

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

**Update Report**

3rd July 2013

**ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**SPEAKERS CONFIRMED INDICATED BY 'S'**

<b><u>Application No.</u></b>	<b><u>Proposal and Address</u></b>		<b><u>Page No</u></b>
<b>S</b> 2013/078/FUL	Erection of 41 dwellings comprising 35 houses and 6 apartments together with roads and associated works Land south of Harris Close, Redditch	Main Report	1
		Update Report	No Update
<b>Presenting Officer : Ailith Rutt</b>			
<b>S</b> 2013/105/FUL	Garage extension (as amended by plans received on 14.06.13) 10 Lower Grinsty Lane, Callow Hill, Redditch	Main Report	11
		Update Report	3
<b>Presenting Officer : Harjap Rajwanshi</b>			
<b>S</b> 2013/119/FUL	Extension of existing factory; relocation of existing bund to increase site parking; additional concrete yard space; mezzanine floor and new site entrance off Winyates Way Magna exteriors and interiors, Merse Road, Redditch	Main Report	17
		Update Report	4
<b>Presenting Officer : Ailith Rutt</b>			
<b>S</b> 2013/130/RC3	Public art piece to celebrate the Redditch Springs and Wireform Industry Grassed area next to Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch	Main Report	23
		Update Report	5
<b>Presenting Officer : Sharron Williams</b>			

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

**Update Report**

3rd July 2013

---

**PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/105/FUL**

**GARAGE EXTENSION (AS AMENDED BY PLANS RECEIVED ON 14.06.13)**

**10 LOWER GRINSTY LANE, CALLOW HILL, REDDITCH, B97 5PJ**

An additional objection has been received from Callow Parks Residents Association Ltd on the following grounds:

The proposed garage mainly affects No. 11 Lower Grinsty Lane as the ground level is significantly higher at number 10. The base of the proposed garage stands 1 to 2 metres above the garden for number 11 and the design of the proposed garage extension will form a tall building from the aspect of the rear of number 11. We are concerned that the height of the extension relative to the terrain from No. 11 Lower Grinsty Lane will not be in keeping with the bungalow nature of the dwellings at numbers 9 and 10.

The plans do not seem accurate. The drawings suggest that the perimeter wall/fence between the dwellings at 10 and 11 will continue to the footpath but in fact the wall/fence will stop before then. In addition, the width of the garage is not clear. The drawings suggest a gap ranging from 740mm to 850mm between the garage and the perimeter fence / wall. We understand that for a square garage the rear of the garage will be up against or even on top of the perimeter wall.

-----

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

**Update Report**

3rd July 2013

---

**PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/119/FUL**

**EXTENSION OF EXISTING FACTORY; RELOCATION OF EXISTING BUND TO INCREASE SITE PARKING; ADDITIONAL CONCRETE YARD SPACE; MEZZANINE FLOOR AND NEW SITE ENTRANCE OFF WINYATES WAY**

**MAGNA EXTERIORS AND INTERIORS, MERSE ROAD, REDDITCH**

Assessment of Proposal

Highways and Access

Page 20 (main agenda) refers to an existing 170 space car park to the south of the site. There are actually 172 car parking spaces contained within the car park. The proposed 'standard size' (2.4 x 4.8m) car parking spaces (32 in number) are shown on an amended plan which accompanies the application. In addition, one extra disabled car parking space is to be created bringing the total number of spaces to be provided to 33. The amended 'Parking Layout Plan' will be available to view during the presentation of the application.

As stated within the main report, highways have confirmed that they are in agreement with the proposed additional car parking spaces to be provided having regard to the new floorspace to be created.

---

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

**Update Report**

3rd July 2013

---

**PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/130/RC3**

**PUBLIC ART PIECE TO CELEBRATE THE REDDITCH SPRINGS AND  
WIREFORM INDUSTRY**

**GRASSED AREA NEXT TO TOWN HALL, WALTER STRANZ SQUARE,  
REDDITCH**

**Consultee Responses**

*Town Centre Co-ordinator*

No objections from a Town Centre perspective.

***Community Safety***

Would recommend that:

- 1) Consideration is given to protecting the artwork with a transparent anti-graffiti coating which will allow any graffiti to be more easily removed.
- 2) Further details of the spring sizes and arrangements, in particular the gaps within and between the coils are provided to assess these risks and the ease of removing wedged items.
- 3) Consideration be given to creating a boundary for the artwork.
- 4) The service hatch providing access to the electrical wiring is secured with a key lock.

Note that CCTV coverage of the artwork location from RBC camera 5 (mounted above the vacant former Poundstretcher unit) is obscured by two trees in RBC owned brick planted areas (outside former Barclays Bank building).

**Additional comments**

In respect to comments submitted by Community Safety, additional information has been submitted by the applicant.

Regarding the galvanized finish and whether this would need any further treatment with regard to resisting graffiti or making its removal easier. The zinc surface, which coats the steel as part of the galvanizing process, is slightly 'greasy' by its very nature, so very resistant to the permanent bonding of paints and other decorative surface treatments. If paint is applied directly to the new and untreated zinc surface this will often lift off over the following weeks and months on its own through weathering. Or, if it has been applied accidentally, it can be removed with an appropriate solvent cleaner or a mild scourer used.

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

**Update Report**

**3rd July 2013**

Therefore, it is considered in this case that any additional barrier preparations or anti-graffiti paints are not necessary on this occasion

With regard to the physical structure of the springs, the artist will be gauging the density and gaps as he constructs the piece to minimise any inclinations to climb the piece through the look and shape of the trunk of the sculpture. In addition, the density of the metalwork at the base should be such that the removal of any litter should become part of a normal litter picking process. However, the artist will be paying a lot of attention to these factors to reduce any undue problems.

A light will be fixed inside the solid steel box and so would be impossible to reach from below. The back of the box (in the folds of the pretend cardboard box) is where maintenance can attend to changing bulbs or working on the light. A particular key will be required but at 2.5 metres high we do not anticipate a problem in any case. The look of the box will not be affected.

In respect to CCTV coverage, one of the trees that is blocking the view of the proposed art work from the nearest CCTV camera, is intended to be trimmed back in the next couple of days (before the Committee meeting). If it is considered that the work is not sufficient to enable suitable coverage, the Council's Landscape Section are agreeable to removing the tree and replacing with a large plant instead.

Officers consider that these details address the issues raised by Community Safety. However, in respect to the camera coverage, it is considered appropriate to add an informative regarding possible tree removal if needed.

**Recommendation**

**As per the report with the additional following informative**

- 3) The applicant is recommended to contact RBC Community Safety when initial tree work has taken place on the tree obscuring CCTV coverage, to ascertain if further work is required. If so, the applicant is required to contact RBC Landscape Services to organise the removal of the tree and replacement planting.
-