

Update Reports



Planning Committee

Thu 22 Oct
2026
7.00 pm

Oakenshaw Community
Centre, Castleditch Lane,
Redditch

If you have any queries on this Agenda please contact

**Gavin Day
Democratic Services Officer**

Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH

Tel: (01527) 64252 (Ext. 3304)

e.mail: gavin.day@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

Planning

Thursday, 22nd October, 2026

7.00 pm

Oakenshaw Community Centre

Agenda

Membership:

Cllrs:

Roger Bennett (Chair)
Simon Farmer (Vice-Chair)
William Boyd
Brandon Clayton
Andrew Fry

Bill Hartnett
Wanda King
Nicola Lloyd
Ian Woodall

4. Update Reports (Pages 5 - 8)

To note Update Reports (if any) for the Planning Applications to be considered at the meeting (circulated prior to the commencement of the meeting)

This page is intentionally left blank

Redditch Borough Council Planning Committee

Committee Updates

Update number 1.

22nd October 2026

23/01237/CPE 6 Moors Lane, Feckenham**No Updates****26/00950/FUL Redditch Play Council, The Children's Centre**

Page 27 of the published report refers to the earlier version of the NPPF. Officers request that the first sentence of the section on **Residential Amenity**, which reads;

Policy 5 of the BORLP4 states that the reuse and regeneration of previously developed land would be highly encouraged and paragraph 135(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that planning decisions should seek a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupants.

be replaced with the following sentence;

Policy 5 of the BORLP4 states that the reuse and regeneration of previously developed land would be highly encouraged and Policy DP3 of the revised NPPF (2026) sets out the design, amenity and general principle for well-designed places.

25/00888/FUL Land at Wheaten Hill Farm, Astwood Lane**Construction Traffic**

Worcestershire County Highways have held a meeting with Feckenham Parish Council regarding the routing of construction traffic associated with the development.

Concerns raised regarding the potential for Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) associated with the construction of the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) to utilise routes through Feckenham and Astwood Bank. These routes are considered less suitable for regular HGV movements due to proximity to residential properties and interaction with local traffic.

In response, it is proposed that condition 24 is revised to require the submission and approval of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) prior to commencement of development. The CTMP would include details of the routes to be used by all HGVs and abnormal loads during the construction, commissioning and decommissioning phases of the development.

The condition would require all HGVs and abnormal loads associated with the development to access and depart the site via the A441 and B4090 and would prohibit such vehicles from travelling through Feckenham via High Street or through Astwood Bank via Church Road, except where an alternative route is required as a result of an emergency, accident, road closure, direction of the Highway Authority, or other circumstances first agreed in writing by the Local

Planning Authority.

The CTMP would also be required to incorporate measures relating to driver inductions, contractor instructions, delivery management, monitoring and complaint investigation procedures. The approved measures would be implemented throughout the construction, commissioning and decommissioning phases of the development.

Officers consider that the revised condition provides a clear and proportionate mechanism to control construction traffic routing, safeguard highway safety and residential amenity, and ensure that construction traffic utilises the most appropriate sections of the highway network. This is recommended for inclusion should Members be minded to grant planning permission.

The revised condition will replace condition 24, with the following:

24. *No development shall commence until a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

The CTMP shall include details of the routes to be used by all Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) and abnormal loads travelling to and from the site during the construction, commissioning and decommissioning phases of the development.

The CTMP shall ensure that all HGVs and abnormal loads associated with the development shall access and depart the site via the A441 and B4090 or alternative specified and shall not travel through Feckenham via High Street and Droitwich Road or Astwood Bank via Church Road, except where an alternative route is required as a result of an emergency, accident, road closure, direction of the Highway Authority, or other circumstances first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The approved CTMP shall include measures for driver induction, contractor instructions, delivery booking procedures, monitoring and complaint investigation, and shall be implemented in full throughout the construction, commissioning and decommissioning phases of the development.

Reason: To safeguard highway safety and the free flow of traffic on the local highway network, to avoid HGV traffic using unsuitable roads through Feckenham and Astwood Bank, and to minimise the impact of large vehicle movements on road users and local communities, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant local transport policies.

Amendments to the Committee Report

The correct dates for consultation as per page 42 are as follows:

7 Public Consultation Response

Site Notice erected 20.08.25 expired 14.09.25

Press Notice published 05.09.25 expired 22.09.25

Neighbour consultation letters have been sent to 21 properties 28.08.25 expired 21.09.25

Following the request for a 9 year implementation period, further public consultation was undertaken as follows:

Site Notice erected 18.06.26 expired 12.07.26

Press Notice published 26.06.26 expired 13.07.26

Neighbour consultation letters have been sent to 21 properties and members of the public that commented on the original application 18.06.26 expired 05.07.26

Paragraph 12.5 at the top of page 56 of the committee report has the 2024 definition of Grey Belt, the correct definition from Annex B is as follows:

For the purposes of plan-making and decision-making, 'grey belt' is defined as land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in policy GB2.

Representations received following publication of Committee Report

Since publication of the Committee Report, further representations have been received on behalf of local objectors, supported by a planning review and an independent landscape appraisal. The submissions object to the proposal and request that planning permission be refused. The principal matters raised are summarised below.

A planning advice note submitted on behalf of local residents contends that the proposal does not satisfy the requirements of national Green Belt policy and that insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate an unmet need for the development. The submission refers to recent electricity network connection reforms, the status of the proposed grid connection and the existing pipeline of battery energy storage developments. It is argued that the proposal should be afforded substantially reduced weight in respect of energy security benefits and that Very Special Circumstances have not been demonstrated.

The submission further contends that the proposed nine-year implementation period weakens the weight that should be attributed to the scheme's benefits, and that biodiversity enhancement, landscape mitigation and other positive effects have been overstated within the planning balance.

A landscape review prepared on behalf of the objectors disputes the findings of the submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. The review concludes that:

1. Landscape effects have been underestimated;
2. Public rights of way users should be regarded as receptors of greater sensitivity;
3. Views of transformers and associated infrastructure would be more extensive than reported;
4. Cumulative effects with existing and proposed energy infrastructure have not been fully assessed; and
5. The proposal would result in greater adverse landscape and visual effects than concluded by the applicant.

The review concludes that some landscape and visual effects would remain moderate to major adverse even following establishment of proposed planting.

The representations reiterate previous objections regarding:

1. The adequacy of proposed firewater containment measures;
2. Potential pollution pathways to nearby watercourses and ecological receptors;
3. Risks arising from thermal runaway events;
4. Emergency access and fire-fighting arrangements;
5. Potential impacts upon nearby designated ecological sites;
6. Reliance upon planning conditions to secure detailed mitigation.

It is argued that further technical work should be undertaken before any planning permission is granted.

Officer Response

The matters raised within the additional submissions largely reiterate issues already considered within the Committee Report, including Green Belt policy compliance, need for development, landscape and visual effects, fire safety, ecology, hydrology, pollution control and the overall planning balance.

The additional planning and landscape submissions represent alternative professional opinions regarding the weight to be afforded to certain planning considerations. However, officers have reviewed the information submitted and are satisfied that no material factual inaccuracies have been identified within the Committee Report and that the additional representations do not introduce any new material considerations which would fundamentally alter the assessment.

The Committee Report already acknowledges that the proposal would result in harm to openness if the site is not considered to be grey belt, landscape character and visual amenity, and substantial weight has been attributed to those harms within the planning balance. Similarly, matters relating to fire safety, pollution prevention, drainage, ecological protection and site restoration have been considered in detail and are proposed to be secured through the recommended planning conditions.

Having reviewed the additional information submitted, officers remain satisfied that the proposal has been appropriately assessed and that the recommended conditions provide an appropriate mechanism to secure the necessary mitigation and ongoing safeguards.

One representation has been received from a member of the public expressing support for the proposal. The representation supports the development on the basis that battery energy storage infrastructure will assist in storing renewable energy, improve network resilience and reduce reliance on fossil fuels.

The additional representations, including both the objections and letter of support, have been taken into account and are available to view in detail on the public access record for this application. Officers are satisfied that no new material planning considerations have been raised that would justify a departure from the conclusions set out in the Committee Report. Accordingly, the recommendation remains unchanged.