REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

making a difference

www.redditchbc.gov.uk

Executive Committee

2nd September 2013

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Bill Hartnett (Chair), Councillor Greg Chance (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Rebecca Blake, Juliet Brunner, Brandon Clayton, John Fisher, Phil Mould, Mark Shurmer and Debbie Taylor

Also Present:

Councillors Carole Gandy, Pattie Hill and Brenda Quinney and Mr David Rose

Officers:

E Baker, R Bamford, K Dicks, C Felton, C Flanagan and S Morgan

Committee Services Officer:

I Westmore

33. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

34. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

35. LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Leader advised that a question had been received in accordance with Procedure Rule 16 in respect of Item 5, Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4, and that the question would be read at the start of that item.

36. MINUTES

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the meeting of the Executive Committee held on 9th July 2013 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

.....

Chair

37. BOROUGH OF REDDITCH LOCAL PLAN NO. 4

As noted at Minute 35 above, a question to the Leader in respect of this item had been received from Mr David Rose, as set out below:

Why are Redditch Borough Council still advocating building between 600 and 3,400 houses in Webheath, when Redditch Borough Council Planning Committee on 22nd May, 3013 voted against Taylor Wimpey building 200 new houses, (which surely means that Redditch Borough Council have decided not to build in Webheath), because of poor highway infrastructure, over subscribed local schools, poor unsustainable infrastructures (including foul sewage) etc.?

The Leader replied as follows:

Paragraph 3.16 in the Report answers this question and explains why an early planning application from a developer, on part of a proposed site, is different to the consideration of sites for inclusion through the Plan making process.

3.16 "…With regards to Policy 48 Webheath, Officers are aware that the Council refused planning permission on 22nd May 2013 for a proposal on part this Strategic Site set out in the Draft Local Plan No.4. The refusal was based upon the proposal's additional traffic generation on the local road network coupled with the lack of suitable infrastructure to support the development and the lack of contribution towards the wider highway network infrastructure; however this does not alter the fact that the proposal site and the remainder of the Webheath Strategic Site is capable of sustainable delivery in the short to medium term, subject to necessary infrastructure being delivered. This Strategic Site should therefore continue to feature in the Proposed Submission version of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4."

More details will follow later this year on the viability of the site to be able to deliver the necessary infrastructure. This will confirm whether there are showstoppers to the Local Plan's proposed allocated sites being delivered sustainably. The necessary works for the Foxlydiate site will be tested through detailed highway modelling. The costs of wider highway infrastructure and other sustainable transport costs will need to be aggregated to the Webheath site and to the cross boundary site at Foxlydiate in order to test the viability accurately. The cost of implementing necessary sewerage treatment for the two sites is borne by both the developer (for the on-site drainage, connection, pumping station and pressurised sewer) and Severn Trent Water and therefore has little impact on the ability of the site to be delivered, in any case the cost

of upgrade works to serve these sites would not be vastly different to the alternative site options.

Mr Rose subsequently asked the following supplementary question of the Leader:

The Leader was asked to which overseeing Local Government watchdog local residents might complain regarding the proposal by the Council to contradict the decision made by its Planning Committee and the throwing of money at a scheme which was not sustainable.

Officers provided the following answer to this supplementary question on behalf of the Leader:

Until the Local Plan inquiry process was under way there was no recourse for local residents, developers or any other interested party to complain about the content of the document. Officers undertook to seek confirmation that there was no further redress for parties to the Local Plan process and pass on any further details to Mr Rose following the meeting.

Officers then presented the printed report. It was noted that the report contained summaries of all consultation responses received during the last consultation in April to May 2013 and details of minor changes made as a consequence. There were no responses received which brought into doubt the key points in the draft Plan. Therefore the amount of residential and employment development required to the end of the Plan period was not suggested to change and neither were the main locations suggested for such development.

It was reported that most of the comments received had related to the rejection of Bordesley as a preferred option for future housing development. Officers confirmed that the rejection of Bordesley was based on its visual prominence and the harmful effect on the retention of the openness of the Green Belt. Development at Bordesley would also considerably reduce the gap between Redditch and Alvechurch as well as the strategic gap with Birmingham.

The meeting was informed that Members of the Committee and other Members of the Council had had the opportunity to consider the appendices to the report and consider in detail all the consultation responses through briefings from Officers, the documents being made available in Group Rooms and through meetings of the Planning Advisory Panel in recent months.

The Portfolio Holder stressed the need for the Borough to have a sound Local Plan and reminded those present that, even following any approval of the Committee's recommendations by the Council the following week, there would be a further period during which the soundness of the Plan could be challenged before it was presented to the Secretary of State and his inspectors for rigorous examination.

The question was raised as to why Officers were being offered delegated authority to make revisions, technical corrections and editorial changes without reference back to all Members. In order to allay any such concerns it was proposed that such changes be made by Officers following consultation with the Portfolio Holder and the Leader of the Opposition.

Officers were asked what processes were to be used to publicise the Local Plan process and to assist local residents and others to become involved in the next stage in its development. The Committee was informed that there were no plans to go out to local centres or hold road shows at present because the forthcoming stage in the process was different in nature to earlier stages. Officers would make themselves available to members of the public to help them to fill out the forms through which comments on the soundness of the Plan might be submitted. A lay-persons guide was also to be prepared to this end. Officers added that they had been proactive in meeting with those individuals and groups locally who had demonstrated an interest in the process but stated they were prepared to hold surgeries in other parts of the town should Members feel it necessary.

There was some discussion around certain details of the proposals. The possible access routes to the area around Webheath and potential bus routes were discussed. Officers advised that Highways Officers of the County Council would be attending a meeting of the Planning Advisory Panel on 17th September 2013 at which Members would have the opportunity to ask detailed questions of them. Officers referred to Appendix 5 of Appendix 3 to the Report which stated that an overall transport assessment would be undertaken in due course. Furthermore, Members were advised that the Local Plan documents set out the issues that any potential future developers would need to address but were not designed to establish every detail of every possible development area.

The proposal within the Local Plan to designate land within the Winyates area for housing and employment use was raised given a stance taken by the Council several years earlier on a proposal from Stratford-upon-Avon District Council to carry out similar development. Officers were able to confirm that the negative view taken at that time was based on inadequate highways infrastructure

based, as it was, on access from Far Moor Lane. The current proposals were for a direct access from the Coventry Highway which was considered to be sustainable.

RECOMMENDED that

1) the Officer responses and actions (Appendix 1) to consultation held on Draft Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 be endorsed;

2) the Officer responses and actions (Appendix 2) to consultation held on Redditch Housing Growth be endorsed;

3) the Proposed Submission Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 (Appendix 3) and Sustainability Appraisal (Appendix 4) for representations to be made by statutory bodies and members of the public, commencing 30th September 2013 until 11th November 2013 be approved;

4) authority be delegated to the Executive Director of Planning, Regeneration, Regulatory and Housing Services/Head of Planning and Regeneration and the Development Plans Manager following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration and the Leader of the Opposition to review the representations made following the close of the representations period, and that subject to no significant weaknesses being raised to doubt the soundness of the draft Plan (for tests of soundness see paragraph 3.20 of this report), that the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 be submitted to the Secretary of State for examination in December 2013;

5) authority be delegated to the Executive Director of Planning, Regeneration, Regulatory and Housing Services/Head of Planning and Regeneration and the Development Plans Manager following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration and the Leader of the Opposition to prepare and submit the necessary documents to support Submission of the Local Plan; and

6) authority be delegated to the Executive Director of Planning, Regeneration, Regulatory and Housing Services/Head of Planning and Regeneration and the Development Plans Manager following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration and the Leader of the Opposition, to undertake such further

revisions, technical corrections and editorial changes deemed necessary in preparing the Local Plan for submission to the Secretary of State and to agree subsequent changes where appropriate during the examination.

(At 7.49pm, following consideration of this item, there was a short adjournment. The meeting reconvened at 7.53pm.)

38. CHANGES TO SCHEME OF FEES AND CHARGES FOR NON-STATUTORY PLANNING ADVICE

The Committee received a report on on-going transformation work in Planning and consequent proposed changes to the charges levied for permitted development enquiries and pre-application advice. The transformation project had determined that the interests of both the customer and the Planning Officers were not best served by the present arrangement.

It was intended to introduce a revised, hybrid process which was more customer-focussed but still retained an element of charging for some specific types of enquiries and the provision of advice. Members welcomed the new initiative whilst recognising that there would be a very small loss of income which would be offset by the redirection of Officer time to more productive areas of work.

RECOMMENDED that

the fees and charges scheme and schedule as set out in Appendix 1 to the report be approved to come into effect between 1st October 2013 and 31st March 2014 and Appendix 2 to the report be approved to come into effect from 1st April 2014.

39. GREATER BIRMINGHAM AND SOLIHULL LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP - DELEGATIONS OF FUNCTIONS TO A JOINT COMMITTEE (LOCAL SUPERVISORY BOARD)

The Committee considered an update on the current position regarding the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) and on the governance arrangements for the body in particular.

It was proposed that a Supervisory Board be established to ensure that any decisions taken under a Single Local Growth Fund had the required legal mandate. As a consequence, it would be necessary to have a single voting representative from each constituent local authority. Scrutiny arrangements were in the process of being developed for the LEP but Officers explained that the form of such

arrangements had still to be determined. Officers of the Council were to discuss the developing Scrutiny arrangements with colleagues from Birmingham City Council later in the month but at present were unable to confirm details of political balance or the timescales for finalisation of the arrangements. Officers undertook to keep Members informed of on-going developments in this regard.

RESOLVED that

1) the creation of a Joint Committee to act as a Supervisory Board for the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972 with voting representatives appointed by each constituent local authority and non voting business representatives be approved;

2) functions relating to the bidding for and approval of schemes and expenditure of funds devolved under the Single Local Growth Fund be delegated to the Joint Committee (Supervisory Board);

3) the appointment of the Leader as an ex officio appointment as the Redditch Borough Council Representative on the Joint Committee be approved;

4) the appointment of the Deputy Leader as an ex-officio appointment as the Redditch Borough Council substitute representative on the Joint Committee be approved;

5) the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services be authorised to agree and enter into all necessary legal documents to effect the above decisions and update the Council constitution; and

RECOMMENDED to Council that

6) authority be delegated to the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services, following consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition Group, to agree the establishment of a Joint Scrutiny Committee, its terms of reference and the appointment of a representative from this Council to the Committee as appropriate.

40. LOCAL TRANSPORT BOARD

A report was considered which related to the establishment of a Joint Committee to act as the Local Transport Board for the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP). Officers considered that this new arrangement might have the potential for providing a better outcome for Redditch Borough.

The Committee was informed that, should the issue with Wyre Forest's respective allocations to the Worcestershire LEP and the GBSLEP not be resolved, Redditch Borough and Bromsgrove District Councils would need to arrange for alternative representation on the Joint Committee. Officers highlighted that scrutiny arrangements would also be developed for the Local Transport Board and delegated authority was sought to agree appropriate arrangements following consultation with lead Members.

RECOMMENDED that

1) the creation of a Joint Committee to act as the Local Transport Board for the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise partnership in accordance with Section 102 of the Local Government Act 1972 be approved;

2) functions relating to the approval of Local Transport schemes in the area of the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise partnership and the bidding for and expenditure of funds devolved to the Joint Committee under the Local Major Transport Scheme capital funding be delegated to the Joint Committee (Local Transport Board);

3) the Terms of Reference of the Local Transport Board as detailed at Appendix 3 to the report and the Local Transport Board Assurance Framework as detailed at Appendix 4 to the report be approved;

4) Councillor J-P Campion for Wyre Forest District Council be appointed as the representative on the Local Transport Board to represent the Borough Council, Bromsgrove and Wyre Forest District Councils, with Councillor P Mould as the substitute representative; and

5) authority be delegated to the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services to agree and enter into all necessary legal documents to effect the above decisions and to update the Council Constitution accordingly.

41. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Committee considered the minutes of the meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 2nd and 23rd July 2013 and the outstanding recommendations arising out of these meetings.

A number of Members expressed their disappointment and concern at the proposal to reduce the number of occasions upon which the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel was scheduled to meet. The Committee members stated their wish that the Panel should meet on more than just the one occasion each year and also that Members be encouraged to bring forward proposals for matters which might be considered by this body as they arose.

Members also noted the comments within Minute 25 of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee minutes in respect of the sexual health clinics. It was agreed that the Local Strategic Partnership be requested to discuss this matter further at a future meeting.

2nd July 2013

Future Approach to Crime and Disorder Scrutiny at Redditch Borough Council - Discussion

RECOMMENDED that

1) subject to the comments in the preamble, above the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel hold at least one scheduled meeting during the year to scrutinise the work of the local Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership;

23rd July 2013

Local Strategic Partnership – Monitoring Update Report

RESOLVED that

2) Officers be requested to try and identify suitable sources of funding, including from external partner organisations such as Worcestershire County Council, that could be used to fund the installation of adult exercise equipment in Morton Stanley Park; and

3) the Local Strategic Partnership be requested to consider the issue of sexual health clinics and teenage pregnancy at a forthcoming meeting.

42. WORCESTERSHIRE SHARED SERVICES JOINT COMMITTEE

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the meeting of the Worcestershire Shared Services Joint Committee held on 27th June 2013 be received and noted.

43. MINUTES / REFERRALS - OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE, EXECUTIVE PANELS ETC.

There were no minutes or referrals to consider under this item.

44. SHARED SERVICES BOARD

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the meeting of the Shared Services Board held on 4th July 2013 be received and noted.

45. ADVISORY PANELS - UPDATE REPORT

The latest update on the activity of the Council's Advisory Panels and similar bodies was considered by the Committee.

RESOLVED that

the report be noted.

46. ACTION MONITORING

The latest version of the Committee's Action Monitoring report was received by the Committee.

RESOLVED that

the Action Monitoring report be noted.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 8.43 pm

.....
Chair