

## Planning and Regulatory Committee

### Tuesday, 6 December 2016, County Hall, Worcester - 10.00 am

		<b>Minutes</b>
<b>Present:</b>		Mr R C Adams (Chairman), Ms P Agar, Mr A T Amos, Mrs S Askin, Mr P J Bridle, Mr S J M Clee, Mr P Denham (Vice Chairman), Mrs A T Hingley, Mr I Hopwood, Mr A P Miller and Mr D W Prodger MBE
<b>Also attended:</b>		Mr C B Taylor was also in attendance as the local councillor for Agenda item 5.
<b>Available papers</b>		The Members had before them: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A. The Agenda papers (previously circulated);</li><li>B. A copy of the summary presentations from public participants invited to speak; and</li><li>C. The Minutes of the meeting held on 1 November 2016.</li></ul> A copy of documents A-B will be attached to the signed Minutes.
<b>962</b>	<b>Named Substitutes (Agenda item 1)</b>	None.
<b>963</b>	<b>Apologies/ Declarations of Interest (Agenda item 2)</b>	An apology was received from Mr R J Sutton.
<b>964</b>	<b>Public Participation (Agenda item 3)</b>	None.
<b>965</b>	<b>Confirmation of Minutes (Agenda item 4)</b>	<b>RESOLVED</b> that the Minutes of the meeting held on 1 November 2016 be confirmed as a correct and signed by the Chairman.
<b>966</b>	<b>Proposed change of use</b>	The Committee considered a County Matter planning application for the proposed change of use of agricultural

**of agricultural buildings and associated land to reclamation facility (MRF) at Weights Farm, Weights Lane, Redditch, Worcestershire (Agenda item 5)**

buildings and associated land to Material Reclamation Facility (MRF) at Weights Farm, Weights Lane, Redditch, Worcestershire.

The report set out the background of the proposal, the proposal itself, the relevant planning policy and details of the site, consultations and representations.

The report set out the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy's comments in relation to the waste hierarchy, the location of the development, the Green Belt, the landscape character and visual impacts, residential amenity (noise, dust and odour), traffic and highway safety, the water environment, ecology and biodiversity and other matters – economic impact, heritage impacts, integrity of the railway line, infrastructure assets and sustainable development.

The Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy concluded that as the proposed development would involve the bulking up of various sources of waste in preparation for transfer and subsequent recycling by specialist operators it would comply with the objectives of the waste hierarchy.

Policy WCS 3 of the Waste Core Strategy required waste management facilities that enable re-use or recycling of waste, including treatment, storage, sorting and transfer facilities, to be permitted within all levels of the Geographic Hierarchy, where it was demonstrated that the proposed location was at the highest appropriate level of the Geographic Hierarchy. The proposal would be located in Level 1 of the geographic hierarchy for waste management in Worcestershire (the highest level), and therefore, complied with Policy WCS 3 of the Waste Core Strategy.

The proposed development would re-use farm buildings and associated land and therefore, would comply with Policy WCS 6 of the Waste Core Strategy, relating to compatible land uses.

The proposed development would be located wholly within the West Midlands Green Belt. The Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy considered that the proposal would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing agricultural buildings and would not conflict with the five purposes of Green Belt. It was considered that the proposal would fall under the Green Belt exemptions (paragraph 90: 'the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of

permanent and substantial construction'), and therefore, would be an appropriate form of development in the Green Belt.

Based on the advice of the County Landscape Officer, it was considered that the proposed development would not have an adverse or detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the local area, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

The Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy considered that, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions relating to operating hours, construction hours, requiring a detailed lighting scheme and implementation of the mitigation measures outlined in the submitted Noise Assessment, there would be no adverse air pollution, noise or dust impacts on residential amenity or that of human health.

The Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy was satisfied that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact upon traffic and highway safety, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

Based on the advice of North Worcestershire Water Management and Severn Trent Water Limited, it was considered that subject to the imposition of an appropriate condition, there would be no adverse effects on the water environment, in accordance with Policy WCS 10 of the Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy.

The Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy considers that, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions as recommended by the County Ecologist, the proposal would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on ecology and biodiversity at the site or on the surrounding area.

It was noted that the NPPF afforded significant weight to economic growth. By securing existing jobs and creating new opportunities, the proposal would support communities and thereby provided a social benefit. Furthermore, by providing jobs and a service to other businesses, it would contribute to the local economy. In so far as it provided these social and economic benefits, it was considered that the proposal would accord with the aims of the NPPF.

Taking into account the provisions of the Development Plan and in particular Policies WCS 1, WCS 2, WCS 3, WCS 6, WCS 8, WCS 9, WCS 10, WCS 11, WCS 12,

WCS 13, WCS 14, and WCS 15 of the adopted Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy, Policies DS1, DS2, DS13, C4, C9, C10, C17, C27, C31, C32, E9, TR1, TR2, TR11, ES1, ES4, ES14 and ES14A of the adopted Bromsgrove District Local Plan, and Policies BDP1, BDP4, RCBD1, BDP13, BDP15, BDP16, BDP19, BDP21, BDP22 and BDP23 of the Draft Bromsgrove District Local Plan, it was considered the proposal would not cause demonstrable harm to the interests intended to be protected by these policies or highway safety.

The representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy introduced the report and commented that members had visited the site, observing the location of the existing skip hire operation, the existing agricultural buildings, the nearest residential properties, the location of the Brockhill East mixed-use development allocated in the Draft Bromsgrove District Local Plan and Draft Redditch Borough Local Plan No.4, and the residential development adjacent to Weight's Lane.

He added that since the publication of the report, further comments had been received from Bromsgrove District Council stating that the proposal by virtue of its vehicle movements and disturbance would be materially detrimental to the residential amenity of the proposed Brockhill East site. The applicant had responded to these comments, stating that the relationship with the application site to the housing allocation site had been addressed in the planning application. The master plan showed the layout of residents' back gardens orientated away from Weights Lane and landscaped areas adjacent to Weights Lane. The hours of the proposed MRF would help to mitigate the impact on residential amenity. This housing would be over 100 metres from the nearest waste management processing building. Weights Farm was an existing industrial estate and already generated HGV movements.

He had also received further communication from Network Rail stating that it was not known if the existing drainage from Weights Farm had consent to discharge to Network Rail property. The water flowing from the site must be of suitable quality for discharge and Network Rail would need confirmation of the volume and velocity of the discharge. This would allow Network Rail to revise or create a new easement as necessary.

In the ensuing debate, the following principal points were raised:

- The local councillor commented that, having regard to the comments by Bromsgrove District Council, he was surprised at the amount of weight given by the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy to the Local District Plan when it was highly likely that the Plan would be adopted by the District Council early 2017. The reference to the uncertainty over Phase 2 of the Redditch Cross Boundary Development was also puzzling given that it was highly likely that housing would be built on the proposed sites. He concurred with the concerns expressed by Bromsgrove District Council that the number of vehicle movements would be materially detrimental to the residential amenity of the occupiers of future housing developments. He argued that the number of vehicle movements had been understated and the removal of material off site had not been accounted for in the calculations. He also expressed concern about hook-lorries carrying containers onto the site given their size and whether they would be able to unload inside the building. If as a result unloading took place outside, there would be noise and pollution issues. He was concerned about the lack of a highways contribution from the applicant. No reference was made to the extra 20 employees which would lead to additional vehicle movements at the beginning and end of the working day. More information was required on vehicle movements. He was puzzled by the reference in the Local District Plan for the need to set aside land for a MRF and the reason for this application coming forward. He was concerned about the condition that required no burning on site as the ideal use for chipped wood would be to create energy. To enable this, a licence would be required for a Biomass Burner on site. As a bi-product of this process, the applicant would also be able to dry the waste before sending it to landfill. He had no problem with the proposed use of the buildings as they already existed. The damage to the Green Belt resulted from the number of vehicle movements. He queried whether the applicant would be able to turn vehicles away and stick to the proposed opening hours for business purposes and argued that the proposed condition was unworkable and unenforceable. The condition allowing self-regulation of the site by the applicant was also unenforceable. Site records should be open for inspection on demand. Any electrical material

brought onto the site needed to be handled in a specialist way. The use of settlement tanks would be preferable for dealing with any run-off from the site. He concluded that there were a number of issues that needed to be resolved and he requested that consideration be deferred

- The representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy recommended that significant weight be given to the District Local Plan which he considered appropriate in the circumstances of the stage in the approval process. The management of the site including the treatment of electrical waste was controlled by the Environmental Permit for the site and the EA had not objected to the application. The purpose of the condition prohibiting the burning of waste was to prevent air pollution. Any proposals for a Biomass Burner would likely require a separate planning consent. It was acknowledged that there would be additional staff vehicle movements and the applicant had submitted a travel plan that included car sharing and cycle spaces on site. The planning permission would not control the type of vehicle or size of the skips entering the site as that was a management issue. However the Council would be able to control the capacity of the site which in turn would limit the number of vehicle movements which could be monitored with reference to the waste return records. It was possible to enforce operating hours and the Council's monitoring officer would respond to any complaints
- The representative of the County Highways Officer indicated that contributions were always sought for planning permissions where it could be assured that the contribution sought was directly related to the development and in conformity with the CIL Regulations. In this case, the housing developer was already in the process of improving the highway infrastructure. There were no other schemes identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan that would be deemed directly related to this application. The vehicles exiting the site would not all be empty. She was satisfied that the additional vehicle movements were acceptable on the existing highway. In addition, vehicles would not need to travel through any future proposed residential developments to access the strategic road network
- In response to a query about loading on site and vehicle movements, Mr Wood, the applicant

confirmed that skips would be back-filled wherever possible before leaving the site

- The representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy confirmed that because the application was for a change of use of existing buildings in the Green Belt, it represented an exception under the NPPF and was therefore considered to be appropriate development in the Green Belt and did not need to be referred to the Secretary of State
- In response to a concern, Mr Wood confirmed that there would be no additional vehicle movements to those proposed in the application
- A concern was expressed about the width of the road from the roundabout to the application site, given the size of the vehicles accessing the site. The representative of the Highways Officer stated that the existing and future capacity of the access road had been examined and considered acceptable
- Concern was expressed about the impact of the noise from vehicle reversing beepers on neighbouring properties. The representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy commented that it was possible to add a condition about reversing vehicle beepers if members so wished
- In response to a query, the representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy commented that the management of asbestos on site was controlled by the Environmental Permit
- In relation to tree planting on site, the representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy indicated that the site was constricted and difficult to plant and in any case the County Ecologist and County Landscape Officer had not proposed any planting on site
- How would the 10% energy gains be generated? The representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy explained that a condition was proposed requiring details to be submitted on any renewable energy proposals. It was anticipated that solar panels would be introduced
- In response to a concern about the structure of the buildings and their capacity to cope with the proposed loads and whether they have been examined by a structural engineer, the representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy commented that details of materials to be brought on site had been

requested and Worcestershire Regulatory Services had not objected in respect to noise emissions. The applicant was proposing to increase the height of the concrete walls but the finer details would need to be submitted before approval. Mr Wood stated that the main building had been in industrial use in the past

- Facilities of this nature were increasingly necessary and should be permitted wherever possible. The report emphasised that the Green Belt was not there to prevent development but to ensure that any development would need to meet stringent regulations before approval. The objections on Green Belt grounds were not substantial and the application should be approved
- It was encouraging to hear the applicant state that he wanted to increase recycling from 80-90%. The application complied with the waste hierarchy policies. It was clear that boxing in the sides of the buildings would not impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The County Highways Officer had examined the evidence and not objected to the application. Significant weight had been given to the Local District Plan and there was no contradiction with it. Worcestershire Regulatory Service had not objected to the application on the basis of noise. The 10% renewable energy gain was very sensible. Network Rail's comments about water run-off were puzzling particularly given that there would be no increase in water on the site and in any case they would need to approve any drainage proposals for the site. On balance the proposal should be supported
- The additional jobs created by this proposal was welcomed
- In response to a request to include vehicle charging points on site, the representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy advised Worcestershire Regulatory Service had not recommended their inclusion for this application.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted for the proposed change of use of agricultural buildings and associated land to Material Reclamation Facility (MRF) at Weights Farm, Weights Lane, Redditch, Worcestershire, subject to the following conditions:



**Commencement**

- a) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission;

**Approved Plans**

- b) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on submitted Drawings Numbered 7857-100 Rev A, 7857-200, 3475/1940/03 Rev B, 3475/1940/04 Rev A, 3475/1940/05, 3475/1940/06, 3475/1940/07, 3475/1940/08, 3475/1940/09, 3475/1940/10, 3475/1940/11, 3475/1940/12, 3475/1940/13, 3475/1940/14 and 3475/1940/15, except where otherwise stipulated by conditions attached to this permission;

**Throughput**

- c) The annual throughput of materials handled at the site shall be limited to a maximum of 100,000 tonnes per annum and records shall be kept and made available to the County Planning Authority on written request for the duration of the operations on the site;

**Hours of Working**

- d) Construction works shall only be carried out on the site between 08:00 to 18:00 hours on Mondays to Fridays inclusive, and 08:00 to 13:00 hours on Saturdays, with no construction work on Sundays or Bank or Public Holidays;
- e) Excluding the ancillary office on the first floor of unit 59, operations within the site hereby approved shall only take place between the hours of 08:00 hours and 18:00 hours Mondays to Fridays inclusive, and 08:00 to 13:00 hours on Saturdays, with operations on Sundays or Bank or Public Holidays;

**Noise**

- f) All waste processing (including crushing, shredding and screening) shall take place within the buildings hereby approved;
- g) All vehicles, plant and machinery operated within the site shall be maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications at all times, and shall be fitted with and use fully operational silencers;
- h) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with Section 5.8 '

**Conclusions' of the Noise Chapter of the submitted 'Weights Farm Environmental Assessment, dated 25 August 2016;**

**Storage Heights**

- i) **The height of any external stockpiles of material shall not exceed 4 metres and a scheme for the setting up of a permanent marker that allows operatives and officers from the County Planning Authority a means of visually checking this height shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the County Planning Authority prior to the operation of the development hereby approved. The agreed height marker shall be erected and maintained on site for the duration of the development hereby approved;**

**Lighting**

- j) **Details of any lighting to be installed at the site shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing prior to being erected. These details shall include:**
- i. Height of the lighting posts;**
  - ii. Intensity of the lights;**
  - iii. Colour;**
  - iv. Spread of light (in metres);**
  - v. Any measure proposed to minimise the impact of the lighting or disturbance through glare; and**
  - vi. Times when the lighting would be illuminated;**

**Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;**

**Pollution**

- k) **Any facilities for the storage of oils, fuels or chemicals shall be sited on impervious bases and surrounded by impervious bund walls. The volume of the bunded compound shall be at least equivalent to the capacity of the tank plus 10%. If there is multiple tankage, the compound shall be at least equivalent to the capacity of the largest tank, vessel or the combined capacity of interconnected tanks or vessels plus 10%. All filling points, associated pipework, vents, gauges and site glasses must be located within the bund or have separate secondary containment. The drainage system of the bund shall be sealed with no discharge to any watercourse, land or underground strata. Associated pipework shall be located above**

ground and protected from accidental damage. All filling points and tank/vessels, overflow pipe outlets shall be detailed to discharge downwards into the bund;

- l) No materials shall be burnt on the site;

**Ecology**

- m) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with Section 4.2 'Recommendations' of the submitted 'Preliminary Bat Roost and Nesting Bird Assessment', dated 19 July 2016;

**Materials**

- n) Notwithstanding any indication of the materials, which may have been given in the application, no development shall take place until a schedule and/or samples of the materials and finishes for the vehicle maintenance workshop building has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;
- o) Prior to the use of the development hereby approved, details of renewable or low carbon energy generating facilities to be incorporated as part of the approved development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The details shall demonstrate that at least 10% of the predicted energy requirements of the development will be met through the use of renewable/low carbon energy generating facilities. The approved facilities shall be provided prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved;

**Drainage**

- p) No works or development shall take place until a scheme for foul and surface water drainage has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. This should include proposed measures to manage the level of pollution in the sites surface water runoff and provided an appropriate level of treatment. The approved scheme shall be completed prior to the first use of the development hereby approved;

**Protection of Railway Lines**

- q) Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, should any excavations,

earthworks or temporary site compounds be proposed adjacent to the railway line, or should vibro-compaction or displacement piling plant be used in the construction of the development hereby approved, a Method Statement detailing how the structural integrity of the railway line, embankment and retaining walls shall be maintained, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority in consultation with Network Rail. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

- r) Any scaffold which is to be constructed adjacent to the railway must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles or cranes over-sail or fall onto the railway. All plant and scaffolding must be positioned that in the event of a failure it will not fall onto Network Rail's land; and

**Planning Permission**

- s) A copy of this decision notice, together with all approved plans and documents required under the conditions of this permission shall be maintained at the site office at all times throughout the period of the development and shall be made known to any person(s) given responsibility for management or control of activities/operations on the site.

**967 Proposed construction of a single storey building to form an early years cabin and forest school boot room at Blackwell First School, St Catherine's Road, Blackwell (Agenda item 6)**

The Committee considered an application under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 1992 for the construction of a single storey building to form an Early Years cabin and Forest School boot room at Blackwell First School, St Catherine's Road, Blackwell.

The report set out the background of the proposal, the proposal itself, the relevant planning policy and details of the site, consultations and representations.

The report set out the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy's comments in relation to the need for the nursery building, the location of the development, residential amenity, traffic and highway safety, and other matters – design.

The Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy concluded that the applicant stated that there was a recognised need for nursery places in the local area, and for a nursery that would be convenient for working parents.

The Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy considered that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of need for the nursery in accordance with Section 8, paragraph 72, of the National Planning Policy Framework, which accorded great weight to the need to expand or alter schools, and Policy S28 of the development plan. Furthermore, the proposal was considered to be acceptable in terms of location when assessed against Policy DS4 of the development plan, subject to being compatible with other policies of the development plan. In view of the above, the great weight accorded to the need for the nursery must be balanced against the other concerns surrounding this application.

A letter of representation raised an objection on the grounds of harm to residential amenity (amongst other objections). The Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy recognised that the proposal would cause impacts in terms of construction, highways concerns and lighting. However, in terms of the development plan, the proposal would be acceptable through the imposition of planning conditions and the recommendation for a management solution to the problems associated with pick up and drop off times, which are common at many schools throughout the County.

Another objection was raised on the grounds that the proposal would over-develop the Blackwell School site. The Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy would have preferred the small amount of open space to not be developed. However, it was considered that the proposal would not result in the loss of such a significant amount of open space as to be seen as unacceptable in terms of the development plan.

The proposal would also result in additional children and staff accessing the site at pick up and drop off times, although the applicant states that these would be staggered to avoid those of the main school. The County Highways Officer had no objections to the proposal, subject to a condition requiring the installation of cycle storage facilities. The Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy therefore considered that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of traffic and highways safety.

In assessing the application as a whole, the great weight accorded to the need to expand or alter schools by the National Planning Policy Framework was considered to outweigh the other concerns outlined above.

Furthermore, the other concerns were not considered to be so significant as to conflict with the development plan.

In view of the above, and taking in to account the provisions of the Development Plan and in particular Policies DS3, DS4, DS13, S19, S28, S29, S31, C11, C17, TR1, TR11, TR13, RAT4 and ES2 of the Adopted Bromsgrove District Local Plan and Policies BDP1, BDP2, BDP12, BDP16, BDP19, BDP21, BDP22 and BDP23 of the Draft Bromsgrove District Plan 2011-2031, it was considered the proposal would not cause demonstrable harm to the interests intended to be protected by these policies or highway safety.

In the ensuing debate, the following principal points were raised:

- The proposed layout of the application fitted in well with the existing location of the school and the application should be supported
- Would any of the proposals put forward by the Council's Sustainability Team be included in the development? The representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy commented that the applicant intended to use sustainable materials to build the facility to current energy efficiency and thermal standards and this was considered appropriate. It was an aspiration to achieve BREEAM and Passivehaus standards but given the cost restrictions, it was not considered appropriate for this site
- In response to a query, the representative of the County Highways Officer commented that a Travel Plan was a condition of the previous planning permission granted at the site. Work continued with the Head teacher and parents to address highways issues. The representative of the Head of Legal and Democratic Services explained that zig-zag markings can now be enforced irrespective of whether there is a supporting traffic regulation order.

**RESOLVED that planning permission be granted for the construction of a single storey building to form an Early Years cabin and Forest School boot room at Blackwell First School, St Catherine's Road, Blackwell subject to the following conditions:**

- a) **The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission;**

- b) The permission enures for the benefit of Worcestershire County Council only;

**Details**

- c) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the drawings titled "Site location plan", "Block plan as proposed", "Floor plan as proposed" and "Elevations as proposed Roof plan as proposed", except where otherwise stipulated by conditions attached to this permission;
- d) Notwithstanding any indication of the materials, which may have been given in this application, prior to the construction of the development hereby approved, a schedule and/or samples of the materials and finishes for the development shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the County Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;

**Lighting**

- e) Details of any lighting to be installed at the site shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing prior to being erected. These details shall include:
- i. Height of the lighting posts;
  - ii. Intensity of the lights;
  - iii. Spread of light (in metres);
  - iv. Any measure proposed to minimise the impact of the lighting or disturbance through glare; and
  - v. Times when the lighting would be illuminated;

**Drainage**

- f) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the drainage strategy outlined in the document titled "Design & Access Statement", which was submitted to the County Planning Authority on 14 September 2016;

## **Ecology**

- g) In the unlikely event that any protected species are found on the site during the works then all works must cease immediately and the advice of a suitably qualified ecologist must be sought prior to works re-commencing;**
- h) No removal of vegetation shall take place between 1 March and 31 August inclusive, unless a competent ecologist has undertaken a careful, detailed check of vegetation for active birds' nests immediately before the vegetation is cleared and provided written confirmation that no birds will be harmed and/or that there are appropriate measures in place to protect nesting bird interest on site. Any such written confirmation should be submitted to the local planning authority;**
- i) Trees and hedgerows to be retained throughout the scheme should be given adequate protection as per BS5837:2012 with appropriate "biodiversity protection zone", "root protection zone" or similar signage installed;**
- j) Within 6 months of the completion of the development, details of one bat and one bird box (including the location) shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Thereafter, the bat and bird boxes shall be installed in accordance with the approved details within 3 months of approval being received;**

## **Highways**

- k) The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the applicant has submitted to and had approved in writing by the County Planning Authority details demonstrating that secure parking for two bicycles has been installed in accordance with the drawing titled "Block plan as proposed 03A A3", which was submitted to the County Planning Authority on 21 October 2016; and**

## **Construction**

- l) Construction works shall only be carried out on**



**968 Proposed change of use from mixed use D1 (Libraries) and B1 (Offices) to mixed use D1 (Libraries), B1 (Offices) and A2 (Financial and Professional Services) at Redditch Library, 115 Market Place, Redditch, Worcestershire (Agenda item 7)**

**the site between 08:00 to 18:00 hours on Mondays to Fridays inclusive, and 08:00 to 13:00 hours on Saturdays, with no construction work on Sundays, Bank Holidays, or Public Holidays.**

The Committee considered an application under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 1992 for a change of use from mixed use D1 (Libraries) and B1 (Offices) to mixed use D1 (Libraries), B1 (Offices) and A2 (Financial and Professional Services) at Redditch Library.

The report set out the background of the proposal, the proposal itself, the relevant planning policy and details of the site, consultations and representations.

The report set out the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy's comments in relation to the reduction in library floorspace, the location of the development, traffic and highway safety and other matters – storage and collection of waste, drainage, and indicative plans.

The Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy concluded that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of the overall loss of floorspace in accordance with Policies CS.5 and C(CF).1 because the applicant stated that there would be no reduction in the provision of core library services. Furthermore, the proposal would contribute to protecting the library service by assisting the applicant in meeting their savings targets.

The proposal would be acceptable in terms of the location of the development because Policies CS.7 and E(TCR).1 directed development that would attract large numbers of people and public office provision respectively towards Redditch town centre. Policy CS.7 also indicated that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of traffic and highways safety because Redditch Library was located in a sustainable town centre location.

In terms of other matters, the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy considered that arrangements for waste, drainage and the indicative plans were acceptable in terms of the development plan.

Taking in to account the provisions of the Development Plan and in particular Policies CS.5, CS.7, B(BE).13, B(BE).14, B(BE).28, E(TCR).1, E(TCR).4, C(CF).1 and C(T).12 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3 2006 and Policies 1, 2, 5, 15, 20, 30, 31, 36, 37, 38 and 39 of the Draft Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4, it was

considered the proposal would not cause demonstrable harm to the interests intended to be protected by these policies or highway safety.

Mr P Blaydon an objector to the proposal was unable to attend the meeting to read out his presentation. The Chairman allowed the members of the Committee a few moments to read his presentation summary.

In the ensuing debate, the following principal points were raised:

- In response to a query about the capacity of the large meeting rooms, Mrs Adorisio from Place Partnership acting on behalf of the applicant commented that the meeting rooms had been designed to be as flexible as possible. Bigger groups could be accommodated in those meeting rooms
- Would the proposals to reduce library space have an impact on the number of books? The representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy advised that there was no intention to reduce book storage and mobile shelving and staff had confirmed that there would be no impact on the availability of books
- There was no objection to this application in planning terms and there could be an additional benefit of people attending the Jobcentre Plus being able to access the library
- The application should be approved on the basis that it was supported by the local councillor and the availability of books and space for public use had been maintained
- In response to a concern about the amount of quiet study areas available at the library, Mrs Adorisio confirmed that quiet study areas and computers would be made available in the building
- In response to a concern about the impact on the library service of other uses in the building, the representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy commented that these type of dual-use arrangements already existed successfully in other libraries in the County
- The representative of the Head of Strategic Infrastructure and Economy confirmed that the library shelving was moveable to allow the creation of a large open space if required.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted for a change of use from mixed use D1 (Libraries) and B1 (Offices) to mixed use D1 (Libraries), B1 (Offices) and A2 (Financial and Professional Services) at Redditch Library, subject to the following conditions:

- a) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission;
- b) The permission enures for the benefit of Worcestershire County Council only; and
- c) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the drawing titled "Location Plan" (Ref. BW 20013L/R/PL 01).

The meeting ended at 11.40am.

Chairman .....