

Planning Committee

13th December 2011

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Michael Chalk (Chair), Councillor Roger Hill (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Peter Anderson, Bill Hartnett, Alan Mason (substituting for Councillor Robin King) and Brenda Quinney

Also Present:

Cllr Jinny Pearce (observer as Portfolio Holder) and M Collins (observer for Standards Committee)

Officers:

S Edden, A Hussain, A Rutt and S Skinner

Committee Services Officer:

J Smyth

52. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Robin and Wanda King.

53. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Bill Hartnett and Roger Hill, declared personal and prejudicial interests in relation to Item 8 (Former Marlfield Farm First School Site, Redstone Close, Church Hill – Variation of Section 106 Planning Obligation Agreement) as detailed separately at Minute 59 below.

54. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The Committee received for approval, two sets of Minutes from the 3rd October and 2nd November Planning Committee meetings.

Further to the deferral of the 3rd October minutes at the Committee's previous meeting, Members disputed the accuracy of Minute 35, in respect of an additional agreed matter (relating to waiting time restrictions on the proposed car park). The Committee agreed that a matter recorded as an 'Informative', ought properly to be recorded instead as a formal planning Condition.

.....
Chair

Accordingly it was

RESOLVED that

subject to deletion of Informative 3) 6 of Minute 35 (Planning Application 2011/227/FUL – Church Hill District Centre, Tanhouse Lane, Church Hill) of the 3rd October Planning Committee meeting and its recording instead as Condition 22 on the approved Planning Permission;

the minutes of the meetings of the Committees held on 3rd October and 2nd November 2011 be confirmed as correct records and signed by the Chair.

**55. PLANNING APPLICATION 2011/282/COU –
TRAFFORD PARK, UNIT 19 TRECOTT ROAD, REDDITCH**

Change of use from redundant factory unit (Class B.1)
to form fitness suite (Class D.2)

Applicant: Competition Line UK Ltd

Mr J Taylor, Architect and Agent and Mr G Hall, the Applicant, addressed the Committee under the Council's Public Speaking rules.

RESOLVED that

having regard to the Development Plan and to all other material considerations, Planning Permission be REFUSED for the reasons stated in the main report.

**56. PLANNING APPLICATION 2011/286/FUL –
PHOENIX MEGASTORE, SMALLWOOD STREET, REDDITCH**

Proposed restaurant, new retail and storage area
and new self-contained flat

Applicant: Hawkfield Investments Ltd

RESOLVED that

having regard to the Development Plan and to all other material considerations, Planning Permission be GRANTED, subject to the Conditions and Informatives summarised in the main report.

**57. PLANNING APPLICATION 2011/296/FUL –
LAND AT TEARDROP SITE, BORDESLEY LANE, REDDITCH**

Erection of a C1 Hotel (Premier Inn)
and A3 Restaurant (Beefeater)

Applicant: Whitbread

Mrs A Reeves, objector representing Scottish Widows, and Miss J Patel, the Applicant's Agent, addressed the Committee under the Council's Public Speaking rules.

RESOLVED that

having regard to the Development Plan and to all other material considerations, Planning Permission be GRANTED, subject to the conditions and informatives summarised in the main report and update report and the following additional condition:

“12, All parking spaces to be provided on site prior to first use/occupation.”

(In order to ensure sufficient spaces were provided on the site to accommodate both uses and any future extension of the hotel to accommodate the additional 18 bedrooms, approved under the permission, Members considered it prudent to condition the proposed car parking allocation as detailed in additional Condition 12 above.)

(Informally, Officers agreed to approach the Applicant to ascertain if they would be willing to consider providing some additional appropriate off-site hedgerow planting (such as Laurels) along Bordesley Lane to afford the Crematorium on the opposite side of the road from the development some additional privacy.)

**58. PLANNING APPLICATION 2011/306/FUL –
7 OAKHAM CLOSE, OAKENSHAW**

Porch, ground floor extension, internal alterations
and first floor extension

Applicant: Mr J Bonner

Mr Bonner, the Applicant, addressed the Committee under the Council's public speaking rules.

RESOLVED that

having regard to the Development Plan and to all other material considerations, Planning Permission be GRANTED, subject to the Conditions and Informative summarised in the main report.

(In considering the planning application, which Officers had recommended for refusal on grounds detailed in the Update report, and whilst acknowledging the Council's Policy on encouraging good design and particularly the set-back guide, Members were of the opinion that, as a number of houses in close proximity to the applicant's property had, over recent years, been extended similarly to that proposed, a flush 2nd floor extension in this location would not have a dominating effect on the design, character and appearance of the dwelling or be detrimental to the street scene.)

**59. FORMER MARLFIELD FARM FIRST SCHOOL SITE,
REDSTONE CLOSE, CHURCH HILL –
VARIATION OF SECTION 106 PLANNING OBLIGATION
AGREEMENT**

The Committee considered a variation to a Section 106 Agreement associated with Planning Permission 2010/253/FUL in relation to the development of 79 houses on the former Marfield Farm First School site in Redstone Close, Church Hill.

Members were asked to release the other parties involved in the agreement from the requirement for a financial contribution towards education facilities that was no longer appropriate as a result of a revision to the proposed tenure of the development, which would see the ten dwellings originally designated for sale on the open market becoming shared ownership homes, which did not require a contribution.

Some concerns were expressed that, whilst the need for social housing was important, the loss of affordable starter homes was disappointing. Officers clarified that shared ownership would give tenants the opportunity to part own their properties and provide a potential stepping stone to full ownership in the future.

RESOLVED that

the variation to the Section 106 Agreement, dated 17th January 2011 and made between:

- 1) Accord Housing Association Ltd**
- 2) Worcestershire County Council, and**
- 3) Redditch Borough Council,**

regarding the amendment to the tenure of the development in relation to affordable housing and education obligations therein, be agreed, namely:

that the tenure of the development shall be 100% affordable housing and that the requirement for the payment of a contribution towards education facilities be deleted from the Section 106 Agreement, as the contribution is now unnecessary and not required.

(Prior to consideration of this item, and in accordance with the requirements of Section 81 of the Local Government Act 2000, Councillor Hartnett declared a personal and prejudicial interest as a Board Member of Redditch Co-operative Homes and additionally of Accord Housing Association, and withdrew from the meeting prior to the Committee's discussion of the item.

Councillor Hill also declared a personal and prejudicial interest as a member of Redditch Co-operative Homes and withdrew from the meeting prior to the Committee's discussion of the item.)

60. PLANNING COMMITTEE - CONSTITUTION – PROCEDURE RULES

The Committee was asked to consider and comment upon a draft Planning Committee Procedure Rules' document, which incorporated a number of minor amendments to current procedure, to be built into the Council's revised Constitution for 2012. It was noted that further minor amendments had been made to the published draft document at a meeting of the Constitution Review Working Party Group the previous evening. Copies of the updated document were tabled at the meeting.

Members noted and generally supported the proposed Procedure Rules, which generally only reflected existing practice. Some Members expressed concern, however, with regard to a number of the Rules, namely those relating to:

- 3.4 the Leader of the Council not being able to sit on the Planning Committee as a member or substitute;
- 4.2 neither the Chair nor the Vice-Chair, if a member of the Controlling Party Group, being a member of the Executive Committee; and
- 11. formal site visits being routinely arranged for Committee Members before consideration of major applications.

In respect of paragraphs 3.4 and 4.2, some Members considered the proposals might prove too restrictive on Members interested in serving on the Planning Committee, and should therefore be rejected.

Some concern was also expressed that proposals for formal pre-meeting site visits for major applications might also restrict Members ability to serve on the Committee, particularly if ever made compulsory. A formal Motion to delete these elements was therefore put to the vote but failed. The Committee did agree, however, that the word “major” should be changed, in relation to applications which would benefit from formal site visits, to “significant”, as “major application” had a very specific meaning in Planning terms.

Officers clarified that the need for such site visits would be determined by Planning Officers, in consultation with the Committee Chair, on a case by case basis. The current recommended practice that Members familiarise themselves with sites on an informal basis would also continue to be encouraged.

RECOMMENDED that

subject to the word “major” in Item 11 (Site Visits) being changed to read “significant”, the proposed Planning Committee Rules of Procedure be approved.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 9.12 pm

.....
CHAIR