

Planning Committee

Thursday, 18th July, 2024

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Andrew Fry (Chair), Councillor William Boyd (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Juma Begum, Bill Hartnett, David Munro, Gemma Monaco and Jen Snape

Officers:

Helena Plant, Paul Lester, Steve Edden and Amar Hussain

Democratic Services Officers:

Gavin Day

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillors Brandon Clayton and Sid Khan with Councillors Chris Holz and Alan Mason in attendance as substitutes respectively.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Andy Fry declared in relation to Agenda item 5 (minute No5), in that he wished to address the Committee during public speaking as the Ward Councillor for Greenlands and Lakeside.

Councillor Gemma Monaco declared an interest in respect of Agenda Item 7 (Minute No7), in that she had publicly expressed her opinion during a previous phase of the development.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on 20th March 2024 and 17th April 2024 were presented to Members.

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on 20th March 2024 and 17th April 2024 were approved as true and accurate records and signed by the Chair.

Chair

4. UPDATE REPORTS

The Chair Announced that there was an update report in relation to Agenda item 7 (Minute No7).

Members were given a few minutes to read the report, after which Members indicated they were happy to proceed and moved that the Update reports be noted.

5. 24/00502/FUL - 3 SOUTHCREST ROAD, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B98 7JG

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

Having declared in relation to the item, Councillor Fry, retired to the public Gallery and Councillor William Boyd took over the Chair for the agenda item. Councillor Fry addressed the committee as Ward Member during public speaking, then retired from the committee room and took no part in the debate or decision thereof.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 5 to 22 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for 3 Southcrest Road, Redditch, Worcestershire, B98 7JG and sought a Rear single storey extension and two storey side garage and bedroom extension.

Officers detailed that the property was a 3 bedroom dwelling which sat in a elevated and prominent position.

Members attention was drawn to the current and proposed site plans detailed on pages 12 and 13 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack. Officers explained the extent of the works to Members, which would increase the number of bedrooms to 8 with 3 new bedrooms on the first floor with an additional 2 in the dormer loft.

The planning history was detailed on page 18 of the Public Reports pack and pages 15 to 20 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack. Officers clarified the Planning history in that:

- The application 20/01047/FUL was received in 2020 which sought a two-storey side extension. This application was refused, on the grounds that it was too imposing on the surrounding dwellings considering the prominence of the location and that the plans did not step back the extension.
- An appeal was dismissed on 16.06.2021.

- A second application 21/01720/FUL was submitted in 2021 which proposed stepping back the extension to be less imposing and therefore, approval was granted.
- A third application 24/00047/FUL was submitted in 2024 for a larger extension which included a dormer loft conversion. The application was refused as the development once again was not stepped back.

Officers clarified that the second application 21/01720/FUL remained implementable and was for a two-storey side and single storey rear extension.

The application was recommended for refusal on the grounds that a new rear window was overlooking local properties and that the plans were not stepped back.

At the invitation of the Chair, Councillor Andy Fry, Ward Member, and Mrs Asya Parveen, the applicant, addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The following was clarified follow questions from members.

- That the 2020 application was refused as it was deemed out of character for the area being unnecessarily imposing as it was not stepped back.
- The 2021 application remedied the stepping back and was thus approved.
- That although Officers could not identify an exact figure the size of the proposed extension was in excess of an increase of 100% of the footprint of the dwelling.
- That there was a privacy concern in relation to No6 which was 9.3m away from an overlooking window created by the application.

Members then proceeded to debate the application.

Members noted that they can only consider the application which was in front of them, however, they did have regard to the prior planning history and the fact that there was an existing approved application for the site. Members expressed the opinion that the 2021 approved application was a more modest application, and the proposed development was very extensive and imposing.

Members also addressed the fact that there were no concerns raised by neighbours, however, it was noted that future occupants may not share the same view, therefore, more weight was given to the planning policies and guidance.

On being put to a vote it was

RESOLVED that

having had regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, that planning permission be REFUSED, for the reasons as detailed on page 24 of the Public Reports pack.

6. 23/01108/FUL - HEART OF WORCESTERSHIRE COLLEGE, OSPREY HOUSE, ALBERT STREET, REDDITCH, B97 4DE

The application was reported to the Planning Committee because the application was for major development which also required a Section 106 planning obligation. 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 36 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for Osprey House, Albert Street, Redditch, B97 4DE and sought the Change of use of the existing building from education use (Use Class F1) to 33 supported living apartments (Use Class C2). The application also proposed the erection of a three storey 83 bed care home (Use Class C2).

Officers detailed the location of the development and its relation to the local road network. Officers further detailed the location of the existing and proposed building and site plans outlined on pages 26 to 30 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

27 underground car parking spaces were proposed beneath the care home building. An additional 35 above ground parking spaces would be provided making a total of 62 car parking spaces for the development in total.

The design of the new building would match the character of the area with inspiration being taken from British mills historic building which was in close proximity to the site.

Officers detailed that there were no highways or conservation objections subject to appropriate conditions and Section 106 contributions. Due to the Section 106 agreement, the recommendation was to delegate authority to the Head of Planning Regeneration and Leisure services to grant permission.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr David Pickford, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee in support of the application.

The following was clarified following question from Members.

- There was no arrangement to differentiate parking for staff and visitors to the site between the under and above group car parks.
- The Section 106 financial contributions which were requested were all single payments and the figures had been supplied by the relevant authorities based on their internal calculations.
- The 33 assisted living units were single person units, the maximum capacity would therefore be 33 occupants.

Members were broadly in support of the application and expressed the opinion that the development was needed in Redditch, the development also made use of a vacant site and was noted to have a generous parking provision.

Some concern was raised regarding the distribution of parking for staff and visitors, although Members accepted that it could not be a condition due to the required tests set out in the NPPF including the enforceability of such a condition. The possibility of an informative was discussed, whereby officers were in agreement that an informative could be included but it would be at the discretion of the applicant / operator to enforce this. The informative was to restrict the underground parking to be used by employees only.

Councillor Bill Hartnett then proposed an Amendment to the Officer's Recommendation to include such an Informative, wording to be determined by officers. The Amendment was seconded by Councillor David Munro and on being put to a vote was agreed by Members.

With the addition of the proposed amendment as detailed in the preamble above, the Officers recommendation was determined by Members 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, Regeneration and Leisure Services to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- a) The satisfactory completion of the Section 106 Obligation.**
- b) Conditions and Informatives outlined on pages 36 to 43 of the Public Reports pack**
- c) The additional Informative as detailed in the preamble above.**

7. 24/00083/REM - PHASE 5 DEVELOPMENT BROCKHILL EAST, HEWELL ROAD, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE

The application was reported to the Planning Committee because the application was for major development. As such the application fell outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

Having declared an interest in the item, Councillor Gemma Monaco retired from the committee and took no part in the debate or decision thereof.

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 37 to 53 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for land in Brockhill East, Hewell Road, Redditch, Worcestershire and was Phase 5 of the hybrid planning permissions 19/00976/HYB and 19/00977/HYB (Cross boundary application with Bromsgrove DC 24/00077/REM). The application sought reserved matters approval (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for the construction of 241 dwellings and associated works and infrastructure.

Members were informed that there was an update report which would be covered under the Officers presentation.

Officers detailed the various phases of the Brockhill development and their stages of completion in that:

- Phases 1 and 2 were complete.
- Phase 3 was a Hybrid planning application and permission was being sought
- Phases 4 and 6 had been approved.
- Phase 5 was a Hybrid application with Bromsgrove District Council (BDC) and permission had been granted by the BDC Planning Committee on 09.07.2024
- Phases 7 and 8 had not yet come before Planning Committee.

Members attention was drawn to the site layout detailed on pages 42 to 46 of the Public Reports pack. Officers identified the 47 dwellings which would be situated in the administrative area of Redditch Borough Council and that 21 of those (44.7%) were affordable housing units. This was an overprovision of affordable housing units to ensure phases 3, 4 and 5 together comply with the Councils 30% requirement.

The green open space and SUDS basins were shown on page 44 of the Public Reports pack, Officers highlighted that over the whole Brockhill development, 57% was planned to be green infrastructure.

Officers drew Members attention to various housing designs detailed on pages 47 to 53 of the Public Reports pack, this was a selection and was not the whole assortment and that there were other designs which would be used on site. Officers further clarified that some of the designs would be used in both market and affordable units, so the development was considered tenure blind.

The following was clarified after questions from Members:

- That there was some proposed public parking/visitor bays around the site.
- That the public footpaths would be a tarmac material and not grass verges.
- That there is no provision for any play areas within Phase 5, however, there was specifications and details of the open space provision under the hybrid application which looks at the wider development.

Members expressed some concern that the development was less diverse in the housing types than other phases, however, Officers reassured Members that large developments often sought to give phases a different feel to distinguish between phases and give the area a character.

On being put to a vote it was

RESOLVED that

having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations that the Reserved Matters of Layout, Scale, Appearance and Landscaping be approved subject to conditions outlined on pages 57 to 59 of the Public Reports pack.

8. 24/00503/FUL - 76 EATHORPE CLOSE, REDDITCH, WORCESTERSHIRE, B98 0HQ

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

Officers presented the report and in doing so, drew Members' attention to the presentation slides on pages 55 to 62 of the Site Plans and Presentations pack.

The application was for 76 Eathorpe Close, Redditch, Worcestershire, B98 0HQ and sought the internal alterations to create two flats with an associated entrance to the upper floor unit.

Officers drew Members attention to the location of the development and detailed that there was no individual parking provision associated with the dwelling with all local parking being communal in nature.

The existing and proposed layouts were detailed on pages 59 to 61 of the Site Plans and Presentation pack and the location of the new access for the first floor flat was also identified.

The ground floor flat would be a single bedroom unit whilst the first floor would feature two-bedrooms due to the link access being an additional space for the first floor flat.

No objections were identified from consultees, which included Worcestershire County Council (WCC) Highways, as they did not identify a net increase of vehicles required by the development and therefore, had no objection.

The following was clarified after questions from Members

- That the garden space would be a communal area, the management of which would be up to the landowner to manage.
- That WCC, Highways did not raise an objection, as from their calculations the existing and proposed development would require the same number of car parking spaces. According to WCC guidance:
 - The Existing 4 Bedroom dwelling needed 3 spaces
 - The Proposed 1 Bed flat would need 1 space
 - The Proposed 2 Bed flat would need 2 spaces

Members expressed some concern that the maintenance of the garden space was not properly outlined, however, they accepted that it was not a planning consideration but a managerial consideration to be decided by the landowner. 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 66 of the Public Reports pack.