

Redditch Borough Council
Planning Committee

Committee Updates
14th April 2021

Update sheet number 1

20/00178/FUL Saltways, Cheshire Home, Church Road, Webheath. Redditch.



Additional supporting information submitted by the agent.

- Corrected North West (NW) Existing Elevation plan – 190185/105(A), dated 01/04/21 to show the existing relatively steeply pitched roof on the north east projecting wing of the complex rather than the relatively shallow, almost flat roof shown on the original existing NW Elevation.




- It is stated that from an examination of aerial photos there is a difference in levels, but the exact quantum of this difference is unknown. It is asserted that the lower level of residential properties in sections 1 and 2 is beneficial as level changes would naturally reduce any impact of the proposed fencing and protect the amenity of the residential properties.
- Three **indicative** cross sections have been submitted to demonstrate this point.


1. North west (NW) 2 metre perimeter fence and no. 3 Churchfield Court. It indicates a 1 metre drop in levels at the base of the 2-metre high 'perimeter' fence and the ground floor rear elevation of no. 3 Churchfield Court.




2. North corner of building complex and rear elevation of no. 48 Shirehampton Close. It indicates a 3-metre drop in levels between the base of the 3 metre high fence and the ground floor level of rear elevation of no. 48.



3-10 Indicative Section 1:100



3. North east (NE) wing and adjacent 3-metre-high security fence and NE footpath boundary. It indicates a 3.7 metre rise in levels from the base of the fence and the base of the north east boundary fence.



The applicant has also now amended/ updated the Location and Block Plan to show the amended position of the proposed family garden to conform with the other plans amended to this effect. The suggested condition no. 2 is also updated with the new reference number.

The applicant requests that the triggers for the suggested 'pre-commencement' conditions be reviewed to see if any of them can be 'prior to first installation'

Additional consultation responses have been received as listed below;

NHS Hereford and Worcester Clinical Commissioning Group

The CCGs understanding of the proposal:

- The service development will be commissioned by NHS England (Midlands) Specialised Commissioning Team. The team commissions services for both the East and West Midlands and is based in Leicestershire.
- The development is intended as a regional (East and West Midlands) secure in-patient or Tier 4 resource. Admissions to the service will be via NHS England approval processes and therefore not the responsibility of the CCG. The CCG is not able to confirm the proposed service delivery for the unit, this information is held by NHS England who hold the contract with the service provider, Regis Healthcare.
- The service will be available for local children and young people; however this will be based on bed capacity at the time of referral, noting that there would not be any priority for children and young people living within Worcestershire.

- The standards for Tier 4 secure services (inclusive of the specification for anti-climb fencing) are available to the public via NHS England websites. This is not information held by the CCG.

Worcestershire Wildlife Trust (WWT)

The boundary trees have some potential for commuting and foraging bats, but it seems that there is limited potential for roosts. Importantly, the trees are already likely to be subject to some illumination and so any increased risk to light intolerant species is limited. That said, we would still recommend surveys (or at least a visit by an appropriately qualified ecologist) in cases like this where lighting may be an issue. A condition designed to control light spill to background levels where it might affect mature vegetation and timers etc. should limit the duration of unneeded illumination as far as possible.

Worcestershire Regulatory Services (WRS)

They have clarified that the proposed fence would not provide any noise attenuation.

Conservation Officer

Commenting on the effect of the proposed development on the setting of St Philip's Church in Church Road the following points are made:

- The significance of the St Philip's Church is largely derived from its architectural interest.
- The church is set in a spacious plot with a landscaped carpark to the south east of the Church and is further separated from the application site by a cul de sac of houses built on one side of Churchfield Court.
- The immediate setting of the Church are its grounds and carpark, with the surrounding residential area forming the wider setting. The wider setting contributing little if anything to the significance of the building.
- The proposed security fencing is located beyond this wider setting. It is possible that there may be fleeting views of the fencing, but they are likely to be largely obscured by the houses.
- Therefore, the fencing would have little or no impact on the setting of the Church, and its significance.

Commenting on the suggestion by various members of the public that Hewell Grange maybe a suitable alternative site for the CAMHS unit the following facts are pointed out:

- This site is a Grade II* registered park and falls within the Hewell Conservation Area and the house itself is listed Grade I.
- The whole area is in the greenbelt.

Overall, from a conservation perspective that high security fencing would not be suitable at Hewell Grange.

West Midlands Ambulance Service

- There is currently no CAMHS Level 4 provision within the West Midlands, so a development of such a facility would be welcome.

- The majority of patients who would be taken to such a facility would be non-blue light and most likely be provided by a private provider, as people in this category of care are generally not 'emergency' cases.
- It is not possible to tell how many such journeys would be completed, but their opinion is that is that it would not be a significant number.
- As there is no such facility of this type in the region, it is not possible to give an indication as to how likely it would be that they would be called to it, should an incident take place to provide medical care. However, given that there would be clinicians on site, we would not expect to attend more than occasionally, perhaps not even once a month.

Further Public consultation responses.

Since the report was published there have been 16 people making representations or further representations. The following specific summarised comments are in addition to those in the summary of the main report.

- The local area has lower than average numbers of young people requiring this type of tier 4 accommodation and it ought to be located in an area where there is greater demand which needs to be met.
- The erection of a 3-metre-high security fence will have a negative impact on the setting of the 150 year old St Philips Church and on the amenity of Church Road, one of the oldest roads in Redditch thereby conflicting with policy 39 in the BoRLP.
- Conflict with Policy 40 of BoRLP because a 3-metre-high security fence would not complement the local surroundings
- Conflict with Policy 44 of BoRLP because new and improved health facilities should be in the most accessible locations.
- Conflict with Policy 30 of BoRLP because the not being situated in the town centre because the proposed development in locational terms would not accord with the hierarchy of centres since Webheath is not a named centre
- The existing single storey hipped gabled end of the side (NW) accommodating the admissions ward is particularly close to residential properties.
- The 3-metre security fence enclosing the northern corner next to the admissions ward would look like a 6-metre-high fence due to height difference in relation to houses to the north in Shirehampton Close.
- The security fence is inadequate; it cannot hold back determined climbers, nor prevent missiles being thrown into gardens. Any higher and it becomes even more out-of-character
- The facility would damage community cohesion.
- Local residents have supported development in character with village quality and there is no lack of compassion for the mentally ill.
- Whatever the conclusions of the odd legal reasons related to Class C2 a fenced off CAMHS unit is not the same as the former hospice like Cheshire Homes. The former cheerful Cheshire Home to a high-fenced CAMHS unit for sectioned, very disturbed adolescents. This "equal standing" is against natural justice.
- Despite the Counsels opinions there is no evidence of another CAMHS unit in the UK (as proposed for Webheath which is surrounded on all sides by family homes

- The risk of errors and organisations making wrong judgements over who can be accommodated at the proposed unit on a site adjacent to residential properties e.g. The case of Jonty Bravery illustrates how badly things can go wrong.
- The following category ought to be added to the Glossary:
Tier 4 community-based forensic child and adolescent service Specification document (<https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/service-specification-community-forensic-child-and-adolescent.pdf>) by NHS England, 2.1.4 specifies *There are currently two **broadly** distinguishable clinical groups of young people in secure mental in-patient provision ('forensic' and 'complex non-forensic'); such clinical groups are not necessarily mutually exclusive and there frequently is considerable overlap between them.*
- Devaluation of property prices.

There have also been 2 letters of support from people outside the local area making the summarised points.

- Residents would object to whatever goes on the site as they did in respect of the former Saltways (Leonard Cheshire Home) because they are primarily concerned about their property values.
- There is always a stigma from people in the community against those that suffer from mental health problems and there ought to be more compassion.

OFFICERS ASSESSMENT OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Applicant's Observations

The additional/updated plans have satisfactorily clarified ambiguities and support the arguments in the assessment section. The suggested conditions are updated, below.

The trigger points of the suggested conditions are appropriately drafted to support their relative intentions. Several conditions are already draft as prior to first installation; (Materials, Windows and Mechanical ventilation), whilst justification is given for those that are drafted as pre commencement i.e., tree protection.

Levels

The further indicative plans confirm that the proposed fence in the vicinity of the northern corner of the building would be significantly higher than if it were built on level ground. However, it illustrates the conclusion of the assessment section of the main report in that it would not result in significant additional harm in terms of dominance at ground floor level or within rear gardens. Whilst the illustrations confirm that the fence would be conspicuous at first floor level it would be seen against the backcloth of the building and the harm is capable of being mitigated by being disguised with existing and proposed tree and shrub planting

Security

Whilst some residents consider that a 3-metre-high fence would not be fit for purpose it accords with the NHSE and West Mercia Police advice

Bats

The WWT comments confirm that the impact of external light would not be unduly harmful, but it is appropriate to add to the reason for condition 10 to include a bat protection reason as well as site security and residential amenity.

Conservation

The Conservation views reinforces the conclusion of the Assessment section that the proposed security fence would not unduly harm the character and appearance of the area which includes its heritage asset.

Additional Public consultation views (not covered by the topics above)

The concerns regarding lack of local need, better locations for the proposed use, harm to community cohesion and fear of crime are related mainly to the proposed use which, based on legal advice, is concluded does not need planning permission per se. Whilst there are doubts amongst the public that it is reasonable to accept the legal opinions and the interpretations regarding planning permission not being needed for the proposed use, there is insufficient objective evidence and/or cogent grounds to draw different conclusions on the legal position or its interpretation

Glossary

It is appropriate to add and adopt the specific definition of Tier 4 community-based forensic child and adolescent service. Tier 4 community-based forensic child and adolescent service Specification. Paragraph 2.1.4 specifies *There are currently two broadly distinguishable clinical groups of young people in secure mental in-patient provision ('forensic' and 'complex non-forensic'); such clinical groups are not necessarily mutually exclusive and there frequently is considerable overlap between them – NHSE Specification document C11/S/c.*

Conditions

In the light of the above, it is necessary to omit conditions 2, 6 and 10 from the main report and replace them with those listed below.

2. The proposed development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Approved Plans/ Drawings listed in this notice:

- Location/ block plan – 190185/101/A110A – submitted by e-mail dated 13/04/21.
- Proposed Site Plan 1:200 denoting areas of use in building – 190185/109(-) – 18/05/20.
- Proposed Site Plan 1:500 - 190185/110(B) – 18/05/20
- Proposed NE Wing Rev B -- floorplan 'Admissions Ward' – 190185/112(B) – 18/05/20
- Proposed SW Wing floor plan Rev B 'Transitions Ward' – 190185/113(B). – 18/05/20
- Existing & Proposed Street Scene Elevations & photomontage – 18/05/20
- Updated Indicative Cross sections with approx. levels -190185/118(-) submitted by e-mail dated 05/04/21.
- Proposed School floorplan – 114A – 11/02/20.
- Proposed Main Elevations – 115A – 11/02/20.
- Proposed School Elevations –116(-) - 11/02/20.
- Planning Statement Ref 190185 Rev B – 28/09/20.
- Design & Access Statement Revision B – 18/05/20.
- Supplementary Planning Information Rev A - 03/12/20.

Reason: For avoidance of doubt to seek compliance with the approved plans

6. No development shall commence until a scheme of landscaping, including details of existing trees and shrubs to be retained, proposed tree and shrub plantings and treatment of all parts of the site not covered by buildings, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the sizes, numbers, species and grade of all proposed trees/plants; and specifications to ensure successful establishment and

survival of new planting. The approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting season following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any trees or plants including trees and shrubs to be retained which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species and in accordance with the approved details.

Reason; To ensure that the designs for and implementation of an approved landscaping scheme would satisfactory mitigate the proposed large scale and expanse of security fencing and to complement the security of the site, in the interest of character of the area, the living conditions of adjoining residents and site security.

10. No development shall be commenced until details of the proposed external lighting and CCTV cameras and system, including measures to control light spill to background levels shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The installation of the external lighting and CCTV systems shall be in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To achieve an acceptable design for and implementation of external lighting and CCTV as an integral part of the development in the interests of site security, residential amenity and bat protection.

All the other suggested conditions are as per the main committee report.

21/00139/FUL Land At, Torrs Close

Since the report was prepared, 2 additional representations have been received. In summary these objections relate to;

- Residents have not been appropriately consulted on the application.
- The location of the site on a sharp bend and where on street parking is commonplace.
- Insufficient on-site parking will lead to overspill onto the highway which is narrow at this point; congestion will result.
- Additional housing to the rear of 4 Torrs Close has taken the Close to its limit.

These issues have been addressed within the main Committee report. It is noted that Highways have not raised any objections in relation to the application, subject to appropriate conditions. Publicity has been undertaken both in terms of a site notice and the direct notification of 15 adjoining occupiers as detailed on page 41.

21/00228/FUL Morton Stanley Park, Windmill Drive

Members will note the Café is a steel structure with composite and cedar cladding; materials which are common to modular building solutions and are found on similar buildings in other park settings. However, the applicant has been actively exploring additional ways to ensure the building responds positively to the advice of the Community Safety officer and is involved in discussions with the contractor as well as with other advisors (investigating options for fire retardant protection for example).

To enable these issues to be explored further (which may include options such as a mix of cedar and brick slip cladding, or brick cladding) it is recommended Members treat the submitted elevations and listed materials as indicative and representing one option available as to how the

development may appear. To ensure that satisfactory control is retained over the subsequent appearance of the development, Officers recommend an additional condition being attached to any consent which requires the approval of the materials to be used in the construction of the café building, prior to their use. This enables the matter to be further considered by the applicant without compromising the appearance of the development. In addressing the condition Officers would be mindful of both advice from Community Safety, but also for the need for the development to be suitably assimilated within the setting of the Park as a whole

Additional condition 7;

Prior to their first installation, details of the form, colour and finish of the materials to be used externally on the walls and roofs of the café building, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason ; to ensure that the development is satisfactory in appearance and to safeguard the visual amenities of the area.