

# Planning Committee

---

Wednesday, 28 July 2021

## MINUTES

### Present:

Councillor Michael Chalk (Chair), Councillor Julian Grubb (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Gemma Monaco, Tom Baker-Price, Andrew Fry, Imran Altaf, Aled Evans, Karen Ashley and Timothy Pearman

### Officers:

Helena Plant, Amar Hussain, Sharron Williams, Charlotte Wood and Sarah Hazlewood

### Democratic Services Officer:

Sarah Sellers

### 8. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

### 9. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

### 10. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 14TH JULY 2021

#### RESOLVED that

**The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2021 be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.**

### 11. UPDATE REPORTS

Under this item officers explained to Members that an updated version of the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) had been brought into effect from 20<sup>th</sup> July 2021. The 2021 version replaced the 2019 version and although there were some changes the document was not significantly different to the previous version.

.....  
Chair

The updated version had come into effect after the agenda for this meeting had been issued. Therefore, in the Update Report officers had noted for each report any aspects where the changes were relevant to the NPPF provisions for that item.

Subject to this explanation, the Update Report was noted.

**12. APPLICATION 19/01264/FUL - ROCKHILL FARM ASTWOOD LANE FECKENHAM REDDITCH B96 6HG - MR GORA**

Erection of 2 x dwellings in lieu of 1 dwelling granted as part of the site's re-development under application 17/00451/FUL (Retrospective)

Officers presented the application and explained the planning history of the site. Planning permission had been granted in 2017 under application reference 17/00451/FUL for the conversion of former farm buildings into residential units. That application included the demolition of a large dutch barn and its replacement with a single dwelling on the same footprint.

Works were commenced in 2020 but the dwelling constructed to replace the dutch barn was not in accordance with the approved plans, the building having been sub-divided to create two 2 bedroomed units instead of one 4 bedroomed unit.

Officers described the dwellings now in situ (and subject to this application) with reference to the slides in the presentation pack and referred to changes to the roof which had been built with a dual pitched roof instead of a flat roof.

The site was located in the Green Belt, and under the NPPF the dwellings would be classed as inappropriate development and the application did not fall into any of the exception categories.

Members were advised that with regard to application 17/00451/FUL, officers had found that very special circumstances applied in that the application would represent a visual improvement.

When assessing the impact on openness of the Green Belt of this application, officers noted that the dual pitched roof was higher than the flat roof under application 17/00451/FUL. However, the design of the revised roof was more in keeping with the location and remained considerably lower in height than the original dutch barn and officers considered that these factors amounted to very special circumstances.

In other aspects the scheme was very similar to that previously approved. The number of parking spaces would be increased from

three to four and there were no objections from County Highways. The location was considered to be acceptable being within walking distance of local amenities.

It was noted that the Council could not demonstrate a five year housing land supply and members were referred to the presumption in favour of development and the test under paragraph 11(d)(ii) of the NPPF as set out on page 9 of the report.

NWMM had commented that on site drainage was acceptable although some further work was needed with regard to offsite drainage which was the subject of ongoing discussions between the developer and highways.

In light of the assessment that very special circumstances applied, and the addition of an extra dwelling to the housing stock, overall it was considered that the application was acceptable and officers were recommending approval.

At the invitation of the Chair the following speakers addressed the Committee, the first in objection to the application and the second in support: -

- Mr Alan Smith – Chair of Feckenham Parish Council
- Mr Ron McKie – on behalf of the applicant

The first public speaker highlighted that application 17/00451/FUL had only been part implemented by the applicant and questioned the comparisons made under this application to the dimensions of the now demolished dutch barn. The speaker also questioned the weight which could be attached to the addition of a single dwelling to the five-year housing land supply.

In response to questions from Members, officers confirmed that the works at the site had started during lockdown. An application for planning permission had been made at the time but that the works had been continued pending the outcome of the planning application. With regard to the permission under reference 17/00451/FUL, this had been implemented for the majority of the site subject to the deviation of the replacement building on the footprint of the Dutch barn.

In debating the application Members referred to the minimal differences between the current application and the single dwelling which was approved under reference 17/0045/FUL.

Legal advice was given that some of the issues raised in public speaking regarding the implementation of the permission granted under reference 17/0045/FUL and the extent to which any deviation

from that permission could be classed as “de minimis” would benefit from further investigation, and for that reason the recommended course of action would be for the application to be deferred.

**RESOLVED that**

**the application be deferred to a future meeting of the Planning Committee to allow officers the opportunity to investigate issues raised in public speaking.**

**13. APPLICATION 21/00444/FUL - THE ALEXANDRA HOSPITAL WOODROW DRIVE REDDITCH B98 7UB - MR LEWIN**

Creation of two new staff car parks and demolition of two existing staff car parks, plus creation of some additional infill car parking spaces around the trust site and repositioning of the helipad

Officers presented the application and described the proposed reconfiguration of the existing parking areas with reference to the slides in the presentation pack.

In summary the main changes proposed were to replace the existing staff car park with a new parking area to the north of the main hospital building. This would also involve the re-positioning of the existing helipad. The existing staff parking at the south eastern corner of the site would be expanded to add extra spaces. The existing public parking area would be reconfigured with a slightly altered lay out and re-located entry/exit points. Additional staff spaces would be created along the western edge of the main hospital building.

Conditions were proposed to ensure the creation of the new staff parking area would be completed before the closure of the existing staff parking area.

The application was recommended for approval.

At the invitation of the Chair, Councillor Emma Marshall addressed the committee in her capacity as ward member for the area.

In responding to questions from Members, officers clarified that the number of parking spaces that would be displaced was 307 and the number of replacement spaces would be 302 giving a net loss of 5 spaces. The changes would include the installation of some electric vehicle charging points.

The plans did not include the creation of a hackney carriage stand for taxis.

With regard to the re-location of the helipad, and concerns over health and safety, officers advised that the hospital would be required to comply with all other regulating bodies and statutory provisions in that regard, and that questioning these very technical aspects would be outside the role of Members on the committee.

In debating the application Members expressed concerns around the existing pressures on car parking at the hospital and the resultant overspill of vehicles that could not be accommodated on the site into nearby streets and residential areas. This included users of the hospital and staff parking on streets off Woodrow Drive and on Nine Days Lane.

Albeit that the net loss of spaces was small, Members were concerned about the displacement of more vehicles. It was not clear what the precise breakdown of the 302 spaces would be as between public and staff parking. Officers did not have further figures available although it was pointed out that there might be a later addition of a small number of spaces following the demolition of the empty staff accommodation blocks.

Following further discussion Members concluded that they did not have sufficient information to reach a final decision and that the application should be deferred. Officers were requested by Members to go back to the applicant to pass on the comments made about the net loss of spaces and find out more detailed information about the numbers of parking spaces.

### **RESOLVED that**

**the application be deferred to a future meeting of the Planning Committee to allow officers the opportunity to find out more information from the applicant as to the reconfiguration of the parking areas and the numbers of parking spaces affected.**

#### **14. APPLICATION 20/01648/FUL - 5 CHURCH GREEN WEST REDDITCH B97 4DY - GRILLWICH**

Change of use from E(a) display or retail of goods, to E(b) sale of food and drink for consumption on the premises and Sui Generis hot food takeaways.  
New shopfront.

Officers presented the application for the currently vacant ground floor unit of the three storey building to be subject to a change of use from retail to a take away / dine in restaurant.

It was noted that the site was located in the conservation area. The plans included replacing the existing recessed shop front with a

more simple design that would be in keeping with the area. Following consultation with the Conservation Officer, the final details of the new shop front would be subject to approval by officers through a condition (Condition 3).

Members were referred to Policy 30 and Policy 32 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan no 4. Whilst the change of use would create a row of three adjacent non-retail units in breach of Policy 32, officers had given weight to changes to the use class system aligning the uses of retail (A1) and cafes and restaurants (A3), and the opportunity to enhance the vitality of the town centre by bringing a vacant unit back into use.

The application was felt to be acceptable with regard to residential amenity subject to the condition which had been included to restrict hours of operation (Condition 6). There had been no objections from WRS or highways, and control of extraction of odour would be secured through a condition (Condition 4).

The application was being recommended for approval.

In responding to questions from Members officers clarified a number of points including that: -

- Members could be reassured that WRS had considered and approved the arrangements for control of odour which were secured by a condition.
- With regard to concerns of the placing of bins by other businesses on William Street, a condition had also been added to require internal bin storage.
- For dine in 18 seats would be provided and the split was expected to be 80% take away as to 20% dine in.

### **RESOLVED that**

**Having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions set out on pages 26 to 27 of the agenda and that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to add two informatives to the decision with regard to shuttering on the shopfront of the premises and future display of signage.**

- 15. APPLICATION 21/00766/FUL - 11 LILAC CLOSE REDDITCH  
B98 7EA - REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

### Proposed rebuild of property following fire damage

Officers explained that the Council owned property, one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings had been damaged by fire to the extent that it would have to be re-built. Permission was therefore sought to construct an identical replacement dwelling to the same design as the original.

### **RESOLVED that**

**Having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions and informatives set out on pages 33 to 34 of the agenda.**

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm  
and closed at 8.51 pm