



Planning Committee

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Peter Fleming (Chair), Councillor Imran Altaf (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Juma Begum, Andrew Fry, Bill Hartnett, Chris Holz and Sid Khan

In Attendance

Councillor Emma Marshall

Officers:

Helena Plant, Amar Hussain (On Microsoft Teams), Steve Edden, Sarah Hazlewood, David Kelly, Ryan Keyte and Karen Hanchett (of Worcestershire County Council Highways)

Democratic Services Officer:

Gavin Day

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Timothy Pearman.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Peter Fleming declared an Other Disclosable Interest in respect of agenda item 9 (Minute No10) - 23/00321/FUL - Arrow Valley Park, Battens Drive, Redditch, B98 0LJ, as he had previously been involved in a decision regarding this application in his role as a former member of the Executive Committee.

Councillor Fleming, in his role as Chair, suggested that in light of the declaration, the order of the agenda be amended and that item 10 on the agenda (Minute No9) - 23/00322/ADV - Arrow Valley Park, Battens Drive, Redditch, B98 0LJ be considered prior to item 9 (Minute No10). This was agreed by Members and 23/00321/FUL - Arrow Valley Park, Battens Drive, Redditch, B98 0LJ was considered as the last item on the agenda. Councillor Fleming left the meeting during consideration of Minute item 10 and took no part in the debate or any vote thereon.

.....
Chair

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 19th April 2023 were a true and accurate record and signed by the Chair.

4. UPDATE REPORTS

There were no update reports.

5. 21/00447/OUT - THE ALEXANDRA HOSPITAL, WOODROW DRIVE, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B98 7UB

This application was being reported to the Planning Committee as the application required a Section 106 Agreement. As such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 5 to 12 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack.

The application was for The Alexandra Hospital, Woodrow Drive, Redditch, B98 7UB and sought outline planning permission for the removal of the existing carpark and apartment buildings to make way for a new residential development of up to 92 homes, with all matters reserved except for access.

Officers informed Members that the application went before the Planning Committee on 19th April 2023, whereby Members decided to defer the application pending additional information on:

1. If there was a legal covenant attached to the site which related to its land use.
2. Additional information on the traffic survey carried out.

In response to the above, Officers had included two further Appendices, as detailed on pages 37 to 49 of the Public Reports pack.

Officers clarified to Members that the application before them was to decide on the principle of the development and that all plans, with the exception of those showing the proposed access, were indicative.

Officers further highlighted the location of the proposed development and the site's current designation in the Local Plan.

The land was being released due to an NHS initiative to review vacant land for development, it was also highlighted that the NHS were joint applicants.

Officers drew Members' attention to the proposed access plans as detailed on page 11 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack, highlighting the widening of the footpaths along both sides.

At the Invitation of the Chair, Councillor Emma Marshall, Ward Member for Greenlands Ward addressed the Committee in Objection to the application. Mr Andeep Gill, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee in support of the application.

There were no direct questions to Officers so Members proceeded to Debate the application.

Members questioned the timing of the 2021 Traffic survey in that it was undertaken 4 days prior to the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown restrictions being lifted. Karen Hanchett of Worcester County Council Highways, clarified to Members that the assessment for the application was based on the 2015 and not the 2021 survey. Officers further detailed that the results of the 2015 survey were scaled up to 2026 using the governments Tempro software, this provided an accurate indication of future traffic levels which could be assessed with the development. The process of scaling up surveys using Tempro was standard practice and was used by many Local Authorities and considered all current/approved/completed developments in the area which could impact traffic levels.

Members proposed that due to the expanding nature of the Borough and aging population, that allowing land around the hospital to be sold off would have a detrimental impact on the wider community and therefore, would be a material consideration against approving the development.

Members further commented on the transport links to local Hospitals and commented that the Alexandra Hospital lacked key facilities such as a Paediatric department and Maternity Ward and would need the land to expand should these departments be reopened to service the community.

Officers advised Members that the land use and impact to the wider community would fall under hospital operational matters, it was up to the hospital to decide the facilities and land that they required, therefore, the aforementioned reasons would not form material planning considerations.

Members raised concerns regarding the increase in traffic generated by the development and were of the opinion that the impact would be greater than the data indicated and therefore Members suggested a current traffic survey should be undertaken.

Having debated the Recommendation on pages 28 to 35 of the Public Reports pack, a detailed discussion took place where some Members opted to vote against the Officers Recommendation.

Following further in-depth debate, the Committees Legal Advisor provided the Committee with procedural advice regarding the options available to Members for determining the application.

- Members could vote to approve the application; this could be the same or a variation.
- An Alternative Recommendation could be put forward to refuse the application, this would need to be proposed and seconded.
- An Alternative Recommendation could be raised for deferral. However, as there had already been a deferral, Members needed to be very clear as to their reasons for a second deferral and what further information was required. Otherwise, there was a risk it may go to appeal on the grounds of none-determination.
- Members could fail to reach a decision at which point the matter may go to a non-determination appeal and substantial costs could be awarded against the Council. Officers strongly advised against this option.

Officers further reiterated that Members needed to be very clear as to their reasons for their decision should they be minded to vote against the Officer's recommendation. Decisions should be based on the facts and information as presented and Material Planning Considerations. Otherwise, the Committee could have their decision overturned on appeal and costs may be awarded against the Council.

Members then sought further clarity on deferring the application to conduct a new traffic survey. Highways responded that in their opinion the information supplied was sufficient and followed best practice in regard to using Temproware software on an older traffic survey. Officers further expressed the opinion that should Members defer the application to gain additional information, they were unsure whether anything further could be added in addition to the full highways report already provided, as detailed on pages 39 to 48 of the Public Reports pack.

With the agreement of the Chair the meeting stood adjourned from 20:13 hours to 20:18 hours for Members to read the full highways report.

Having reconvened, Members decided to take a second vote on the Officer Recommendation, and on being put to a vote it was

RESOLVED that

having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, authority be delegated to the head of Planning and Regeneration to GRANT planning permission subject to:-

- a) A section 106 agreement.
- b) Conditions as outlined on pages 28 to 35 of the Public Reports pack.

6. 22/00915/FUL - OLD YARR, BLAZE LANE, ASTWOOD BANK, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B96 6QA

The application was being reported to the Planning Committee as the application was for a major development and an objection had been received from a statutory consultee. As such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 13 to 15 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack.

The application was for the Old Yarr, Blaze Lane, Redditch, B96 6QA and sought retrospective planning permission for a change of land use from agricultural land to Equine.

Officers detailed to Members the position of the site on page 15 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

Officers also detailed that the change of land use was for personal and not commercial use, Officers further detailed that any changes would require another planning application.

At the invitation of the Chair Mr Greg Collings, the Planning Agent addressed the committee in support of the application.

Members were displeased with the retrospective nature of the application; however, they saw no reason to refuse the application. 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 and Informatives detailed on pages 57 and 58 of the Public Reports pack.

7. **22/00918/FUL - OLD YARR, BLAZE LANE, ASTWOOD BANK, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B96 6QA**

The application was being reported to the Planning Committee as an objection had been received from a statutory consultee. As such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 17 to 22 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack.

The application was for the Old Yarr, Blaze Lane, Redditch, B96 6QA and sought retrospective planning permission for a menage and the removal of some floodlighting.

Officers detailed to Members the position of the site on page 18 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack.

Officers detailed to Members that to replace the surface and the erection of a new fence would not need planning permission under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Officers further detailed that the removal of the floodlighting would support the openness of the Green Belt.

At the invitation of the Chair Mr Greg Collings, the planning Agent addressed the committee in support of the application.

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 detailed on pages 68 and 69 of the Public Reports pack.

8. **22/01563/FUL - OLD YARR, BLAZE LANE, ASTWOOD BANK, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B96 6QA**

The application was being reported to the Planning Committee as an objection had been received from a statutory consultee. As such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 23 to 28 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack.

The application was for the Old Yarr, Blaze Lane, Redditch, B96 6QA and sought retrospective planning permission for the temporary erection of children's play equipment.

Officers detailed to Members the position of the site on page 24 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The layout of the equipment as constructed was shown on pages 26 and 27 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

Officers detailed that the development was in the Green Belt but it was considered an appropriate form of development.

At the invitation of the Chair Mr Greg Collings, the planning Agent addressed the committee in support of the application.

Officers clarified the following points after questions from Members.

- The length and width of the development was 11.3m by 8.6m and the height was approximated to be 3.8m at the highest point.
- The play equipment was for the personal recreational purposes.

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 detailed on pages 57 and 58 of the Public Reports pack.

9. 23/00322/ADV - ARROW VALLEY PARK, BATTENS DRIVE, REDDITCH, B98 0LJ

As detailed under declarations of interest, agenda item 2 (minute No2), this application was considered prior to agenda item 9 (Minute No10) - 23/00322/ADV - Arrow Valley Park, Battens Drive, Redditch, B98 0LJ.

The application was being reported to the Planning Committee as the applicant was Redditch Borough Council. As such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 37 to 40 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack.

The application was for The Arrow Valley Park, Battens Drive, Redditch, B98 0LJ and sought planning permission for a free-standing sign at the park entrance.

Officers detailed the proposed location of the new sign on page 38 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack. It was further highlighted that the existing sign would be removed.

The new sign would be 2.8m in height and 1.6m in width and would have a powder coated black frame and be constructed of glass reinforced plastic.

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 detailed on pages 85 and 86 of the Public Reports pack.

10. 23/00321/FUL - ARROW VALLEY PARK, BATTENS DRIVE, REDDITCH, B98 0LJ

The Chair, Councillor Peter Fleming, having declared an interest under agenda item 2 (minute No2), left the room for the item and played no part in the debate or decision-making process for the application. Councillor Imran Altaf sat as the Chair for this item.

The application was being reported to the Planning Committee as the application was Redditch Borough Council. As such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 29 to 36 of the Site Plans and Presentations Pack.

The application was for The Arrow Valley Park, Battens Drive, Redditch, B98 0LJ and sought planning permission for parking and infrastructure improvements.

Officers drew Members attention to page 31 of the Site plans and Presentations Pack and detailed the relocation of the vehicular access to the southern carpark with the current access being closed off.

Pages 31 to 34 of the Site plans and presentations pack highlighted the additional car parking spaces provided and would increase the total from 139 to 171 spaces.

There were a number of trees lost due to the proposed development with one mature willow tree removed during the moving of the vehicular access. The other trees lost with the

additional carparking on the western side would all be young specimens. It was noted that the Councils Tree Officer raised no objections to the application and was satisfied that the parking areas will not give rise to harm to mature trees located in proximity to the parking areas

Officers clarified the following points after questions from Members.

- There was no Tree Protection Order (TPO) attached to the large willow tree that was proposed to be removed. TPOs were not normally placed on trees located on Council owned land.
- The disused vehicular access would have barriers installed to prevent access, these had not been shown as part of the application as such measures came under permitted development and therefore did not require planning permission.
- That no additional drainage was deemed necessary, and a porous material would be rendered ineffective due to the nature of the red clay soil underneath.
- That the only large tree was the willow tree removed due the vehicular access.

Members then debated the application.

Members requested an additional Informative to be attached to the application regarding barriers to be installed.

On being put to a vote it was

RESOLVED that

That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be GRANTED, subject to

- a) the Conditions detailed on page 82 of the Public Reports pack.**
- b) an additional Informative covering the instillation of appropriate barriers to prevent access via the closed off vehicular entrance.**

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 9.09 pm

This page is intentionally left blank