

# BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

**PLANNING COMMITTEE  
9 JULY 2009**

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON  
THURSDAY, 9 JULY 2009 AT  
1100 HOURS IN COMMITTEE ROOMS  
3 AND 4, COUNCIL HOUSE, BIRMINGHAM**

**PRESENT:-** Councillor Douglas Osborn in the Chair;

Councillors Beauchamp, Maureen Cornish, Delaney, Bill Evans,  
Fazal, Gaved, Jones, Kooner, Linnecor, Sharpe, Smith,  
G Sutton and Whorwood.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PUBLIC ATTENDANCE**

5780 The Chairman welcomed members of the public to the meeting, indicating that a leaflet had been circulated explaining how the Committee operated. He stressed that, because the Committee was a quasi-judicial one, no decisions had been made before the meeting.

---

5781 **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were submitted on behalf of Councillor I Ward.

---

**CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Householder Permitted Development**

5782 The Chairman reminded Members that training in respect of householder permitted development would be held on 23 July 2009.

---

**MINUTES**

5783 **RESOLVED:-**

That the Minutes of that part of the last meeting of the Committee open to the public be noted.

**NOTIFICATION BY MEMBERS OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS THAT THEY CONSIDER SHOULD BE DETERMINED BY COMMITTEE**

**A. Planning Application No C/02698/09/FUL – MacDonald’s, Coventry Road, Yardley**

5784 Councillor Jones requested that a report relating to the above planning application be submitted to a future meeting of the Committee in light of concerns that the development would have an adverse impact on the amenities of local residents and neighbouring occupiers.

---

**B. Planning Application No N/02355/09/FUL – Land at No 4 and to the Rear of 2-16 Edge Hill Road, Sutton Coldfield**

5785 Councillor Maureen Cornish requested that a report relating to the above planning application be submitted to a future meeting of the Committee in light of concerns that the development would have an adverse impact on the amenities of local residents and neighbouring occupiers and the local highway network and was in close proximity to a school.

---

**C. Planning Application No S/02600/09/FUL – 12 The Green, Kings Norton**

5786 Councillor G Sutton requested that a report relating to the above planning application be submitted to a future meeting of the Committee in light of concerns that the development would have an adverse impact on the amenities of local residents and neighbouring occupiers.

---

**D. Planning Application No S/02474/09/OUT – 42 Rednal Road and Rear of 46 Rednal Road, Kings Norton**

5787 Councillor G Sutton requested that a report relating to the above planning application be submitted to a future meeting of the Committee in light of concerns that the development would have an adverse impact on the amenities of local residents and neighbouring occupiers and the local highway network.

---

**E. Planning Application No S/02153/09/FUL – 1209-1211 Stratford Road, Hall Green**

5788 Councillor Smith requested that a report relating to the above planning application be submitted to a future meeting of the Committee in light of concerns that the development would have an adverse impact on the local highway network and parking which would impact on other users in the area.

---

**REPORTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND REGENERATION**

The following reports were submitted:-

(See document No 1)

**Planning Applications in Respect of the South Area**

**Report No 7 – Ravenhurst Road, Land Off (Site A), Moor Pool, Harborne – S/00872/08/FUL**

The Senior Constituency Planning Officer (South) advised that further letters of objection had been received regarding the proposal. He added that he wished to amend the conditions regarding the drainage of Site A.

The Head of Environmental (Legal), Public Law and Property advised Members of the legal considerations that needed to be taken into account and made particular reference to their general duties under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act. He went on to give examples of case law and particularly the test set out in the case of South Lakeland District v The Secretary of State for the Environment.

Councillor Sharpe was opposed to the proposed development and considered that it would not enhance the area and would be totally out of character with the surroundings. In response to a question by Councillor Sharpe, the Head of Environmental (Legal), Public Law and Property explained in more detail the law regarding whether or not a proposed development would harm an area.

Councillor Linnecor concurred with Councillor Sharpe's comments and considered that the proposal would have a detrimental affect on the wildlife, ecology, transport and parking in the area.

5789

**RESOLVED:-**

- (i) That consideration of the application be deferred pending the completion of a suitable legal agreement as set out in the report;
- (ii) that, in the event of the above legal agreement not being completed to the satisfaction of the local planning authority within a period of 3 months from the date of this resolution, planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in the report;
- (iii) that, in the event of the legal agreement being completed to the satisfaction of the local planning authority within a period of 3 months from the date of this resolution, favourable consideration would be given to the planning application for the reason(s) set out in the report, subject to the conditions

specified therein and amended below:-

**Amended Condition 8**

In association with the condition for site-wide sustainable surface water drainage, details of the size, position and depth of the foul and surface water soakaways and associated pipework indicated on Drawing No. 260321-SK07 Rev. C, shall be submitted for the written approval of the local planning authority. The submission shall also address tree, hedge and allotment protection during soakaway construction and during any future maintenance and a programme of allotment restoration after soakaway construction and any future maintenance. The approved scheme shall be implemented and completed prior to first occupation of the houses hereby approved.

REASON: In order to control site drainage and to control works to the affected allotments and nearby trees.

**Amended Condition 23**

Details of a scheme of initial and future management for the 'Wildlife Area' shown on Drawing No. AW1 shall be submitted for the written approval of the local planning authority.

REASON: In order to secure the benefits of the 'Wildlife Area' in compensation for the loss of allotments at Site A.

- (iv) that the Corporate Director of Governance be authorised to prepare and seal the appropriate legal agreement.

---

**Report No 8 – Ravenhurst Road, Land Off, Moor Pool (Site A) – S/00869/08/CAC**

The Senior Constituency Planning Officer (South) and the Head of Environmental (Legal), Public Law and Property reiterated the points made on report no 7 considered earlier in the meeting.

Councillor Beauchamp considered that the garages were an eyesore and that demolishing them would enhance the area.

Councillor Linnecor considered that the condition of the garages was shameful and that it was possible that they might have been allowed to become run down on purpose.

5790

**RESOLVED:-**

That conservation area consent be granted for the reason(s) set out in the report, subject to the conditions specified therein.

Councillors Linnecor and Sharpe wished to be recorded as having voted against the decision.

---

**Report No 9 – Ravenhurst Road, Land Off, and Garden Land at 146 Ravenhurst Road, Moor Pool (Site C) – S/00874/08/FUL**

The Senior Constituency Planning Officer (South) and the Head of Environmental (Legal), Public Law and Property reiterated the points made on report no 7 considered earlier in the meeting.

The Senior Constituency Planning Officer (South) advised that he wished to amend a condition regarding the parking layout and turning space.

5791

**RESOLVED:-**

- (i) That consideration of the application be deferred pending the completion of a suitable legal agreement as set out in the report;
- (ii) that, in the event of the above legal agreement not being completed to the satisfaction of the local planning authority within a period of 3 months from the date of this resolution, planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in the report;
- (iii) that, in the event of the legal agreement being completed to the satisfaction of the local planning authority within a period of 3 months from the date of this resolution, favourable consideration would be given to the planning application for the reason(s) set out in the report, subject to the conditions specified therein and amended below:-

Addition to Condition 20

Drawing Number P21

New Condition

28 - PLA999

Details of an amended parking layout.

REASON: In order to provide adequate turning space for all parking bays along the site's southern boundary.

- (iv) that the Corporate Director of Governance be authorised to prepare and seal the appropriate legal agreement.
-

**Report No 10 – Ravenhurst Road, Land Off, Moor Pool (Site C) – S/00870/08/CAC**

The Senior Constituency Planning Officer (South) and the Head of Environmental (Legal), Public Law and Property reiterated the points made on report no 7 considered earlier in the meeting.

5792

**RESOLVED:-**

That conservation area consent be granted for the reason(s) set out in the report, subject to the conditions specified therein.

---

**Report No 11 – Wentworth Gate, Land Adjacent No 7, Moor Pool (Site EI), Harborne – S/00873/08/FUL**

The Senior Constituency Planning Officer (South) and the Head of Environmental (Legal), Public Law and Property reiterated the points made on report no 7 considered earlier in the meeting.

The Senior Constituency Planning Officer (South) advised that a further letter of objection regarding access implications for a local family with a disabled child had been received. He added that he wished to amend the conditions.

5793

**RESOLVED:-**

That planning permission be granted for the reason(s) set out in the report, subject to the conditions specified therein and amended below:-

Delete Condition 9 (alternative fenestration).

---

**Report No 12 – Wentworth Gate, Land Adjacent No 7, Moor Pool (Site EI) – S/00871/08/CAC**

The Senior Constituency Planning Officer (South) and the Head of Environmental (Legal), Public Law and Property reiterated the points made on report no 7 considered earlier in the meeting.

5794

**RESOLVED:-**

That conservation area consent be granted for the reason(s) set out in the report, subject to the conditions specified therein.

---

**Report No 13 – 189 Alcester Road South, Kings Heath – S/01804/09/FUL**

5795

**RESOLVED:-**

That planning permission be refused for the reason(s) set out in the report.

**Report No 14 – 27 Watford Road, Cotteridge – S/02428/09/FUL**

The Senior Constituency Planning Officer (South) advised that a further letter of objection had been received.

In response to a comment by Councillor G Sutton, the Transportation Officer advised that the level of parking provision was unlikely to provide any demonstrable harm and, therefore, he did not consider that there were grounds for refusal on highway matters.

Councillor Whorwood, in referring to the report, pointed out that the premises were located next to a pet shop and that there was a shared passageway. The Senior Constituency Planning Officer (South) advised that, with regard to the pet shop, there was no adjoining wall to the property and, therefore, the pets would not be adversely affected. He added that access to the passageway would be unaffected and he did not consider that street noise would increase as a result of the proposal.

In response to a question by Councillor Kooner, the Senior Constituency Planning Officer (South) advised the Committee of the proposed opening hours set out in the report.

5796

**RESOLVED:-**

That planning permission be granted for the reason(s) set out in the report, subject to the conditions specified therein.

---

**Report No 15 – 743 Bristol Road South, Northfield – S/01970/09/FUL**

Councillor Delaney declared an interest and left the room during consideration of the item.

The Senior Constituency Planning Officer (South) advised that two extra letters and a petition objecting to the proposal had been received.

Councillor Maureen Cornish pointed out that amusement arcades already existed in the area and suggested that the opening hours should all be the same. Councillor Beauchamp concurred with that comment.

It was proposed by Councillor Maureen Cornish and seconded by Councillor Smith that temporary consent be granted.

Councillor Gaved was concerned that the proposal could lead to increased noise in the area.

Councillor Linnecor expressed concern that a response had not been received from West Midlands Police regarding the proposal. Councillor Sharpe concurred with that comment and proposed that consideration of the application

## Planning Committee – 9 July 2009

be deferred pending information from West Midlands Police. Councillor Kooner seconded that proposal. The Assistant Director (Planning Management) advised that a letter had been sent to West Midlands Police on 27 May 2009 but no response had been received. Upon being put to a vote it was 1 vote for and 8 against deferring consideration of the application. That proposal was lost.

The Chairman suggested a reduction in the opening hours, that temporary consent be granted and that the premises be targeted. Upon being put to a vote it was 8 votes for and 3 against. That proposal was won.

5797

### **RESOLVED:-**

- (i) That temporary planning permission be granted for the reason(s) set out in the report, subject to the conditions specified therein and amended below:-

New Condition

9 - PLT999

The use hereby permitted shall be discontinued and the land restored to its former condition on or before 9 July 2010 in accordance with a scheme of works submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

REASON:

In order to ascertain the effect of the development on local amenity.

Amended Condition 3

The use hereby permitted shall not be open to customers outside the following times of 0900 to 2200 hours Mondays to Saturdays and 0900 to 1800 hours on Sundays.

REASON:

In order to safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of premises/dwelling(s) in the vicinity.

Condition 8 deleted.

- (ii) that the application premises be targeted.

Councillors Linnecor and Sharpe wished to be recorded as having voted against the decision.

---

Councillor Delaney returned to the meeting.

**Planning Applications in Respect of the North Area**

**Report No 16 – 209-211 Walsall Road, Premier Waste UK PLC, Perry Barr – N/01651/09/FUL**

The Area Planning Manager (North) advised that she wished to amend a condition.

In response to a question by Councillor Beauchamp, the Area Planning Manager (North) advised that the proposed conveyer would be enclosed.

5798

**RESOLVED:-**

That planning permission be granted for the reason(s) set out in the report, subject to the conditions specified therein and amended below:-

Amended Condition 11

This permission relates to the details shown on Drawing Numbers 2807-01 Rev A, 2807-02, 31 Rev G, 36 Rev B, 38 Rev D, 39 Rev A, 40 Rev A, 41 Rev A, 42 Rev A and 43-47 (inclusive) and shall not be altered unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

REASON:-

In order to define the permission.

---

**Report No 17 – 1 Coleshill Road, Hodge Hill – N/02326/09/FUL**

A supporter spoke in favour of the application and made a number of points including the following:-

1. An established business analysis of the locality stated that, on the basis of the rental value, the frontage was not recognised as a prime frontage.
2. The prime area was the covered shopping centre.
3. Planning permission had recently been granted for a Tesco retail outlet in the same area. Granting planning permission to Tesco undermined the maintenance of the frontage policy.
4. The use of the property as an estate and letting agents was in line with other businesses and usage in the area.
5. Ten people maintained their livelihood from the established estate and letting agents.

## Planning Committee – 9 July 2009

6. A site visit was suggested.
7. Temporary planning consent was suggested as an alternative to permanent planning permission.

The Area Planning Manager (North) outlined the Council's policies regarding retail frontages set out in the Fox and Goose Local Action Plan.

Councillor Linnecor sympathised with the applicant and suggested that, if planning permission was refused, Regeneration be asked to investigate the possibility of alternative accommodation. Councillor Fazal concurred with that comment.

In response to a question by Councillor Smith, the Assistant Director (Planning Management) advised that the estate and letting agents was established in May 2008.

Councillor Beauchamp considered that some areas of the city had been ruined as a result of being taken over by estate and letting agents. He considered that it ruined the ethos of an area and that it was important to maintain a viable and vibrant shopping centre.

Councillor Kooner, who was not familiar with the area, considered that it would have been useful to have been supplied with pictures of the shopping centre and frontages.

5799

### **RESOLVED:-**

That planning permission be refused for the reason(s) set out in the report.

Councillor Fazal wished to be recorded as having voted against and Councillor Kooner wished to be recorded as having abstained from the decision.

---

### **Report No 18 – 113 Nansen Road, Ward End – N/01869/09/FUL**

A supporter spoke in favour of the application and made a number of points including the following:-

1. The education centre would be for teaching people over 16 years of age. No young children would be taught at the centre and therefore it would not create noise disturbance.
2. A local school nearby probably created more noise than would be generated by the education centre.
3. The centre would be attended by local residents who would be likely to walk rather than use cars to the venue. Therefore, parking was unlikely to be a problem.

4. He suggested a temporary consent as an alternative to granting permanent planning permission.
5. The maximum number of adults attending the centre would be 30.

The Area Planning Manager (North) advised that the main concern had been the fact that the premises were not detached and that noise could have a detrimental affect on neighbouring properties.

Councillor Beauchamp did not think that the premises were suitable for use as an education centre and suggested that Regeneration investigate the possibility of an alternative location. Councillor Linnecor concurred with that suggestion.

Councillor Fazal suggested that the number of students attending be reduced.

Councillor Gaved pointed out that the first floor flat would be adjacent to a bedroom in the adjoining property and was concerned about noise disturbance.

5800

**RESOLVED:-**

That planning permission be refused for the reason(s) set out in the report.

---

**Report No 19 – 158 Ward End Park Road, Land Adjacent, Ward End – N/01662/09/FUL**

A supporter spoke in favour of the application and made a number of points including the following:-

1. The proposed property was a self-build dwelling house.
2. Concern had been raised regarding the size of the garden. However, other properties in the area had similar size gardens.
3. The area was currently an eyesore and building a property on the land would improve the appearance of the surroundings.

The Area Planning Manager (North) advised that the design of the proposed building was not in keeping with the surrounding properties and street scene and there was a lack of amenity space.

In response to a question by Councillor Kooner, the Area Planning Manager (North) advised that she was not familiar with the size of the gardens of the other properties in the area but pointed out that if the applicant wished to supply details then it would be taken into consideration.

Councillor Beauchamp considered that the proposed design of the property was very peculiar and not in line with policies or in keeping with the street scene. He also expressed concern regarding the lack of amenity space.

5801

**RESOLVED:-**

That planning permission be refused for the reason(s) set out in the report.

---

**Report No 20 – 354 Bromford Lane, Hodge Hill – N/02022/09/FUL**

Councillor Whorwood, in referring to the report, expressed concern that a café located in the small parade of shops had been operating without planning permission. The Assistant Director (Planning Management) advised that he understood that an application was scheduled to be submitted for consideration in due course.

5802

**RESOLVED:-**

That planning permission be refused for the reason(s) set out in the report.

---

**Report No 21 – 358 College Road, Kingstanding – N/02086/09/FUL**

Councillor Linnecor declared an interest and left the room during consideration of the item.

A supporter spoke in favour of the application and made a number of points including the following:-

1. An incorrect photograph was displayed with the plans on the board in the committee room. The photograph was not part of the application.
2. The mast would replace an existing one.
3. The new mast would be retractable when not in use and complied with policies and guidelines.
4. Letters of support had been signed by local people.
5. The Radio Society supported the application.
6. None of the persons objecting to the mast were in attendance at the meeting.
7. No consideration had been given to the requirements and needs of the applicant and refusal would be against his human rights.

The Area Planning Manager (North), in referring to the report, outlined the reasons for recommending refusing planning permission.

## Planning Committee – 9 July 2009

The Head of Environmental (Legal), Public Law and Property made reference to Section 6 of the Human Rights Act 1998 and the Race Relations Amendment Act 2003 and stressed that Members should only consider the application purely on planning merits.

Councillor Jones was disappointed that no drawing or photograph of the proposed mast was available.

Councillor Beauchamp considered that the applicant should be permitted to pursue his hobby and pointed out that the mast was retractable and would only be erected whilst transmitting. He wondered whether a condition could be imposed to ensure that the mast would be retracted inbetween usage. The Area Planning Manager (North) advised that that would depend upon compliance officers being in the area on a regular basis and that it would be a fairly onerous task.

Councillor Maureen Cornish was concerned that, during transmission, the mast would be visible from surrounding gardens and that it would be difficult to make sure that the mast would be retracted when transmission was not taking place.

Councillor Whorwood wondered how often and how long transmission would take place and was concerned that the mast would dominate the view from surrounding properties.

In response to a question by Councillor Fazal, the Area Planning Manager (North) pointed out that there was a significant increase in the size of the proposed mast.

5803

**RESOLVED:-**

That planning permission be refused for the reason(s) set out in the report.

---

Councillor Linnecor returned to the meeting.

**Report No 22 – 840 Alum Rock Road, Ward End – N/01681/09/FUL**

The Committee was advised that the application had been withdrawn from the planning register by the applicant.

5804

**RESOLVED:-**

That it be noted that the application had been withdrawn from the planning register by the applicant.

---

**Report No 23 – 315 Alum Rock Road, Saltley – N/00515/09/FUL**

5805

**RESOLVED:-**

That if the Committee had had the opportunity of determining application no N/00515/09/FUL planning permission would have been refused for the reason(s) set out in the report.

---

**Report No 24 – 99 Avery Road, Sutton Coldfield – N/01655/09/FUL**

5806

**RESOLVED:-**

That planning permission be granted for the reason(s) set out in the report, subject to the conditions specified therein.

---

**Planning Applications in Respect of the Central Area**

**Report No 25 – 363 Park Road, Hockley – C/00585/09/FUL**

The Principal Planning Officer (Central) advised that Transportation Development had raised no objections to the proposal. He added that an additional letter of objection from the adjoining occupier had been received.

An objector spoke against the application and made a number of points including the following:-

1. The managers of the site had a history of ignoring the issues and conditions of the use of the site.
2. An extension to the operating hours would destroy the quality of life for local residents.
3. Site tonnage should not be increased as this would lead to a greater number of waste vehicles and journeys.
4. The industrial site was in the middle of a residential area.
5. A 5m high fence would not cut out all noise from the site.

A supporter spoke in favour of the application and made a number of points including the following:-

1. Planning permission had been granted for the existing use of the site.
2. The site could be a source of complaints but every effort was made to ensure that they were resolved.
3. The Environment Agency considered that the site was well managed.

## Planning Committee – 9 July 2009

4. Discussions had taken place with appropriate officers to ensure that the plans and scheme complied with all policies and guidelines.
5. Every effort had been taken to ensure that local residents' concerns had been taken into account.
6. A further eight jobs would be created as a result of the proposed development.
7. The proposal was an essential part of the recycling industry and was in accordance with the Council's strategic objectives.

The Principal Planning Officer (Central), in referring to the report, advised that there was sufficient merit in the proposed mitigation measures aimed at tackling problems of dust emissions. He added that there were conditions to ensure that work would be carried out within six months.

On seeking the advice of the Head of Environmental (Legal), Public Law and Property as to whether or not he should withdraw as he had received a letter in connection with the application, Councillor Beauchamp was advised that that would not warrant declaring an interest and, therefore, remained in the meeting.

It was proposed by Councillor Linnecor and seconded by Councillor Sharpe that consideration of the application be deferred pending a site visit. Councillor Delaney concurred with that suggestion.

Councillor Smith, in referring to the report, pointed out that permission had been refused for the retention of the trommel.

Councillor Whorwood, in referring to the report, pointed out that the use of the site was currently in breach of a condition regarding storage of waste.

Councillor Beauchamp considered that the site was shabby but that the applicant had taken steps to try and address problems and keep noise and dust to a minimum.

In response to a question by Councillor Jones, the Principal Planning Officer (Central) advised that there was currently an unrestricted 24 hour consent for the waste transfer station.

5807

### **RESOLVED:-**

That the planning application be deferred pending a site visit.

---

### **Report No 26 – 62-67 Edward Street and 3 Helena Street, Corner of, City – C/02043/09/OUT**

In response to a comment by Councillor G Sutton, the Assistant Director (Planning Management) pointed out that the application was only for outline permission.

5808

**RESOLVED:-**

- (i) That consideration of the application be deferred pending the completion of a suitable legal agreement as set out in the report;
- (ii) that, in the event of the above legal agreement not being completed to the satisfaction of the local planning authority by 4 August 2009, planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in the report;
- (iii) that, in the event of the legal agreement being completed to the satisfaction of the local planning authority by 4 August 2009, favourable consideration would be given to the planning application for the reason(s) set out in the report, subject to the conditions specified therein;
- (iv) that the Corporate Director of Governance be authorised to prepare and seal the appropriate legal agreement.

---

**Report No 27 – 412 Stockfield Road, Rear Garden of, South Yardley – C/01818/09/OUT**

Councillor Gaved did not consider that the proposal was in keeping with the surrounding area.

5809

**RESOLVED:-**

That planning permission be granted for the reason(s) set out in the report, subject to the conditions specified therein.

Councillor Gaved wished to be recorded as having voted against the decision.

---

**Report No 28 – Trinity Road, Aston Hall, Aston – C/02380/09/FUL**

Councillor Beauchamp thought that it was a sign of the times that it was necessary to install security measures to the stables block at Aston Hall.

5810

**RESOLVED:-**

- (i) That determination of application no C/02380/09/FUL be deferred pending the determination of application no C/01785/09/BLB by the Department for Communities and Local Government;
- (ii) that, in the event that the Department for Communities and Local Government approve application no C/01785/09/BLB,

## **Planning Committee – 9 July 2009**

favourable consideration be given to application no C/02380/09/FUL, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

---

### **Report No 29 – Trinity Road, Aston Hall, Aston – C/01785/09/BLB**

5811

#### **RESOLVED:-**

That application no C/01785/09/BLB be referred to the Department for Communities and Local Government for its determination and that they be advised that the Committee would be minded to approve the application, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

---

### **Report No 30 – 119 Holloway Head, George Nott House – C/02302/09/NOT**

The Chairman declared an interest and left the room during consideration of the item.

Councillor Smith, Vice-Chairman, took the Chair for the item.

5812

#### **RESOLVED:-**

That no prior approval is required.

---

The Chairman returned to the meeting.

### **Policy Reports**

#### **Sutton Coldfield Town Centre Regeneration Framework, 2009**

The Principal Planning Officer (Planning and Regeneration East) gave a powerpoint presentation outlining the Sutton Coldfield Town Centre Regeneration Framework, 2009.

Councillor Linnecor considered that the buses should have access to the middle of the site to get people into the area. He was concerned that access along the Birmingham Road would be hindered by the large number of cafés with open seating areas.

Councillor Maureen Cornish welcomed the proposals and redevelopment of the centre of Sutton Coldfield but recognised that it would be difficult to achieve and that at this stage it was a 'wish list' although it covered a lot of issues and needs.

Councillor Whorwood was concerned at the cost of the consultation and stressed the importance of addressing the congestion and parking problems in the area.

## **Planning Committee – 9 July 2009**

Councillor Delaney considered that the plans looked wonderful and hoped that they would materialise. He added that whenever he visited Sutton Coldfield he parked on the car park to the rear of Aldi and noted that that area was due to be developed as part of the regeneration framework.

Councillor Beauchamp suggested that traffic should be encouraged to travel around rather than through the centre of Sutton Coldfield.

The Principal Planning Officer (Planning and Regeneration East) pointed out that the framework was very much an aspirational document and that issues regarding buses, car parking and traffic would be addressed in more detail in the future.

The Director of Planning and Regeneration considered that the framework was a statement of commitment to Sutton Coldfield which would hopefully attract investors and developers to the area.

5813

### **RESOLVED:-**

That the comments made in the foregoing pre-amble be referred to the Director of Planning and Regeneration.

---

### **Annual Update on Planning Obligations**

The Assistant Director (Planning Management) introduced the report and, in particular, drew Members' attention to the reduction in the number of agreements over the last year. In response to a comment by Councillor Delaney he explained the difference in the statistics set out in the report.

5814

### **RESOLVED:-**

- (i) That the report be noted;
  - (ii) that approval be given to the distribution of 'S106 Agreements – A Guide' amongst all Members of the City Council.
- 

### **VISITS TO SITES IN CONNECTION WITH PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

5815

The Assistant Director (Planning Management) undertook to advise Members of a date when the visit to 363 Park Road, Hockley – C/00585/09/FUL would take place.

---

**AUTHORITY TO CHAIRMAN AND OFFICERS**

5816

**RESOLVED:-**

That the Chairman (or in his absence, the Vice-Chairman if appropriate) is hereby authorised to act until the next meeting of the Committee except that, in respect of the exercise of the Council's non-Executive functions, the appropriate Chief Officers are hereby authorised to act in consultation with the Chairman and that the Corporate Director of Governance be authorised to affix the Corporate Seal to any document necessary to give effect to a decision of the said officers acting in pursuance of the power hereby delegated to them; further that a report of all action taken under this authority be submitted to the next meeting and that such report shall explain why this authority was used.

---

**EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

5817

**RESOLVED:-**

That, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted, which includes the following exempt information, the public be now excluded from the meeting:-

<b><u>Agenda Item etc</u></b>	<b><u>Paragraph of Exempt Information Under Revised Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972</u></b>
Private Section of the Minutes of Last Meeting	3
Report of the Director of Planning and Regeneration – Proposal to Consider Temporary Deferment of Planning Obligation Payments	5