

The design of the proposed building is considered to be sympathetic to the existing built form on the site, and not substantially different from the existing driving range building. Whilst the building would be taller than the existing, its location on lower ground would mitigate some of the additional impact that this could cause and it is not considered that the additional height would result in a significant increase in impact on the visual amenities of any of the surrounding residents. The nearest residents are those whose rear gardens would face the side of the proposed building and are at a distance of more than 100m from it. Those who would face the open bay side of the building are at a distance of at least 270m from the proposed range building. It is therefore considered that the openness of the open space would not be compromised by this proposal.

The layout has been designed to minimise any negative impacts and contain the use and activity as much as possible, and as such is considered to represent a good design solution which is compliant with policy requirements.

Impact on residential amenity

Due to the significant distance between gardens/dwellings and the proposed built form, it is not considered likely that the proposal would cause any harm to visual amenity or privacy. It is also considered that this distance would not result in any undue or significant increase in noise disturbance to surrounding residents and no objections have been raised by expert officers in this regard.

The proposed bund to the southern end of the driving range is considered to result in a visual barrier that would screen the driving range and activities from residential properties as well as possibly providing some sound attenuation to a small degree. It is no taller than small trees would be, and thus would not be sufficient to be visually intrusive. It would also help to form a barrier that prevents balls from being sent too far down the range and into areas where they would not be welcomed. As such, the bund is considered to be an appropriate and positive feature of the proposal.

Landscaping and trees

There are no plans to remove any mature planting that currently exists on site, but simply to add to the existing landscaping proposals and as such it is considered that these proposals would be welcomed as they would add to the biodiversity of the open space.

Highways and access

The adopted maximum parking standards for a driving range of this size would result in a requirement for 62 car spaces, 3 disabled spaces, 6 cycle parking spaces and 3 motorcycle parking spaces. If only the additional 20 bays are taken into account, these figures reduce to 40 car parking spaces, 2 disabled spaces, 4 cycle spaces and 2 motorcycle spaces. The application proposes 31 new parking spaces and one disabled space adjacent to the range building. It is hoped that some visitors would use the driving range as

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

well as other leisure facilities on the site, and therefore be likely to use the existing parking provision. For example, someone staying at the hotel and using the driving range doesn't require one parking space for each use – that would be double counting. It is therefore considered that a reduction in the maximum standards is acceptable in this case as parking provision already exists for the existing hotel and associated facilities, including the existing smaller driving range.

Other issues

The lighting scheme proposed is designed to cause minimal pollution and light spill. The bollards within the golf course area would not result in the spill of light either horizontally beyond the driving range, or vertically. Thus there should be no residual glow of light upwards or around the facility because the light would be specifically directed in certain areas and ways. It is therefore considered that this would not cause any detrimental impacts either on the wider area or on the surrounding residential amenities, particularly given the proposed times of use. It is, however, recommended that if consent is granted, a condition be imposed to ensure that the lighting is only on between 8am and 10pm and only when the ambient lighting conditions are sufficiently low to warrant their usage. Thus the lighting should never be on at noon, for example, when it would not ever be required.

Sustainability

The supporting information suggests that sustainability has been taken into account when designing the scheme, such as using locally sourced materials, encouraging travel by bicycle and the low-power low-spill lighting scheme. It is therefore considered that the sustainable objectives of the planning system have been included within the proposed development. The proposed permeable surfacing is also welcomed and does much to aid sustainability and drainage.

Conclusion

It is considered that the proposed development is compliant with policy requirements and unlikely to cause significant harm to interests of amenity or safety and as such is considered to be acceptable.

Recommendation

That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions and informatives as summarised below:

1. Commence within three years
2. Hours of use of lighting restricted to hours of darkness between 0800 and 2200 only
3. Lighting to be installed as per details provided with application
4. Highways conditions
5. Permeable surfacing to be retained for the lifetime of the development

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

6. Approved plans (and details) specified

Informatives

1. Reason for approval
2. Light
3. Odour

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

PLANNING APPLICATION 2010/231/RC3

ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENTS – REDESIGN OF EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE TO CREATE ADDITIONAL CAR PARKING SPACES

BLYTHE CLOSE, CRABBS CROSS

APPLICANT: REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL
EXPIRY DATE: 10TH NOVEMBER 2010

WARD: CRABBS CROSS

The author of this report is Nina Chana, Planning Officer (DC), who can be contacted on extension 3206 (e-mail: nina.chana@redditchbc.gov.uk) for more information.

(See additional papers for Site Plan)

Site Description

New town residential area in Crabbs Cross, with dwellings facing outwards onto estate roads and rears of other rows of dwellings, or into parking courtyards. Two storey housing with pitched roofs. Most of the surrounding spaces are rough/hard surfaced. The estate has some grassed verges and amenity strips and also has a redundant play area.

Proposal Description

The application proposes the creation of car parking spaces which will be created by the removal of isolated shrub areas and an old redundant play area which is hard surfaced, but cannot be used for car parking due to its access arrangements and configuration.

The application is supported by a Design & Access Statement.

Relevant Key Policies:

All planning applications must be considered in terms of the planning policy framework and all other relevant material considerations (as set out in the legislative framework). The planning policies noted below can be found on the following websites:

www.communities.gov.uk

www.wmra.gov.uk

www.worcestershire.gov.uk

www.redditchbc.gov.uk

National planning policy

PPS1 (& accompanying documents) Delivering sustainable development
PPG13 Transport

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

Regional Spatial Strategy

- QE3 Creating a high quality built environment for all
QE4 Greenery, urban greenspace and public spaces
T7 Car Parking standards and management

Worcestershire Country Structure Plan

- T4 Car parking
SD2 Care for the environment

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3

- B(BE).13 Qualities of Good Design
B(NE).1a Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
R2 Protection of incidental open space

SPDs

Encouraging Good Design.

Relevant site planning history

None

Public Consultation responses

Responses against

Three objections received raising the following points:

- Loss of shrubbed areas
- Cars overhanging footpath
- Car parking spaces will be nearer to houses

Consultee responses

County Highway Network Control

No objection

Procedural matters

This matter is reported to Planning Committee because more than two objections have been received in relation to it and the recommendation is positive.

Assessment of proposal

The key issues for consideration in this case are the effect of the loss of the incidental shrubbed areas and the overall impact on the provision of parking spaces for the close as a whole.

Loss of amenity areas

Whilst policy seeks to protect incidental amenity spaces, some would remain in this Close, and in considering the benefit of the proposed parking arrangements, this should be weighed against other benefits and disbenefits, when considering the overall proposal here.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

Overall parking provision in the Close

The proposal would result in 28 spaces in total in the Close, to serve 19 properties, which equates to an average of 1.4 spaces per dwelling. This is considered to be a good balance between a realistic level of provision for this location, and a sustainable number that should still encourage other methods of travel and thus sustainability. It is therefore considered by Officers to be broadly in compliance with Policy requirements.

Sustainability

In line with current and emerging planning policy guidance, any hard surfacing to be provided should be permeable or include a Sustainable Urban Drainage system, and thus it is recommended that a condition be imposed to this effect.

Conclusion

On balance, Officers consider that the proposals here would result in an improved residential and visual amenity in this Close, and the loss of the small shrubbed areas and the redundant play area is therefore considered to be outweighed by these benefits.

Recommendation

Having regard to the development plan and to other material planning considerations, it is recommended planning permission be granted subject to conditions and informatives as summarised below:

1. Development to commence within three years
2. Surfacing to be permeable wherever possible for sustainability reasons
3. Details of finishes of surfaces to be submitted and agreed prior to commencement on site, and implemented as agreed
4. Approved plans specified

Informatives

1. Reason for approval

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

PLANNING APPLICATION 2010/234/FUL

FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION, TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO ACCOMMODATE A LIFT AND INTERNAL ALTERATIONS TO PROVIDE ACCOMMODATION FOR CHILD WITH DISABILITIES

15 HOLLOWFIELDS CLOSE, SOUTHCREST

**APPLICANT: MR DARREN HOULT
EXPIRY DATE: 15TH NOVEMBER 2010**

WARD: CENTRAL

The author of this report is Nina Chana, Planning Officer (DC), who can be contacted on extension 3206 (e-mail: nina.chana@redditchbc.gov.uk) for more information.

(See additional papers for Site Plan)

Site Description

The site contains a large detached house which stands within a large plot of land. The property stands within a modern housing estate which was developed in 1987. The site lies within the urban area of the town.

Proposal Description

The application seeks consent to build a first floor extension to the side of the property and also a two storey extension to accommodate a lift for a child with disabilities. The proposal also involves internal alterations to carry out various adaptations.

The application is supported by a Design & Access Statement and a statement from Worcestershire County Council which attempts to justify that such additions and alterations are necessary in order for the disabled child to have their accommodation on the first floor, so they can be cared for by their parents at night-time.

The proposals are located on the west elevation of the property and would include the demolition of a porch, to build a two storey extension to accommodate a lift and a first floor extension which will be part sitting room and part bedroom. The layout arrangements on the ground floor would remain unchanged, but there are changes proposed to the first floor layout. The first floor extension would provide a sitting room and bedroom, and the existing layout would be altered to create an acceptable living space for the family.

Relevant Key Policies:

All planning applications must be considered in terms of the planning policy framework and all other relevant material considerations (as set out in the

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

legislative framework). The planning policies noted below can be found on the following websites:

www.communities.gov.uk

www.wmra.gov.uk

www.worcestershire.gov.uk

www.redditchbc.gov.uk

National Planning Policy

PPS1 (& accompanying documents) Delivering sustainable development

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3

B(BE). 13 Qualities of Good Design

B(BE).14 Alterations and Extensions

SPG – Encouraging Good Design

Relevant Site Planning History

Appn. no	Proposal	Decision	Date
2009/110	Detached double garage	Approved	15/07/2009
2006/390	Side extensions	Approved	29/8/2006
2004/502	New porch	Approved	05/11/2004
1988/921	Self contained parent flat	Approved	02/02/1989

Public Consultation Responses

None

Procedural matters

This application would normally be assessed under the delegated powers granted to the Head of Planning and Regeneration, but is being reported to committee as the wife of the applicant is an employee of Redditch Borough Council.

Assessment of Proposal

The key issues for consideration in this case are the principle of the development and the siting, design, layout and amenity.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

Principle

The principle of extending a residential dwelling within an urban area is acceptable subject to the detailed design and it not causing a detrimental impact on its surroundings.

Design and layout

The proposals have been designed in sympathy with the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. The property is a two storey detached dwelling and due to its location within the estate, the proposal would not cause any detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the streetscene or on the outlook of the surrounding properties. The separation distances are such that neighbours would not be affected by the proposal in terms of sightlines (privacy) and overlooking.

Landscape

Whilst the property is covered by a Tree Preservation Order, there are no protected trees within the vicinity of the proposal.

Conclusion

It is considered that the proposal is compliant with the relevant planning policies and guidance. It is also considered unlikely that it would cause any detrimental impacts to the neighbouring properties and as such the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

Recommendation

That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions and informatives as summarised below:

- 1) Development to commence within 3 years
- 2) Materials to match dwelling
- 3) Approved plans specified

Informatives

- 1) Reason for approval

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

PLANNING APPLICATION 2010/244/COU

**RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION: CHANGE OF USE FROM A1 (RETAIL)
TO MIXED A3 (CAFE/RESTAURANT) AND A5 (HOT FOOD TAKEAWAY)
USE**

UNIT 9 MATCHBOROUGH CENTRE, MATCHBOROUGH WAY, REDDITCH

**APPLICANT: MRS L PASKEVICIENE
EXPIRY DATE: 19TH NOVEMBER 2010**

WARD: MATCHBOROUGH

The author of this report is Steven Edden, Planning Officer (DC), who can be contacted on extension 3206 (e-mail: steve.edden@redditchbc.gov.uk) for more information.

(See additional papers for Site Plan)

Site Description

Unit 9 is currently occupied by Woodstock Cafe and is situated within the Matchborough District Centre. Your Officers believe, through information given by RBC Property Services, that the Unit has been occupied as a Cafe (an A3 use in planning terms), since 2003. The application is therefore part retrospective. The Unit sits between two commercial premises, also within the District Centre: a Fish and Chip Takeaway (Unit 8) and a former Bookmakers (now vacant) (Unit 10). Beyond the District Centre boundary lie a busway to the west, and large public car parks to both the north and south.

Proposal Description

This is a retrospective full application to change the use of Unit 9 from Class A1 (retail) to a mixed use comprising both A3 and A5 (Cafe/restaurant and hot food takeaway) uses. The occupation of the premises would remain primarily as a café/restaurant (A3) use, with the takeaway element of the proposal being pizzas only. This hot food takeaway use would remain ancillary to the primary use of the premises as an A3 use.

Relevant Key Policies:

All planning applications must be considered in terms of the planning policy framework and all other relevant material considerations (as set out in the legislative framework). The planning policies noted below can be found on the following websites:

www.communities.gov.uk
www.redditchbc.gov.uk

National Planning Policy

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS4 Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

PPG13 Transport
PPG24 Noise

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3

CS.7 The Sustainable Location of Development
B(BE).13 Qualities of Good Design
E(TCR).9 District Centres
E(TCR).12 Class A3/A4/A5 uses
C(T).12 Parking Standards
S.1 Designing Out Crime

SPDs

Designing for Community Safety

Relevant Site Planning History

None

Public Consultation Responses

The application has been advertised by writing to neighbouring premises within the Matchborough Centre, and by display of public notice on site.

Responses in favour

None received

Responses against

Three letters received in objection to the application.
Comments are summarised as follows:

- Proposal could lead to an increase in anti-social behaviour
- Concerns raised regarding cooking smells/odours and noise
- Too many non-A1 units in the District Centre
- An alternative user should be sought rather than that of a hot food takeaway use

Many comments received are not reported here since they are not planning matters and are for RBC Property Services as Landlord to note. A copy of the objections have been passed to Property Services for comment.

Consultee Responses

County Highway Network Control

No objection

Police Crime Risk Manager

Comments awaited

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

Waste Management

Comments awaited

Procedural matters

This application is put before the Planning Committee due to the fact that the landowner is Redditch Borough Council, and in this case, the proposals are considered to be significant enough to warrant determination by the Planning Committee. In addition, Class A3 and A5 proposals are automatically reported to Committee, as are applications where two or more objections to the proposals have been received, and the recommendation is one of approval.

Assessment of Proposal

The key issues for consideration are as follows:-

Principle of Change of Use

The relevant Planning Policy in this case is E(TCR).9 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan since the Unit falls within the Matchborough District Centre.

The Town Centre is the primary focus for major shopping needs. District Centres are the secondary level of shopping, meeting daily needs for basic items. Typically District Centres in the Borough accommodate a newsagent, a general store, a sub-post office and occasionally a pharmacy, a hairdresser and other small shops of a local nature. It is important to protect and where appropriate, enhance District Centres particularly with regard to their useful retail function. Proposals that would undermine the retail and community function of the District Centre would normally be refused.

Under paragraph 5 of the reasoned justification for Policy E(TCR).9, it comments that the Council appreciates that in some circumstances there may be an over provision of units for retail uses. If during the plan period there is a problem of vacant units despite appropriate marketing and rent levels, then other uses may be acceptable in District Centres. Only developments that would not hinder the primary retailing function of the District Centre will normally be acceptable.

Occupation of the various units within the District Centre is currently as follows:

Unit 1	'Your Ideas' Community use	D2
Unit 2	Flooring / Carpet shop	A1
Unit 3	Chemist/Pharmacy	A1
Unit 4	Hairdressers	A1
No Unit number	The Old Sticky Wicket Public House	A4
Unit 5	Indian Takeaway	A5
Unit 6&7	Costcutters Supermarket and Post Office	A1
Unit 8	Fish and Chips takeaway	A5

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

Unit 9	Woodstock Cafe: permitted as A1, operating as	A3
Unit 10	Currently vacant, last used as bookmakers	A2
Unit 11 (upstairs)	Dentists	D1
Unit 12 (upstairs)	residential flat	C3
Unit 13 (upstairs)	residential flat	C3

Members of the Planning Committee granted a temporary consent (expiring in March 2012), in 2009 for the change of use of an existing vacant retail use to a community (D2) use. Unit 1 is occupied by the 'Your Ideas' Association and the consent is tied to that user. Application 2009/019/COU refers. At that time, Members were given a list of occupied Units within the District Centre. This list is identical to the current list of occupiers, other than the bookmakers at Unit 10 which closed approximately 6 months ago. At the time of the determination of application 2009/019/COU, Members agreed with Officers that the loss of the existing Unit 1 from A1 use would not hinder the primary retailing function of the District Centre and would sustain and not harm its vitality and viability.

Your Officers consider, as do RBC Property Services that the presence of the Costcutters supermarket occupying a large area of retail floor space at Units 6 and 7 relative to others in the District Centre, together with the current financial situation means that finding A1 users to occupy units in the Centre is difficult, where that District Centre also contains a hairdressers and a Chemist, two of the few uses which do not compete directly with the supermarkets retail offer. Unit 1 was vacant for one year before being occupied by Your Ideas and Unit 10 is currently vacant, although Unit 10 could be used for A1 or A2 consent at any time without requiring planning permission. Other A1 units struggle in the current financial climate, with the carpet/ flooring shop (Unit 2) only opening on a Friday and Saturday.

Turning to the proposed use of Unit 9 as a mixed A3 and A5 use, adopted planning policy does not set limits on the numbers/percentage of A5 Units which may be operated within any of the defined District Centres. A Policy contained within the emerging draft Core Strategy provisionally restricts the total number of Units operating as A5 within the District Centres to no greater than 25% of the total. Should consent be granted here, 27% of the Units would be in A5 use. If consent was refused and the occupier vacated, that percentage would fall to 18%. Your Officers would stress that the above Policy should be afforded relatively little weight since the Core Strategy is in draft form. Your Officers would consider that much greater weight should be placed on adopted Policy E(TCR).9 which contains no such number or percentage limit on the total number of A5 uses within each District Centre and only states that the vitality and viability of the District Centres should not be harmed. In addition, adopted Policy E(TCR).12 which deals specifically with proposals for A3 and A5 use states that District Centres are acceptable locations for such uses since these are sustainable locations. The Policy also recognises the major contribution A3 and A5 uses play towards enhancing the

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

vitality and viability of the District Centres. It is also considered that this use is preferable to the risk of a further vacant unit in the centre.

Likely impact of proposal

The occupation of the premises would remain primarily as a café/restaurant (A3) use, with the takeaway element of the proposal being pizzas only. This use would remain ancillary to the primary use of the premises as an A3 use.

Internally, few alterations would take place, with the premises preparation, store and wash up area remaining to the rear of the unit, with extract ducting being taken through the unit at a high level, exiting as an extract vent to the rear. The front of the unit would retain a seating area (18 covers).

Given that the premises would be in primarily A3 use, Officers do not consider that an over-concentration of A5 uses within the Matchborough Centre would occur, and the existing number of A1 uses would not be considered to harm vitality and viability. Hours of operation would be from 0800 hrs to 2300 hrs daily. The District Centre location of the proposal would suggest that such operating hours would not be unreasonable.

Access, parking and highway safety

A significant level of parking exists to both the north and the south of this courtyard of commercial premises: 44 spaces to the north and 45 spaces to the south. No objections have been raised by County Highways. This level of provision is thought by your officers to be significant and the proposal would not be considered to give rise to any harm to highway safety.

Other matters

The Police Crime Risk Manager has been consulted on the application. No comments have been received at the time of writing. Any comments received will be reported within the update paper. Nothing in the application would suggest to your Officers that approval of this application would lead to an increase in criminal activity within this District Centre. No evidence has been put forward to assert that the commercial collection of refuse is causing any particular problems. Any comments received from the Council's Waste Management team will be reported in the update.

Conclusion

Refusing the application, and returning the unit to vacancy which, given recent trends within the centre, could be a significant length of vacancy is likely to decrease footfall for neighbouring units rather than aid neighbouring premises, which in your Officers view would harm the centre's viability. Your Officers are satisfied that this application would not undermine the retail and community function of the District Centre under the terms of Policy E(TCR).9 and is therefore acceptable.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

Recommendation

That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions and informatives as summarised below:-

1. Approved plans defined
2. Takeaway element restricted to pizzas only with this use remaining ancillary to the primary use of the Unit as a Café/Restaurant
3. Hours of opening: 0800 to 2300 hrs daily

Informatives

1. Reason for approval
2. The granting of permission does not preclude the fact that action can be taken under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 if it is determined that a statutory nuisance exists

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

Appeal Outcome Report for Information

Appeal made against the refusal of planning permission

Planning application details	2009/249/FUL
Proposal	Erection of a single dwelling
Location	Land adjacent to No. 31 Wheatcroft Close, Brockhill
Ward	Batchley & Brockhill
Decision	Refusal 3rd February 2010

Decision made by Planning Committee on 2nd February 2010

The author of this report is Steven Edden, Planning Officer (DC), who can be contacted on extension 3206 (e-mail: steve.edden@redditchbc.gov.uk) for more information.

Discussion

The proposal was to erect a three bed end of terrace dwelling with associated parking arrangements.

The Planning Committee's three reasons for refusal were firstly relating to the proposed dwelling's siting and appearance being out of character with the pattern of development in the area, having regard to its closer proximity to a sound attenuation bund; secondly the perceived inadequacies of the proposed ingress and egress to parking areas resulting in a danger to highway safety and conflict between existing vehicle users of the communal parking area; and thirdly the perceived overdevelopment of the site having regard to the resultant loss of garden area to no.31 Wheatcroft Close.

The Inspector noted that the parking court to the front of No's 29-31 dominated the frontage, relieved only to a limited degree by the small gravelled landscaped area to the front of No.31. The Inspector commented that adding a parking space to the front of No.31, reducing the area for landscaping would result in an area almost completely dominated by cars to the frontage, giving a cramped appearance to the area. He considered that such an arrangement would not respect the context of the surrounding dwellings.

Whilst the Inspector considered that the design of the proposed additional dwelling would match that of the adjoining buildings, he considered that its location would intrude into the area at the foot of the sound attenuation bund. Re-grading of the bund was considered by the Inspector to give a contrived appearance contributing to the cramped appearance of the development.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th November 2010

The Inspector commented that although the Highway Authority had not objected to the proposal on highway safety grounds, and while it might be possible, with multiple manoeuvres to turn a car so that it could enter and leave the shared access area in a forward gear, he considered that additional vehicle movements in the tight and constrained space to the front of numbers 29 to 31 would be hazardous to pedestrians and especially children and would certainly cause significant inconvenience to existing and future residents.

Of assistance to officers and members in this case are the Inspectors comments with respect to the recent reissuing and amendment of Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 – Housing which amended the definition of previously developed land to exclude ‘garden land’ from within this definition and removing the indicative minimum housing density. The Inspector considered that the changes to PPS3 had little effect in this case and did not alter his reasoning on the main issues.

Costs application

No application for costs was made.

Appeal outcome

The appeal was DISMISSED.

Recommendation

The Committee is asked to RESOLVE that

the item of information be noted.