

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

31st October 2012

**APPEAL OUTCOME REPORT FOR INFORMATION**

**APPEAL MADE AGAINST CHANGE OF USE FROM REDUNDANT  
FACTORY UNIT TO FORM FITNESS SUITE**

**PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS: 2011/282/COU**

<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>CHANGE OF USE FROM REDUNDANT FACTORY UNIT TO FORM FITNESS SUITE</b>
<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>TRAFFORD PARK, UNIT 19 TRECOTT ROAD, REDDITCH</b>
<b>WARD</b>	<b>CENTRAL</b>
<b>DECISION</b>	<b>PLANNING DECISION MADE AT PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 13 DECEMBER 2011</b>

The author of this report is Sharron Williams, Planning Officer (DC), who can be contacted on extension 3372 (e-mail: sharron.williams@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) for more information.

**Discussion**

It was proposed to convert the factory unit into a fitness suite that would operate 7 days a week from 06/08:00 hrs to 22:00 hrs.

The proposal would have been on land allocated for employment development, therefore, the proposed use would have taken away the availability of employment land that is sought after in the Borough to meet the Council's strategic employment requirements and so the proposal was considered contrary to policies in Local Plan No.3.

In addition, the proposed use ought to be located in the town centre given the nature of the use and the volume of people who would use it. Such a use in the town centre would maintain the town's vitality and viability. Locating a leisure use outside of the town centre would have a detrimental impact on the centre and would conflict with Local Plan policies. Given that the proposal is not located within the town centre or the edge of centre (Town Centre Peripheral Zone), a sequential assessment was required under the former PPS.4. The assessment that had been submitted did not adequately demonstrate a thorough assessment of available town centre locations and did not address the requirements of the former PPS.4 and policies E(EMP).1 and E(EMP).3 of Local Plan No.3.

There was also a concern that the provision of a leisure facility in the middle of a modern employment complex would be incompatible with the surrounding

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

**31st October 2012**

---

employment units, having an impact on amenity in the area, as well as parking, and hindering interest in the remaining unoccupied units for Class B uses. Officers therefore recommended that the application be refused.

The application was refused for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed change of use to a leisure facility (Class D.2) would result in a loss of land designated for employment use (B1, B2, and B8). In the absence of any justification for this loss, the proposal is considered to be harmful to the employment land supply for the Borough and would be contrary to Policy E(EMP).3 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3. The proposal would also conflict with policies and objectives of PPS.1 Delivering Sustainable Development and PPS.4 Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth.
2. The provision of a leisure facility (Class D.2) in a designated Primarily Employment Area would hinder the amenities of the adjacent employment units and as such would not be compatible with the potential and existing employment uses in this complex and as such would be contrary to Policy E(EMP).3a of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3.
3. Documents submitted by the applicant to justify the location of a leisure facility outside the town centre are insufficient to address the sequential assessment requirements set out under PPS.4 Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth and would be contrary to Policies E(EMP).1 and E(EMP).3 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3.
4. The provision of a leisure facility (Class D.2) use in a location outside of the town centre would by its very nature, have a detrimental impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre and would be contrary to Policies CS.7 and E(TCR).1 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3.

The inspector considered that the main issues were:

- (a) The effect of the proposed development on the vitality and viability of Redditch Town Centre and the supply of employment premises.
- (b) Whether the proposed development would affect the current or future employment use of the neighbouring properties.

The Inspector considered that due to the number of facilities proposed for the development, the scheme would attract a large number of people. As identified in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the proposal would be a more appropriate use in the town centre.

# **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**31st October 2012**

---

Given the site is outside the town centre and the peripheral zone, the Inspector referred to the sequential assessment submitted and noted that it referred to 4 sites at the application stage that expanded to 7 sites at appeal stage. The inspector considered that the level of information submitted was limited, and took the view that there was insufficient evidence available to conclude that there were no sequentially preferable sites to the property and that no adverse harm would be caused to the vitality and viability of the town centre.

The Inspector concluded that the proposed development would cause adverse harm to the vitality and viability of Redditch town centre and the supply of employment premises and, as such, it would not accord with the aims of Local Plan policies CS.7, E(TCR).1 and E(EMP).3.

In respect of the proposed development affecting the current or future employment use of the neighbouring properties, the Inspector considered that neither the existing or proposed uses would appear to be a source of significant or unacceptable noise or other forms of disturbance. He stated that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the current or future employment use of the neighbouring properties and, as such, would not conflict with Local Plan policy E(EMP).3a and the NPPF.

The Inspector concluded that there would be no harm caused to the current or future employment use of the neighbouring properties this is judged to be outweighed by the adverse harm caused to the vitality and viability of the town centre and the supply of employment premises. Accordingly, and taking into account all other matters including the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development, they concluded that the appeal should fail.

### **Appeal outcome**

The planning appeal was DISMISSED. Costs were neither sought nor awarded.

### **Recommendation**

**The Committee is asked to RESOLVE that the item of information be noted.**