

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE
11TH OCTOBER 2011

ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
<p>PART A 08/1044/FULL</p>	19	<p><u>Agent</u> (Additional supporting information) – Two budget hotels will soon be opening in the town centre, Travelodge at the Water Mill and Premier Inn in Slingfield Mill. We understand that these will provide an additional 108 bedrooms.</p> <p>The methodology in the supporting statement compares Kidderminster with a number of similar Midlands towns explains why these towns were chosen</p> <p>This analysis compares the number of hotel rooms and budget hotel rooms in each of these towns by way of ratios per head of population and compares these with Kidderminster. This analysis concludes that there is a shortfall of hotel rooms. For Kidderminster to be on par with the average there would need to be 502 rooms including 213 budget hotel rooms. Currently Kidderminster has 352 rooms with no budget hotel rooms. (<i>Officer Comment – This is incorrect. Kidderminster only has 246 hotel rooms as quoted in the Officer Report</i>)</p> <p>Therefore with the introduction of 108 rooms there will still be an identifiable shortfall of 107 rooms. This would still be the equivalent of one additional large budget hotel or two small hotels such as the one being proposed by the above application.</p> <p>In addition the two new hotels are proposed for the centre of the town leaving room for an additional budget hotel on or close to the periphery. The above site is in such a location on the south side of town and close to a number of businesses. This should mean that it will not necessarily be in direct competition with those in the centre of town</p> <p>We have discussed this with both Travelodge and Premier Inn. Although they will be monitoring the trade generated by their new hotels they would not rule out taking an additional hotel in the town. They have done this in a number of other towns.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>The budget hotel market is a relatively new phenomenon in the UK with branded hotels representing just 16% of the total compared to US at 33% and France 24%. Of the budget market the top 5 branded names represent 17% with the US 34% and France 32% (Source THL latest reporting statement).</p> <p>These global comparisons represent the opportunity created by this immature market and how the demand for branded budget hotels will grow exponentially. Therefore whereas Kidderminster is undersupplied relative to the current UK market, this market itself is growing leading to the conclusion that authorities will need to increase the supply in years to come. Both THL and Premier Inn are predicting growth models until 2026 before they believe the market will be adequately supplied.</p> <p>Therefore in conclusion although some of the identified shortfall will be met by the two new hotels there will still remain a shortfall that needs to be filled if Kidderminster is to compete with its peer towns.</p> <p><u>Chester Road Bowling Club's Company Secretary</u> has confirmed the following, "The Board of Directors of Chester Road Bowling Club reaffirms it is content with its business plan to build a combined indoor and outdoor bowling club supported by the sport's national governing bodies and reiterates its intention for the new club to be ready and open for trading in a minimum of two years."</p> <p><u>Head of Economic Development & Regeneration - North Worcestershire</u> - The site is allocated in the Adopted Local Plan as 'Urban Open Space: Playing Fields and Sports Pitches' and is subject to Policies LR.1 and LR.9 [there is a typographical error on the Proposals Map which implies LR.14 is relevant but this is clarified in the published Addendum]. These policies are themselves reflective of PPG17</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>Policy LR.1 requires the applicant to demonstrate 'exceptional circumstances' when equivalent or improved complementary provision is made in a suitable alternative location. It is for the applicant to demonstrate this is sufficient to outweigh against the loss or reduction of such greenfield open space areas. Paragraph 11.12 of the Reasoned Justification highlights the relevant extract of PPG17 (2002) that "existing open space, sport and recreational buildings and land should not be built on unless and assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space or buildings and land to be surplus to requirements".</p> <p><i>Comment A: The applicants have demonstrated that the Victoria Carpets site is surplus to requirements as open space for sports and recreation. The clubs that were once associated with this site have long since found alternative accommodation and the site has now been inactive for in excess of 5 years and has become overgrown. As such, the provisions Playing Pitch Directive (which applies for 5 years from closure), which ordinarily seeks to protect such spaces for sport are not relevant. The fact that the site has been vacated and unused also means that it was not given formal consideration as part of the Wyre Forest District PPG17 Audit undertaken to inform the Local Development Framework. In addition the Victoria Carpets site forms part of a much larger series of urban open spaces including Kidderminster Golf Club which lies immediately adjacent to the site and the nearby Spennells Valley which offers recreational and play opportunities. This serves to limit the net impact on the wider local amenity.</i></p> <p><i>The provision of a significantly enhanced professional bowling centre including outdoor and (for the first time in Kidderminster) indoor greens together with the significant (£100,000) off-site contributions could be considered to represent an exceptional opportunity to create a sustainable sport and open space infrastructure in the area.</i></p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>Policy LR.9 seeks to protect pitches for their contribution to sport and for their valuable urban amenity role. The Policy states that proposals for development on the scale of this proposal which involve a reduction or loss of playing field sites will not be allowed unless alternative or improved provision of <u>at least equivalent community benefit</u> is made available.</p> <p><i>Comment B: See above which explains how the loss of the open space has been compensated with a significant additional community benefit in terms of access to state of the art bowling facilities and enhancements to existing facilities.</i></p> <p><i>National Planning Policies:</i></p> <p>PPS 4 – requires proposals that secure <i>Sustainable Economic Growth</i> to be treated favourably. To determine whether proposals are sustainable proposals for economic development, which include town centre uses and leisure facilities, should be assessed against various criteria including consideration of environmental issues including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Limiting carbon emissions and provided resilience to climate change; 2) The proposal is accessible by a choice of means of transport and traffic management measures have been secured; 3) The proposal secures high quality design; 4) Impact on economic and physical regeneration; and 5) The impact on local employment. <p><i>Comment E: The application addresses these as follows:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <i>All buildings are to be designed to meet and where possible exceed Building Regulations Part L and the use of energy efficient techniques and equipment. The scheme also proposes the introduction of a Travel Plan to promote a choice and means of travel to the site;</i>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>2) <i>A Transportation Assessment and Travel Plan Framework have been prepared in consideration of the proposals and these make provision for a number of benefits to pedestrians and cyclists including safe and convenient crossing points for Chester Road South and Spennells Valley Road and a new 2m wide footway along Spennells Valley Road. These will help connect the site to local cycle and pedestrians routes including routes to Comberton Hill and the town centre via Worcester Road;</i></p> <p>3) <i>Design of the proposed buildings have taken cues from nearby well-designed modern commercial premises including the Amada factory and care has been taken to ensure that the designs for the hotel/pub and the bowling centre and associated car parking are linked. Retention of existing landscape elements including the hedgerow and trees, is a key part of the design and this will be enhanced by further screening;</i></p> <p>4) <i>The provision of quality budget hotel accommodation will provide additional capacity to bolster the local visitor economy for both leisure and business travellers which in turn will have positive impacts on the image of the district as a business location. Adopted Core Strategy Policy CP10 supports local tourism. The reasoned justification makes specific reference to opportunities outside of Kidderminster town centre to provide tourist accommodation.</i></p> <p>5) <i>The scheme will in itself create new employment opportunities.</i></p> <p>PPS 4 – Planning Applications for Main Town Centre Uses – These uses are defined in the introduction to the PPS and include pub/restaurants and hotel development. This requires two tests to be undertaken. Firstly, a sequential assessment (EC15) is required for planning applications involving main town centre uses that are not within a town centre. Secondly, proposals must include a town centre impact assessment.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>PPS 4 – the <i>Sequential Assessment</i> requires a sequential approach to the development of town centre uses including hotel development. This means that first preference should be for town centre sites, followed by edge of centre and only then out of centre. It is for the applicant to demonstrate that there are no suitable and available sites within town centre or edge of centre locations.</p> <p><i>Comment F: The applicants have undertaken a thorough sequential test with in excess of 20 sites assessed for their suitability and availability. The supporting statement demonstrates that there are currently no alternative, suitable and/or viable sites closer to the town centre.</i></p> <p><i>Planning permission has been granted for a hotel in the upper floors of Slingfield Mill (above Debenhams) in the town centre. Work is expected to commence shortly and is already underway on the site at The Watermill Park Lane where a new Travelodge is under construction.</i></p> <p>PPS 4 – Impact Assessment involves consideration of a number of factors including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Impact on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre; 2) Impact on vitality and viability within the centre and the range and quality of the retail offer; 3) Impact on allocated sites outside the town centre being developed in accordance with the development plan; 4) In the context of retail or leisure the impact on in centre turnover taking account of current and future expenditure capacity; 5) Whether the proposal is of an appropriate scale; and 6) Any other locally important impacts on the town centre.

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><i>Comment G: The application addresses these as follows:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1) There is no identifiable adverse impact on investment in the town centre as demonstrated by the sequential assessment;</i> <i>2) Not applicable – applies to retail floorspace</i> <i>3) Not applicable – applies to retail & commercial leisure* space but in any event the impact of one pub and one small/medium budget hotel would in itself be difficult to quantify;</i> <i>4) Not applicable.</i> <p><i>*Bowling Centre:</i> <i>I have no specific comments to make in respect of the bowling centre other than the above policy references. However, I would distinguish this from a purely 'commercial leisure' proposal (such as ten pin bowling) which would normally be encouraged in town centre locations. This can be distinguished by the need for external greens in addition to the internal facilities and recognition of the sport.</i></p> <p><i>Comment H: PPS 4 – Conclusions</i></p> <p><i>The applicants have demonstrated compliance with the requirements of the sequential approach; and there is no evidence to suggest that the town centre will be adversely impacted. The White Young Green Study undertaken to inform the Local Development Framework does not make the critical link between the health of the town centre and the provision of budget hotel provision within the centre, although such provision would undoubtedly enhance the prospects for the evening economy and this remains a key rationale underpinning the saved policies promoting hotel development within the town centre.</i></p> <p><i>The Kidderminster Regeneration Prospectus and Kidderminster Central Area Action Plan look to provide additional options but all of the sites identified are complex and in most instances require a mixed use development model that could not clearly deliver further hotel development in the short term. Notwithstanding this the development will enable the delivery of a community and sporting facility.</i></p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Correction</u> Paragraph 4.66 (iii) should read £10, 000 to Wyre Forest District Council towards sustainable cycle routes.</p> <p><u>Recommendation updated</u> as follows: delegated authority to APPROVE subject to the submission of:</p> <p>i) amendments to the landscaping as suggested by Arboricultural Officer;</p> <p>ii) an additional lighting strategy for the bowling green undertaken by suitable qualified person indicating vertical light spillage and the impact of the proposed lighting upon ecology with no objections raised by Worcestershire Wildlife Trust, Natural England and the Council's Countryside and Conservation Officer;</p> <p>iii) the signing of a Section 106 Agreement for the items listed under paragraph 4.66; and thereafter</p> <p>iv) subject to the conditions at the end of the report.</p>
10/0659/RESE	58	<p><u>Neighbour</u> (previous landowner) – Formally withdraws earlier objections relating to proximity of play areas to farmed areas; impact of visibility splays; impact of pedestrian and cycle routes on farming activity; impact during construction phase; and adequacy of storm water drainage</p> <p>A <u>further representation</u> has been received raising concerns regarding the proximity of the proposed school to an existing mobile phone mast at the property known as Tagg Barn, which is located to the east of the application site, at an approximate distance of 420mm from the site boundary. (<i>Officer Comment - The principle and location of the school development has previously been approved and the application before Members relates purely to the design and appearance of the development and the associated landscaping. In any event, the distance between the site boundary and the existing, approved mobile phone mast, is considered to be acceptable</i>)</p> <p><u>Environment Agency</u> – No objections to the proposed development. Confirms that all previous outstanding matters have now been satisfactorily addressed</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Countryside and Conservation Officer</u> – Following receipt of revised protected species surveys, No objections to the proposed development. Confirms that previous outstanding matters have been satisfactorily addressed</p> <p><u>Watercourse Officer</u> – No objections to the proposed development. Confirms that proposed storage volumes are sufficient to cater for 1:100 year rainfall plus 30%.</p> <p><u>Worcestershire County Council (Public Path Orders Officer)</u> – Following receipt of revised plans, confirms that the proposals are satisfactory and have formally withdrawn the previous objections</p> <p><u>Corrections</u> Page 67 - Incorrect paragraph numbering.</p> <p>At the top of the page, paragraph 4.14 should be numbered paragraph 4.11, and two thirds of the way down the page paragraph 1.1 should be paragraph 4.14.</p> <p>Also within this paragraph (currently numbered 1.1) reference to paragraph 3.12 on the 3rd line should read paragraph 3.4.</p> <p>Page 68 - Paragraph 4.17 In final sentence, reference to "constraints in pace" should read "constraints in place".</p> <p>Page 69 - Paragraph 1.1 should be labelled paragraph 5.2</p>
11/0110/FULL	71	<p><u>Stourport on Severn Town Council</u> – As it is understood that the application site is liable to flooding, it is accordingly recommended that the application should be refused.</p> <p><u>Worcestershire County Council (Gypsy Liaison Officer)</u> - The letter submitted from the County Council is still current as our waiting list is still full and we have families staying with parents on both Lowerheath and Broach Road Sites. The new site in Sandy Lane has already taken 3 families from our Warndon site and as such has given a home for families from the list.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>Talk around the sites hold the developer's family in high regard and I have been told they are fair people, with those comments from their community and the fact they have got tenants already I think they would both serve a need and be good operators.</p> <p><u>Officer Comments</u> - Officers have considered the possibility of a consent which would allow the travellers to live on the site for a certain number of months of the year. According to PPS25 such a seasonal use would change the proposed use of the land from a 'highly vulnerable use' to a 'more vulnerable use'. However, when considering a 'more vulnerable use' in flood zone 3a PPS25 advises that decision makers should still apply the sequential test. As stated in the report there are considered to be sequentially preferable sites.</p> <p><u>Correction</u> Paragraph 4.53 - Reference to the Race Relations Act 1976 is incorrect and should be replaced by the Equality Act 2010.</p>
11/0252/FULL	107	<p><u>Change of recommendation</u> to APPROVAL subject to the conditions as listed at the end of the report, and</p> <p><u>Additional conditions</u> 14. No lighting unless otherwise agreed in writing 15. Tree retention 16. Tree protection</p>
11/0467/FULL	123	<p><u>Stourport on Severn Town Council</u> - Recommend refusal, as the application site has not previously been developed and is not zoned for residential purposes</p>
11/0468/FULL	133	<p><u>Stourport on Severn Town Council</u> - Recommend refusal as the application site has not previously been developed and is not zoned for residential purposes</p> <p><u>Parks and Green Spaces Manager</u> - The land has never been taken over by the Council and is excluded from areas that the Council are seeking to be taken on in the future. The proposal does result in the loss of an area that was originally intended for a play area and as such in line with PPG17 adequate compensation is required, which should form a financial contribution towards existing play areas</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
<p>PART B 11/0296/FULL</p>	146	<p><u>Corrections</u> Paragraph 5.1 - 1. should read: A6 (Full with no reserved matters)</p> <p>Under 'reason for approval' on page 150, the final line should read " circumstances is compliant with" (i.e. not complaint)</p>
11/0432/RESE	151	<p><u>Agent</u> (the applicant's agent has responded to objection letter 5, referred to in Paragraph 3.3 of the report, as follows) -</p> <p>It is important to note that the letter of objection had regard to an earlier scheme which was submitted to your authority at that time (likely to be Revision B) and as such did not have beneficial regard to the contents of the most recent scheme (Revision E). Accordingly, I would offer the following responses to the separate comments made by Mr. Vick.</p> <p>1) In relation to the perceived lack of tree planting, the current scheme that is before you for consideration includes 7 no. new trees are along the boundary with no. 35 at girths/heights of 16-18cm/4-4.5m. Further to this there is also a proposed new hedge capable of achieving a good height and a further 3 no. trees set back from the boundary between no. 35 and the proposed patios.</p> <p>2) I must stress that the terrace adjacent to the eastern side of the building is exactly the same size and the proposed patios on the western side are now of a comparable size, having been reduced in the issue of Revision E. It should be noted that these are to be constructed at lower ground level, with minimal engineering works, and so will not represent any detrimental impact on neighbouring occupiers, by virtue of the separation distance and their being at a lower level. In any case, this reserved matters submission has sought approval of hard landscaping (as well as soft landscaping) for which the patios are considered to be part. Any details of the patio areas at outline stage were indicative only and the applicant is not bound by these details.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>3) In relation to the boundary treatment, the current landscape plan proposes this to consist of 1.8m CB timber fence with 600mm trellis fixed to top giving a finished height of 2.4m. This overall height would ensure that Mr & Mrs Henderson's privacy is ensured, and accords with their wishes as conveyed by Mr & Mrs Henderson at a meeting with a representative from the applicant company and reiterated by Mr. Vick in his letter. For the avoidance of doubt, it is our intention to site this fence on the development side of Mr & Mrs Henderson's current hedgerow planting, and to supplement it with adjacent planting as described in point 1) earlier. This is shown clearly on the landscape plan (Revision E).</p> <p>4) Importantly, I must stress that the footprint of the building shown on our landscape proposals replicates that shown on the illustrative plan and its position has not moved. We fully recognise that such details were approved under the outline application and also that they are essentially fixed. It is not the intention of the applicant to move the building or change the massing in the course of this submission. Suspicion about changes to the building size and location may have resulted from the difference in style of plan, and that these have been reproduced in different scales/size of paper.</p> <p>In addition, the comments of your Council's Arboricultural Officer are noted. We would have no objection to the use of the suggested conditions relating to details of tree planting specifications and the imposition of a five year management plan covering trees and shrubs.</p> <p><u>Officer Comments</u> – Revision E (to the landscaping scheme) referred to was submitted on 28 September 2011 and no further objections have been received following re-consultation of neighbours</p> <p><u>Correction</u> The application reference at the top of Page 154 should read: 11/0432/RESE</p>
11/0469/FULL	156	<u>Officer Comments</u> - The Section 106 contribution for Open Space would be used at Queen Elizabeth II Silver Jubilee Gardens and/or Northwood Lane

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
11/0498/FULL	160	<p>A <u>letter has been received from the MP</u> which makes reference to the application site, as well as a nearby field which has been the subject of separate enforcement investigations. The letter refers to local concern regarding the history of applications and use of the application site, as well as nearby land, but makes no specific comment as to the merits, or otherwise, of the current application.</p> <p><u>Correction</u> Paragraph 4.28 - Reference to the Race Relations Act 1976 is incorrect and should be replaced by the Equality Act 2010.</p>