

**Redditch Borough Council
Planning committee**

**Committee Updates
9th April 2014**

2013/289/FUL – Land off Dixon Close

The County Highways Engineer has examined the access point to the Enfield Industrial Estate via Windsor Road and considers that the junction has limited visibility. In addition, the access point occasionally floods. Further, coupled with the presence of parked HGV's, the highways engineer considers this route would be undesirable for significant numbers of additional vehicles.

This confirms the earlier views of your officers which are that, following the completion of the development, should permission be granted, vehicular access serving this development should be via Dixon Close only. As stated in the earlier update, access via the Industrial Estate would be suitable as a temporary access whilst construction works take place. A condition to this effect has been recommended.

2013/302/FUL – Haversham House, 327 Bromsgrove Road

Amendment to condition No. 6 to be as follows:-

- 6) No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works (to include the landscaping proposed for the roof of the extension) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include proposed boundary treatment and other means of enclosure, hard surfacing materials, new planting, trees and shrubs to be retained, together with measures to be taken for their protection while building works are in progress.

Reason:- In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and in accordance with Policy CS.8 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3.

2013/336/FUL – 120 Plymouth Road

1 letter of objection as a result of the re-consultation on the amended plans submitted. Summarised as follows:-

- o Happy that the balcony has been changed. However the fact that the double doors in bedroom 3 still open up means you are able to see into my 9 year old daughter's bedroom window. This should not be allowed to happen.
- o The only other changes that can be seen are the slight change in the position of the front wall. It is very slight. In fact it is difficult to see. Then there is a height change from 3 stories to 2.5. Why does this still need to be so high? Our main issue is the loss of light.
- o Plans show lots of large hedges and trees on our side which will block out Mr Male's development. These trees and the hedges are going to be cropped in an attempt to get more light into our garden.

Additional comments

It is considered that the provision of a Juliet balcony is unlikely to cause anymore overlooking than an ordinary window given you are unable to step out from the doorway like you would be able to with a standard balcony. Given the concerns of the neighbour, it may be prudent to impose a condition to restrict that the balconies to be provided on the rear elevation be Juliet balconies only and retained as such thereafter.

Amendment to condition No. 4 to be as follows:-

- 4) The proposed drive and parking area shall be finished in a permeable surface and retained as such thereafter. If a non permeable finish is proposed, no development shall take place until details of the surfacing and drainage arrangements to address surface water run off shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure adequate surfacing for the parking area and driveway that enables permeable drainage to prevent potential flood risk and in accordance with Policy B(BE).19 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3.

Additional condition No.6

- 6) The balconies to be installed on the rear elevation as shown on the amended plans submitted 20 March 2014, shall be Juliet balconies only and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason:- To accurately define the permission for the avoidance of doubt and to safeguard the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers in accordance with B(BE).13 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3.

2013/341/OUT – Unit 81 Arthur Street

No Updates.