

# Planning Committee

9<sup>th</sup> April 2014

## MINUTES

### Present:

Councillor Andrew Fry (Chair), and Councillors Brandon Clayton (substituting for Councillor Roger Hill), Joe Baker, Roger Bennett, Michael Chalk, Wanda King, Brenda Quinney and Yvonne Smith

### Officers:

Steve Edden, Amar Hussain, Ailith Rutt and Sharron Williams

### Committee Services Officer:

Jan Smyth

### 94. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Roger Hill and Alan Mason.

### 95. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

### 96. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

#### RESOLVED that

**the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 12<sup>th</sup> March 2014 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.**

### 97. UPDATE REPORTS

The two Update reports relating to the Applications to be considered were received and noted.

.....  
Chair

**98. PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/289/FUL –  
LAND OFF DIXON CLOSE, ENFIELD, REDDITCH**

Erection of 39 dwellings comprising  
37 houses with a mix of 2, 3 and 4 bedrooms,  
and 2 no. 2 bedroom bungalows.

Applicant: Mr N Laight

The following individuals addressed the Committee under the Council's Public Speaking rules:

Mr J Lorento – objector  
Mrs D Treasure – objector  
Mr B Jones – objector  
Mr N Laight – applicant

**RESOLVED that**

**having regard to the Development Plan and to all other material considerations, authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Regeneration Services to GRANT Planning Permission, subject to:**

- 1) the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation ensuring that:**
  - a) contributions are paid to the Borough Council in respect to off-site open space, pitches and equipped play in accordance with the Council's adopted SPD;**
  - b) contributions are paid to the Borough Council towards the provision of wheelie bins for the new development;**
  - c) contributions are paid to the County Council towards County education facilities in accordance with the Council's adopted SPD;**
  - d) 12 units on the site be restricted to affordable housing in perpetuity;**
- 2) the Conditions and informatives as detailed on pages 16 to 21 of the main report;**

**3) the following additional Conditions:**

- “15) During the course of development works and final fitting out, access to and egress from the site for all construction traffic, contractors and deliveries shall be via the Enfield Industrial Estate.**

**No development traffic shall access the site via Dixon Close unless first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

**Reason: In the interests of nearby residential amenity in accordance with Policy B(BE).13 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3;**

- 16) Prior to the Commencement of Development, details of an emergency access to the site via the Enfield Industrial Estate shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The emergency access works approved shall be implemented prior to the completion of development works on the site. This access point shall be kept available for use by emergency vehicles in perpetuity.**

**Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and in order to provide safe and convenient emergency access to the site in accordance with Policy B(BE).13 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3.**

- 17) The approved emergency access shall be kept available as a secondary access / egress for construction traffic, contractors and deliveries during the construction period. Upon completion of development works this access shall be used for emergency vehicles only.**

**Reason: To allow a secondary access would allow all construction vehicles to access the site at all times via the Enfield Industrial Estate without having to access via Windsor Road, thereby safeguarding residential amenity in accordance with Policy B(BE).13 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3”;**

**and**

- 4) a) **In the event that the Section 106 Planning Obligation cannot be completed by the end of May 2014, authority be delegated to Officers to REFUSE the application on the basis that without the planning obligation the proposed development would be contrary to policy and therefore unacceptable due to the resultant detrimental impacts it would cause to community infrastructure by a lack of provision for their improvements, and that none of the dwellings could be restricted to use for affordable housing in line with current policy requirements; and**
- b) **In the event of a refusal on this ground and the Applicant re-submitting the same or a very similar Planning Application with a completed Legal agreement attached, authority be delegated to the Head of Planning & Regeneration to GRANT planning permission, subject to the conditions and informatives as stated in 2) and 3 above.**

(Officers reported on matters relating to vehicular access to and from the development site, additional comments received from the County Highways Engineer and Officer views on the need to impose an additional condition, all as detailed in the two separate Update reports provided for Members and the public gallery prior to the meeting.)

Officers also reported on the potential for an emergency vehicle access into the development in perpetuity that would be separate to the proposed access via Dixon Close for residential vehicles. In considering this additional information Members were of the view that an additional access, specifically for emergency vehicles only would alleviate some of the concerns in terms of vehicle access from Dixon Close. A further suggestion that the suggested separate emergency access could potentially be used in addition to the Enfield Industrial Estate access for the duration of the construction period was also supported.

The Committee therefore agreed to impose three additional Conditions relating to access and egress from the Site, as detailed at Resolution 3. 15), 16) and 17) above.)

99. **PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/302/FUL –  
HAVERSHAM HOUSE, 327 BROMSGROVE ROAD,  
WEBHEATH, REDDITCH B97 4NH**

Erection of an 8 bedroom and sitting room  
single-storey extension, a single-storey  
laundry extension and associated site works.

Applicant Mr B P Sinha

**RESOLVED that**

**a decision on this matter be DEFERRED for Officers to seek  
further information in regard to proposed parking requirements  
and the Nursing Home’s current classification.**

100. **PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/336/FUL –  
120 PLYMOUTH ROAD, SOUTHCREST,  
REDDITCH B97 4PA**

Two-storey side extension, rear balconies,  
conservatory to the rear, new garage to the  
front of the property, and extend existing  
tarmac driveway with tarmac or block paving

Applicant: Mr Steven Male

Mr D Moran, objector addressed the Committee under the Council’s  
public speaking rules. Mr Male, the applicant, withdrew his request  
to speak to the application.

**RESOLVED that**

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

**“The overall design of the extension including its height, bulk  
and location would result in an overlarge, overbearing and  
obtrusive form of development. The cumulative effect of this  
extension combined with previous extensions to the property  
would result in a development that would be over-intensive  
which would be considered inappropriate with its  
surroundings. In addition, the extent of the development close  
to the side boundary would be overbearing having a  
detrimental impact on the amenities of the neighbouring  
occupiers. As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary  
to policies B(BE).13 and B(BE).14 of the Borough of Redditch**

**Local Plan No.3, the Borough of Redditch Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Encouraging Good Design, and good design principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.**

(In considering the Officer's report and additional information provided in relation to a letter of objection received subsequent to a re-consultation on amended plans and Officers responses, as detailed in the Update report provided to the Committee and the public gallery prior to the meeting, Members expressed a number of concerns in relation to the size and overall design of the proposal which they considered would be overlarge within the context of the residential property and previous extensions to the property and have a detrimental impact on neighbouring occupiers and general surroundings. In view of these concerns, the Committee voted to refuse the application, on which Officers had recommended approval, for the reason detailed in the resolution above.)

**101. PLANNING APPLICATION 2013/341/OUT –  
UNIT 81 ARTHUR STREET, LAKESIDE, REDDITCH**

Outline Permission for the demolition of an existing building and erection of new 1700 sq. m. B2 Unit.

Applicant – Samuel Taylor Ltd

**RESOLVED that**

**having regard to the Development Plan and to all other material considerations, Outline Planning Permission be GRANTED, subject to the Conditions and Informatives set out in the main report.**

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm  
and closed at 8.57 pm

.....  
CHAIR