

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

10th March 2021

Planning Application Consultation Response to Bromsgrove and Stratford-on-Avon District Councils

Reference: Bromsgrove Planning Application No. 20/01502/FUL
Stratford-on-Avon Planning Application No. 20/03396/FUL

Site at: Redditch Gateway,
Land Adjacent to the A4023 Coventry Highway.

Proposal: Internal works to facilitate a new mezzanine level in the storage and distribution building approved under the reserved matter consent 19/00619/REM (Bromsgrove) and 19/01545/REM (Stratford-on-Avon)

Applicant: Momentum Projects Ltd

Ward: Alvechurch South Ward
Closest Redditch Ward: Winyates

The author of this report is Helena Plant, Development Management Manager, who can be contacted on Tel: (01527) 881335
Email: h.plant@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk for more information.

1.0 Purpose and scope of report

- 1.1 Redditch Borough Council has been invited to comment by both Bromsgrove District Council and Stratford-on-Avon District Council upon the above-mentioned application.
- 1.2 The Planning Applications are due to be considered by Bromsgrove District Council's Planning Committee and Stratford-on-Avon District Council's Planning Committee in due course. This response would inform the decision making of those Councils.

2.0 Procedural Matters

- 2.1 This matter is reported to members because whilst the revised scheme of Delegation enables consultations requests from adjoining LPA'S to be responded to by officers in conjunction with the Chair of Planning Committee, on this occasion the Chair has exercised discretion and has requested the matter be considered by Planning Committee.

2.3 What should local planning authorities expect from a statutory consultee in terms of a response?

When consulted in the circumstances set out in Article 22 of the Development Management Procedure Order, consultees are under a duty to provide a "substantive response" (as defined in that Article). Local planning authorities must provide such consultees with the information that will enable them to provide a

substantive response.

The substantive response will need to include reasons for the consultee's views so that where these views have informed a subsequent decision made by a local planning authority the decision is transparent. A holding reply would not be acceptable as a substantive response.

2.4 How long do statutory consultees have to respond to a consultation?

Where a "substantive response" is required, statutory consultees must provide it-

a) within the period of 21 days beginning with the day on which - (i) the document on which the views of consultees are sought, or(ii) where there are several documents and they are sent on different days, the day on which the last of those documents is received, or

b) such other period as may be agreed in writing between the consultee and consultor.

2.5 What happens where a statutory consultee considers that it does not have the information it needs to provide a substantive response?

It is important for statutory consultees to inform the local planning authority without delay if they require additional information, and that they have procedures in place to enable this to occur as soon as possible after they receive a consultation. It is not acceptable for a statutory consultee to wait until the 21-day period would otherwise have come to a close to notify the local planning authority that it believes it does not have enough information to provide a substantive response.

Where a statutory consultee requests additional information it will need to set out clearly and precisely what the additional information is and the reasons why it is required.

2.6 What happens where a statutory consultee is unable to meet the deadlines for responding?

Local planning authorities are expected to determine applications for planning permission, within a time period of 5, 8, 13 or 16 weeks (depending on the type of development). Statutory consultees should be aware of the risk that, should they fail to respond within a specified time period, a local planning authority may proceed to decide the application in the absence of their advice.

2.7 Is it possible for the statutory consultee to negotiate an extension to the deadline for representations?

It is important for statutory consultees to do all they can to meet the deadline for representations. It should not usually be necessary for an extension to be proposed.

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

10th March 2021

Extensions of time which are negotiated between the statutory consultee and the local planning authority will not affect the applicant's right to appeal against non-determination. In considering whether to agree to any proposed extension, local planning authorities will therefore need to consider the views of the applicant and the likely impact on the overall time taken to reach a decision.

3.0 Planning History

- 3.1 This application follows the approval of the reserved matters application for a use class B8 (storage and distribution) building with ancillary floorspace including use class B1 (offices) (ref. Stratford reference 19/01545/REM, Bromsgrove reference 19/00619/REM).

4.0 Site Description

- 4.1 The Redditch Gateway development site is separated by the A4023, dividing the site into north and south parcels. The proposed development would be located within the northern parcel, west of the A435.
- 4.2 The application site straddles the administrative areas of Bromsgrove and Stratford-on-Avon Districts only. The majority of the proposed mezzanine would be within the administrative area of Bromsgrove.
- 4.3 Located to the north east of the Application Site is Gorcott Hall (Grade II Listed Building), to the west is the established Ravensbank industrial estate, to the south is the A4023 and beyond that is the residential area of Winyates Green.

5.0 Proposal

- 5.1 The proposed works involve the installation of an internal mezzanine platform within the new warehouse facility, upon which construction is well advanced following detailed planning permission previously being granted.
- 5.2 The main new mezzanine would be steel framed, with a concrete deck and would be located within the existing facility. Surrounding the main concrete deck mezzanine extending to 15,678m² would be an additional lightweight mezzanine of 8000 m² which would be constructed from steel and have a mixture of open grate steel deck flooring and floor boarding depending on the location and operation specific to that area on the lightweight mezzanine. The main mezzanine would be accessed via 6 internal steel staircases and one goods lift.
- 5.3 The mezzanine floorspace would be used for B8 purposes as with the rest of the warehouse unit.
- 5.4 The purpose of the application is to improve the internal function of the approved warehouse building through the installation of an internal mezzanine level

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

10th March 2021

- 5.5 The building's external envelope would remain unaffected as part of the internal mezzanine's installation. Furthermore, there are no external changes proposed to site as a consequence of the proposal for the introduction of the new internal mezzanine.
- 5.6 Were it not for the fact that the developer wishes to preserve the ability to construct the residual quantum of floorspace approved at the outline stage on the southern parcel, it would have been possible for the developer to add the mezzanine to the completed building on the northern parcel without the need for planning permission. Consequently, a separate permission has been sought for the mezzanine in order to avoid the need to seek a variation to the extant permission.

6.0 Officer Appraisal

- 6.1 LP Policy BP16 (Sustainable Transport) states that developments should comply with the Worcestershire County Council's Transport policies, design guide and car parking standards, incorporate safe and convenient access and be well related to the wider transport network. Developments which generate significant travel demands must include a transport statement and have easy access to existing and proposed public transport links. The Policy further advises that the Council will encourage the use of travel plans, where applicable, to secure the provision of sustainable travel choices, both to new developments and extensions of existing sites regardless of use.
- 6.2 The Transport Statement (dated November 2020), submitted in support of this application, confirms that the Proposed Development would not lead to unacceptable transport impacts. Even assuming the mezzanine attracted additional traffic at the same level as the ground floor area, the increase in traffic would not be significant or material to the traffic capacity testing undertaken and agreed in the Transport Assessment at the outline application stage and reserved matters stage for the Redditch Gateway site. This outcome was found to be the same for sensitive assessments for future development scenarios on the site as well.
- 6.3 Condition 25 pursuant to the S73 consent for the Redditch Gateway development requires the submission of a Travel Plan prior to the first occupation of any building through reserved matters. A Travel Plan is currently being prepared which will include the application site and therefore the applicant does not propose to submit one as part of this application. In terms of parking, LP Policy BP16 directs to guidance set out in Worcestershire County Council's design guide.
- 6.4 The WCC Design Guide advises that commercial operators should have a good understanding of the needs of their business and will determine how land under their control can be managed. The applicant should provide a minimum parking provision for each development along with an evidence base to demonstrate the appropriateness of the provision. Trip rates accumulation should either be derived from first principles or from existing data, for example; TRICS or

comparison to facilities of similar size and geographic circumstance.

- 6.5 For other user needs in non-residential, the WCC Design Guide advises that the following parking ratios are required:
- Disabled Parking (minimum standard) – 4 + 3% of total car park (201 – 500 spaces)
 - Cycle Parking – 1 space per 40 sq.m GFA
 - Motorcycle Parking – 1 space per 10 parking spaces
 - Electric Vehicle Charing - Initially 5% of the total parking spaces plus a further 5% at an agreed trigger. The site currently benefits from a total of 469 car parking spaces (22 of which will be disabled spaces and 48 will be electric), 47 motorcycle spaces and 60 bicycle spaces, as approved under the reserved matters consent.
- 6.6 Whilst the proposal sees an uplift in the amount of B8 floorspace, the Transport Statement considers the level of car parking to be appropriate for the number of employees forecast and for the operation of the site with the mezzanine. It demonstrates that the car parking provision allows for flexibility during the peak periods and shift changeover times when there could be delay within the car park as drivers look for and manoeuvre in and out of spaces.
- 6.7 In all, it is considered that the proposed development would have no impact on the safety or operation of the site and the local highway network and meets the requirements of LP Policy BP16 and the WCC Design Guide.
- 6.8 The proposed development is considered to accord with the planning policies contained in the Bromsgrove District Plan and NPPF which are not outweighed by any other material considerations.

7.0 Conclusion

- 7.1 The Proposed Development would see an uplift in employment floorspace which would be used for B8 purposes to support the function of the warehouse and operational requirements of the future occupier. There are no internal works beyond those being proposed and there are no external changes to the warehouse building or wider site. The proposal for the internal mezzanine level should therefore be granted without delay in accordance with paragraph 11 of the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION:

That RBC raise no objection to the applications cited above, and Members endorse a response to that effect to both LPAs.

