



Wednesday, 7 December 2022

Planning Committee

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Michael Chalk (Chair), Councillor Timothy Pearman (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Imran Altaf, Tom Baker-Price, Brandon Clayton, Andrew Fry and Bill Hartnett

Officers:

Ryan Keyte, Helena Plant, Steve Edden, Charlotte Wood, Claire Gilbert and Sharron Williams

Democratic Services Officer:

Gavin Day

36. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Akbar and Fogg.

37. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Timothy Pearman declared an interest in regard to agenda item 8 (minute No 43) in that he knew the applicant. Councillor Pearman left the room for the aforementioned item and played no part in the debate nor vote in relation to that item.

38. UPDATE REPORTS

An update report was received by Members who indicated that they had received sufficient time to read the report and were happy to proceed with the meeting.

39. 22/00817/S73 - LAND ADJACENT TO LAVENDER PLACE, FECKENHAM

This application had been reported to the Planning Committee because an objection had been received from a consultee which had not been resolved through the course of dealing with the application.

Officers presented their report and in doing so drew Members' attention to pages 1 to 12 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack.

.....
Chair

The application was for the land adjacent to Lavender Place, Feckenham and sought the variation of Condition 2 of planning application (20/00599/FUL) and to replace the approved drawings with revised versions. The changes included omitting herringbone detailing to the brickwork, the partial removal of cladding, conversion of the approved garage (Plot A) to an office/study and associated alterations to fenestration together with setting back the garage (Plot B) further into the site.

Officers drew Members' attention to page 4 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack, outlining the proposed changes to the position of the buildings, which predominately centred around the position and size changes for the garage on plot B.

Officers then detailed the structural changes to the properties which included the removal of two dormers on plot B, the changing of a garage door to a window on plot A and the removal of some of the Herringbone panelling on both buildings.

Finally, Officers highlighted the eaves detail proposed on the site and commented that it more closely resembled the character of the buildings in the local area.

Members asked Officers to clarify why the herringbone design aspect of the application had been removed, Officers replied that the applicant had stated that the herringbone panel arrangement was not appropriate and alien to the area and that there were practical difficulties associated with implementing it. Officers also detailed that the Case Officer and Conservation Officer had proactively met with the applicant and there had been changes to the eaves detail and the cumulative enhancements reflected other properties in the locality.

Members then discussed the application which Officers had recommended be granted.

Members were displeased with the partial retrospective nature of the application, as the foundations had already been installed and trees had been removed which were not consistent with the original application.

Members enquired about the trees being removed and whether they had Tree Protection Orders (TPOs) attached. Officers clarified that the trees did not have TPOs attached, however, they were in a conservation area and therefore afforded some protection via that designation. Members attention was also drawn to the comments received from the Arboricultural Officer, as detailed on page 4 of the Public Reports Pack.

Councillor Clayton proposed an Alternative Recommendation that the application be rejected due to the removal of protected trees, however, without a seconder the Alternative Recommendation was not carried.

On being put to a vote it was

Resolved that

having had regard to the development plan and all other material considerations, planning permission be granted subject to the Conditions and Informatives outlined on pages 7 to 11 of the Public Reports Pack.

40. 22/00952/FUL - 16 BRINKLOW CLOSE, REDDITCH, B98 0HB

The application had been reported to the Planning Committee at the request of the Ward Councillor.

Officers presented their report and in doing so drew Members' attention to pages 13 to 20 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack.

The application was for 16 Brinklow Close, Redditch and sought the alteration of a four-bedroom terraced house to create two flats.

Officers drew Members' attention to the existing and proposed floor plans, as detailed on page 17 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack. Officers commented that the first floor flat had two bedrooms whereas the ground floor flat had one.

It was detailed that there would be no external changes or disruption with the exception of the addition of an external door to access the first floor flat. Members were also informed that the garden would be shared between the two properties with the ground floor having access through an existing access point and the first floor flat having access via the external access point.

At the invitation of the Chair, a statement from Councillor Juliet Brunner, Ward Councillor for the area, was read out.

Members then clarified the following points with the Officers

- That there would be no division of the garden area and that it would be a shared communal space.
- That although the first floor flat was below the technical housing standards size by 5sqm, this standard had not been adopted into the local plan so had reduced weight in the considerations, however, Councillor Hartnett wished this

point to be noted as a loophole in the current local development plan.

Members then considered the application which Officers had recommended be granted.

Members expressed the opinion that the development would result in a reduced number of residents in the building due to the overall reduction in bedrooms, therefore, parking in the area was unlikely to be negatively impacted.

Members disagreed with the division of the outdoor space, some expressed the opinion that it should be divided, whilst others supported the application having a shared communal space.

Councillor Hartnett proposed an Alternative Recommendation that the application be deferred in order for the applicant to return with details on how the outside garden area would be divided, however, without a seconder the Alternative Recommendation was not carried.

On being put to a vote it was

Resolved that

having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions, as detailed on pages 17 to 18 of the Public Reports Pack.

41. 22/00953/FUL - 37 KINETON CLOSE, MATCHBOROUGH WEST, B98 0EU

The application had been reported to the Planning Committee at the request of the local Ward Councillor.

Officers presented their report and in doing so drew Members' attention to pages 21 to 27 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack.

The application was for 37 Kineton Close, Redditch and sought the alteration of a three-bedroom terraced house to create two flats.

Officers drew Members' attention to the existing and proposed floor plans, as detailed on page 17 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack, highlighting that both flats had one bedroom.

Officers highlighted similarities with the previous application in terms of a similar area, the shared communal space, flat size and

layout, however, the key difference was that both flats would have 1 bedroom.

Officers drew Members' attention to page 26 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack in order to highlight the changes to the exterior of the property. The changes included an additional access door for the first floor flat, a full size window to the rear of the property and an additional window at the front.

At the invitation of the Chair a statement from Councillor Juliet Brunner, Ward Councillor for the area, was read out.

Members then considered the application which Officers had recommended be granted.

Members considered this application to be very similar to the previous application, with similar comments on parking, garden access and habitable living space.

On being put to a vote it was

Resolved that

having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be granted subject to the Conditions outlined on page 24 of the Public Reports Pack.

42. 22/01202/FUL - 17 MICHAELWOOD CLOSE, REDDITCH

It was noted that there was an error in the address of the application, and that the correct address was number 27 Michaelwood Close not number 17. Therefore, agenda item number 7 was withdrawn and the application was resubmitted under agenda item number 14 with the correct address.

43. 22/01284/FUL - 2A LIGHT HOUSE WORKS, QUEEN STREET ASTWOOD BANK

Councillor Timothy Pearman declared an interest in the application in that he knew the applicant. Councillor Pearman left the meeting room for the entirety of the application and took no part in the debate nor vote.

The application had been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Officers presented their report and in doing so drew Members' attention to pages 37 to 41 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack.

The application was for 2A Light House Works, Feckenham Road, Astwood Bank and sought the change of use from shop and cafe/ Restaurant (Class E) to a bar and café (Class E), The application also sought the permanent addition of an outdoor seating area.

Officers detailed to Members the contents of the update report which Members had the opportunity to read.

Officers highlighted to Members that this was a retrospective application and detailed the current site layout as detailed on pages 39 and 40 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack

The location of the site was detailed on page 38 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack. Officers also highlighted that nearby residential areas were within 10m of the seating area and detailed that due to the proximity of residential sites it was deemed that the application would cause a significant noise disturbance.

At the invitation of the Chair three individuals spoke in favour of the application, Councillor Craig Warhurst (Ward Councillor), Mr Kevin Flinders and Mr Craig Steet (Applicant).

Members then clarified the following points with the Officers

- That Worcestershire Regulatory Services (WRS) had submitted no representation and had no complaints with regard to noise nuisance. Officers clarified that when speaking of noise, they were referring to the potential detrimental impact on amenity due to the proximity to the residential sites.
- The current lawful use of the property would be the ground floor as a café/restaurant and the first floor as a shop, and that should planning permission be refused, then the applicant would have to return to this usage if an appeal was not upheld.

Members then discussed the application which Officers had recommended be refused.

Members expressed the opinion that the building was a community hub in Feckenham and that there were very few amenities within the area, they also supported the owner making use of a locally listed building and providing employment for the local area.

Members highlighted there was a lack of a significant number of complaints (there were 3 complaints received) and that there had been little objection from consultees including WRS, Licencing, and the Council's Conservation Officer.

Officers reminded Members that permissions were attached to the building and not an individual. Therefore, Members needed to be mindful that although the current owner may not have plans to make full use of that which was permitted, it did not mean that they or any subsequent owners would not do so in the future, which could lead to an increase in complaints and noise disruption.

An Alternative Recommendation was proposed by Councillor Clayton that the application be approved, the Alternative Recommendation was seconded by Councillor Baker-Price. There was then some discussion regarding conditions which could be attached to the Alternative Recommendation, the suggestions included, obscured windows, a full plans list and delegated powers to Officers.

On being put to a vote it was

Resolved that

having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be granted with the following conditions:

- **Development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted information (plans list)**
- **An obscuring glazing treatment scheme to be submitted for windows**

44. 22/01325/FUL - TOWN HALL

The application had been reported to the Planning Committee because the landlord of the site was Redditch Borough Council, as such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Officers presented their report and in doing so drew Members' attention to pages 43 to 55 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack.

The application was for the Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch and sought the installation of a new public entrance at ground floor level and localised landscaping works.

Officers detailed to Members the proposed changes to the site and in doing so drew Members' attention to pages 49 and 50 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack. Officers highlighted to Members that there would be three silver birch trees removed and replaced by Hornbeam trees on site.

Officers detailed other changes to the site, the three benches would be replaced by concrete benches, the sculpture on site would not be disrupted and that Highways had requested some additional cycle storage on site, the approximate location of this was detailed on page 47 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack.

Members questioned the car parking arrangements on site. Officers replied that there was no change in the sites application/usage, therefore there was no additional demand for car parking. The sustainable location of the site was also noted. Officers further detailed that, there had been no objection to the application on this ground.

On being put to a vote it was

Resolved that

having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be granted subject to the Conditions outlined on pages 42 to 43 of the Public Reports Pack.

45. 22/01265/FUL - 30 ANSLEY CLOSE

The application had been reported to the Planning Committee because the land subject to this application was currently owned by Worcestershire County Council. As such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Officers presented their report and in doing so drew Members' attention to pages 57 to 61 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack.

The application was for 30 Ansley Close, Matchborough East, and sought the change of use of highway land to a private residential garden.

Officers drew Members' attention to page 59 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack and the area of land which would be reclassified as to a private residential garden.

Members then clarified the following points with the Officers

- That there was no conflict of interest with Worcestershire County Councillors concerning the Land (owned by WCC) which was proposed to be transferred to a private residential garden.
- That Community Safety was not consulted as there had been no identified crime or community safety issues.
- That it was a retrospective application and the fence had been moved around 10 years ago.

Members then proceeded to discuss the application which Officers recommended be granted.

Members expressed displeasure that this was a retrospective application caused by the unlawful erection of a fence to take land away from the public footpath verges.

Members stated that the removal of the grass verges had caused a narrowing of the footpath causing an increase in the risk to public safety, however, Members also recognised that there had been no supporting representations or comments.

Officers highlighted that even though there were 4 similar applications, each application should be assessed on their own merit as there was a varying amount of intact grass verge for each application.

Councillor Clayton Proposed an Alternative Recommendation to reject the application on the grounds of public safety, crime and disorder caused by the narrowing of public footways. Without a seconder the Alternative Recommendation was not carried.

On being put to a vote it was

Resolved that

having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be granted subject to the Conditions outlined on page 47 of the Public Reports Pack.

46. 22/01356/FUL - 21 ANSLEY CLOSE

The application had been reported to the Planning Committee because the land subject to this application was currently owned by Worcestershire County Council. As such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Officers presented their report and in doing so drew Members' attention to pages 63 to 67 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack.

The application was for 21 Ansley Close, Matchborough East, and sought the change of use of highway land to a private residential garden.

Officers drew Members' attention to page 65 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack and the area of land which would be reclassified to a private residential garden.

During the discussion of the application a number of points were raised these included, the uncertainty of the areas of land, the width of the highway path, the size of the verged area and the effect on public safety in the area.

Due to the aforementioned uncertainties, which could not be sufficiently answered by Officers, Councillor Baker-Price proposed an Alternative Recommendation that that the application be deferred pending a site visit for Members, the Alternative Recommendation was seconded by Councillor Altaf

On being put to a vote it was

Resolved that

having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be Deferred to a future meeting of the Planning Committee subject to a suitable site visit being conducted.

47. 22/01358/FUL - 29 ANSLEY CLOSE

The application had been reported to the Planning Committee because the land subject to this application was currently owned by Worcestershire County Council. As such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Officers presented their report and in doing so drew Members' attention to pages 69 to 73 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack.

The application was for 29 Ansley Close, Matchborough East, and sought the change of use of highway land to a private residential garden.

Officers drew Members' attention to page 71 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack and the area of land which would be reclassified to a private residential garden.

Due to the discussion which took place during agenda item 11 (minute No 46) Councillor Baker-Price proposed an Alternative Recommendation that that the application be deferred pending a site visit for Members, the Alternative Recommendation was seconded by Councillor Pearman.

On being put to a vote it was

Resolved that

having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be Deferred to a future meeting of the Planning Committee subject to a suitable site visit being conducted.

48. 22/01363/FUL - 20 ANSLEY CLOSE

The application had been reported to the Planning Committee because the land subject to this application was currently owned by Worcestershire County Council. As such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Officers presented their report and in doing so drew Members' attention to pages 75 to 79 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack.

The application was for 20 Ansley Close, Matchborough East, and sought the change of use of highway land to a private residential garden.

Officers drew Members' attention to page 77 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack and the area of land which would be reclassified to a private residential garden.

Due to the discussion which took place during agenda item 11 (minute No 46) Councillor Baker-Price proposed an Alternative Recommendation that that the application be deferred pending a site visit for Members, the Alternative Recommendation was seconded by Councillor Fry.

On being put to a vote it was

Resolved that

having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be Deferred to a future meeting of the Planning Committee subject to a suitable site visit being conducted.

49. 22/01202/FUL - 27 MICHAELWOOD CLOSE, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B97 5YB

The application had been reported to the Planning Committee because the applicant was a Council Employee, as such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Officers presented their report and in doing so drew Members' attention to pages 5 to 12 of the Supplementary Pack 1.

The application was for 27 Michaelwood Close, Redditch and sought additions to the property which included a proposed dormer and a flat roof to the existing side extension.

Officers drew Members' attention to pages 10 and 12 of the Supplementary Pack 1, which detailed the proposed changes to Members.

On being put to a vote it was

Resolved that

having had regard to the development plan and to all other material, planning permission be granted subject to the Conditions outlined on page 3 of the Supplementary Agenda Pack 1.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 9.19 pm