



Planning Committee

Wednesday, 15 September 2021

MINUTES

Present:

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

Also Present:

Sukhvinder Agimal (County Highways)

Officers:

Helena Plant, Charlotte Wood, Steve Edden, Amar Hussain and Sarah Hazlewood

Democratic Services Officer:

Sarah Sellers

23. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Karen Ashley. Councillor Alex Fogg attended as substitute for Councillor Ashley.

24. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Imran Altaf declared an interest in relation to Agenda Item 8 in that he had called the application in as Ward Councillor and had previously expressed views in relation to the application. Councillor Altaf left the meeting prior to the commencement of Agenda item 8 and played no part in the debate or the vote.

25. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 25TH AUGUST 2021

RESOLVED that

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 25th August 2021 be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

.....
Chair

26. UPDATE REPORTS

The Update report was noted.

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

Creation of 2 new staff car parks and demolition of 2 existing staff car parks plus creation of some additional infill car parking spaces around the trust site and repositioning of helipad

Members were reminded that this application had originally been considered at the Planning Committee meeting on 28th July 2021 and had been deferred for officers to find out more information about the number of car parking spaces that would be provided under the proposed change in lay out.

Officers took Members through the plans in the presentations pack and outlined that creation of the new parking area to the north of the main building and the reconfiguration of the other parking areas, including the existing public car park. It was noted that the entrance and exit to the public car park were being relocated and the changes would create an extra 18 parking spaces.

Overall, the changes represented a net gain of 28 car parking spaces for the public to use. A total of 307 staff parking spaces were being removed and the number of replacement staff parking spaces would be 308.

The application was recommended for approval.

At the invitation of the Chair Mr Stephen Welch, Director of Estates & Facilities for the Worcestershire Acute NHS Trust, addressed the committee in support of the application.

Members commented that the creation of the additional 28 spaces for public use was positive and thanked the speaker for attending. Whilst reference was made to some of the concerns expressed at the previous meeting regarding lack of parking facilities at the hospital, overall Members were supportive of the application.

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 9 to 12 of the agenda and the amended wording of condition 13 and additional condition 14 as set out on the Update Report.

28. **APPLICATION 21/00195/FUL - LAND SOUTH OF ASTWOOD LANE FECKENHAM REDDITCH B96 6HP - MR MICHAEL FLETCHER (STATKRAFT UK LTD)**

The Chair announced that this item had been withdrawn from the agenda at the request of the applicant and would come back for consideration at a future meeting.

29. **APPLICATION 21/01170/OUT - LAND ADJACENT TO 46 BADGER CLOSE WINYATES WEST REDDITCH B98 0JE - REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

The Chair announced that this item had been withdrawn from the agenda at the request of the applicant and would come back for consideration at a future meeting.

30. **APPLICATION 21/01056/FUL - UNIT 2 MILLSBOROUGH HOUSE IPSLEY STREET SMALLWOOD REDDITCH B98 7AL - MR D CLARKE**

9 no New Dwellings built over 2 storeys over existing roof of Unit 2

Members considered an application for the construction of 9 two bedroom apartments over the existing roof of Unit 2 of Millsborough House.

Officers took the Members through the plans and photographs in the Presentations Pack and described the location and setting of the proposed development in relation to wider site of Millsborough House and the surrounding street scene.

It was noted that the roof line of the proposed apartments would be higher than the existing roof line of the adjoining Unit 1 and this feature would be overly dominant.

Whilst the principle of development in this part of Redditch was supported, the design was felt to be unsuitable and inappropriate in the context of the architectural and historical importance of the building which was classed as a building of historical interest by Redditch Borough Council in 2009. Members were referred to the comments of the Conservation Officer who objected to the application as set out on pages 67 and 68 of the agenda.

Officers had concluded that the proposed addition applied for would detract from the architectural interest of the building and would be contrary to Policy 37 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan (Historic Buildings and Structures). As such the application was recommended for refusal.

At the invitation of the Chair the architect for the applicant, Mr Henry Morris addressed the committee in support of the application.

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

- The difference in roof height between existing Unit 1 and proposed Unit 2 would be significant.
- The existing saw tooth roof design of Unit 2 regarded as having historical significance would be entirely removed as part of the proposed works and the new residential units added would have a flat roof.
- Other development works had already been approved at the site and were in the process of being implemented including the conversion of the existing Unit 2 into residential units.

In debating the application Members referred to the historical context of the building and the desirability for conversions of industrial buildings to residential use to be carried out sympathetically and using designs which enabled heritage features to be retained. Whilst it was noted that there was a tension between the need to provide regeneration and new housing, and the importance of retaining buildings of historical significance, overall Members were of the view that the plans before them were not suitable and did not blend in with or enhance the original structure.

RESOLVED that

Having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be REFUSED for the following reason:

The proposed development by reason of scale, appearance and design would fail to conserve or enhance the character of the building, its setting and features of special architectural and historical interest, harming the character and significance of the building. The extensions would be incongruous and dominant with the proposals being contrary to Policies 37, 39 and 40 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

[Councillor Imran Altaf declared an interest in relation to this agenda item in that he had called the application in as Ward Councillor and had previously expressed views in relation to the application. Councillor Altaf left the meeting prior to the commencement of this agenda item and played no part in the debate or the vote.]

**31. APPLICATION 21/00148/FUL - 1 BLACKSTITCH LANE
REDDITCH B97 5TE - MR NICK BENNETT**

Change of use from adopted highway land to residential garden

Members considered an application for a plot of land forming part of the highways verge and owned by Worcestershire County Council (as the Highways Authority) to be incorporated into the garden of number 1 Blackstitch Lane.

Officers took Members through the plans and photographs in the presentation pack and it was noted that the land formed part of the nature strip at the side of the road and was partially covered in trees that were protected by a tree preservation order.

In policy terms the land was classed as incidental open space land and Members were referred to the tests set out on page 75 of the agenda. Officers had concluded that the criteria to enable development to take place had not been met, and that the need for development did not outweigh the need to protect the incidental open space.

Three neighbour objection letters had been received and Members were referred to the summary of the issues raised on pages 76 and 77 of the agenda.

The application was recommended for refusal.

At the invitation of the Chair the applicant Mr Nick Bennett addressed the Committee under the Council's Public Speaking Rules.

In responding to questions from Members officers clarified that were the application granted permitted development rights could be removed but that would not achieve complete control over the land to preserve its current appearance.

In debating the application members referred to a number of issues including the ecological and screening benefits of preserving the nature strips in Redditch and the importance of incidental open space land as against the impacts of granting the application which might benefit the applicant but could allow future owners to change the land and detract from its intended purpose as highway land.

RESOLVED that

Having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be REFUSED for the following reason:

The proposal would comprise the change of use of land which is incidental open space and currently plays an important role in the character of the local area by contributing to a substantial section of open green highway verge which is free of development. Incorporating this land into the residential boundary of 1 Blackstitch Lane would have a significant detrimental impact to this character by eroding the open appearance of this land by the introduction of domestic paraphernalia and storage, resulting in visual clutter. As the benefits of the development would only be limited and personal to the occupiers of 1 Blackstitch Lane, the need for the change of use of land would not outweigh the need to protect the incidental open space, contrary to Policy 14 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan no. 4.

32. APPLICATION 21/00973/FUL - 17 HOWARD ROAD, REDDITCH, B98 7SH - MR STEVE BENNETT

Warehouse extension

Officers outlined the application for the premises at 17 Howard Road (part of the Park Farm Industrial Estate) recently acquired by Gemporium Limited to be extended. It was noted that the site fell within a Primarily Employment area and the existing floor space of 3,941 square metres would be increased by the addition of an area of 1,591 square metres. The use would be for additional storage.

To accommodate the extension the parking areas on the site would be reconfigured and this would provide a total of 82 parking spaces which was acceptable to County Highways.

Officers took Members through the slides and photographs in the presentation to explain the location of the extension, lay out of the site and the proposed appearance following completion of the works.

The applicant had agreed to the retention of two mature oak trees which would be secured by a condition, and it was also noted that the application would generate a contribution to the local highways authority of £17,860.41 under the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

The application was recommended for approval.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr Ian Ray addressed the committee under the Council's Public Speaking rules on behalf of the Applicant.

RESOLVED that

Planning

Committee

Wednesday, 15 September 2021

Having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, authority be delegated to the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Leisure Services to GRANT planning permission subject to :-

- a) The satisfactory completion of a suitable legal mechanism to provide a financial contribution to Worcestershire County Council for localised improvements

and

- b) The conditions and informatives set out on pages 85 to 86 of the agenda.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 8.42 pm

This page is intentionally left blank