



# Planning Committee

Wed 14 Jul  
2021  
7.00 pm

Council Chamber  
Town Hall  
Walter Stranz Square  
Redditch

**REDDITCH** BOROUGH COUNCIL

*making  
a  
difference*

[www.redditchbc.gov.uk](http://www.redditchbc.gov.uk)

**If you have any queries on this Agenda please contact**

**Sarah Sellers**

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

**Tel: (01527) 64252 (Ext. 2884)**

**email: [sarah.sellers@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:sarah.sellers@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)**

## **GUIDANCE ON FACE TO FACE MEETINGS**

Due to the current Covid-19 pandemic Redditch Borough Council will be holding this meeting in accordance with the relevant legislative arrangements for face to face meetings at a local authority.

If you have any questions regarding the agenda or attached papers please do not hesitate to contact the officer named below.

### **GUIDANCE FOR ELECTED MEMBERS ATTENDING MEETINGS IN PERSON**

In advance of the Committee meeting, Members are encouraged to consider taking a lateral flow test, which can be obtained for free from the NHS website. Should the test be positive for Covid-19 then the Member should not attend the Committee meeting, should provide their apologies to the Democratic Services team and should self-isolate in accordance with national rules.

Members and officers are encouraged to wear face masks during the Council meeting, unless exempt. Face masks should only be removed temporarily if the Councillor requires a sip of water and should be reapplied as soon as possible. Refreshments will not be provided by the venue. Hand sanitiser will be provided for Members to use throughout the meeting.

The meeting venue will be fully ventilated, and Members may need to consider wearing appropriate clothing in order to remain comfortable during proceedings.

### **PUBLIC ATTENDANCE**

Whilst the meeting is open to the public, due to the need to comply with rules on social distancing the amount of seating in the public gallery will be very limited.

Members of the public in attendance are encouraged to wear face masks, to use the hand sanitiser that will be provided and will be required to sit in a socially distanced manner at the meeting. It should be noted that members of the public who choose to attend in person do so at their own risk.

In line with Government guidelines, any member of the public who has received a positive result in a Covid-19 test on the day of a meeting should not attend in person and should self-isolate in accordance with the national rules.

### **PUBLIC SPEAKING**

The usual process for public speaking at meetings of the Planning Committee will continue to be followed subject to some adjustments in light of the on-going restrictions around social distancing. For this meeting the options to participate in public speaking will be in person, by joining the meeting using a video link or by submitting a written statement to be read out by officers.

The process approved by the Council for public speaking at meetings of the Planning Committee is (subject to the discretion and control of the Chair), as summarised below:

- 1) Introduction of application by Chair
- 2) Officer presentation of the report

- 3) **Public Speaking - in the following order:-**
  - a) **Objectors to speak on the application**
  - b) **Supporters to speak on the application**
  - c) **Ward Councillors**
  - d) **Applicant (or representative) to speak on the application**
- 4) **Members' questions to the Officers and formal debate / determination.**

**Speakers will be called in the order they have notified their interest in speaking to the Democratic Services Team and invited to address the committee in person or using Teams.**

**Each individual speaker will have up to a maximum of 3 minutes to speak, subject to the discretion of the Chair.**

**Each group of supporters or objectors with a common interest will have up to a maximum of 10 minutes to speak, subject to the discretion of the Chair.**

**Notes:**

- 1) **Anyone wishing to address the Planning Committee on applications on this agenda must notify the Democratic Services Team on 01527 64252 Extn.2884 or by email at [sarah.sellers@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:sarah.sellers@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) before 12 noon on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> July.**
- 2) **Advice and assistance will be provided to public speakers as to how to access the meeting. Provision has been made in the amended Planning Committee procedure rules for public speakers who cannot access the meeting either in person or by Teams, and those speakers will be given the opportunity to submit their speech in writing to be read out by an officer at the meeting. Please take care when preparing written comments to ensure that the reading time will not exceed three minutes. Any speakers wishing to submit written comments must do so by 12 noon on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> July.**
- 3) **Reports on all applications will include a summary of the responses received from consultees and third parties, an appraisal of the main planning issues and a recommendation. All submitted plans and documentation for each application, including consultee responses and third party representations, are available to view in full via the Public Access facility on the Council's website [www.redditchbc.gov.uk](http://www.redditchbc.gov.uk)**
- 4) **It should be noted that, in coming to its decision, the Committee can only take into account planning issues, namely policies contained in the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4 and other material considerations, which include Government Guidance and other relevant policies published since the adoption of the Development Plan and the "environmental factors" (in the broad sense) which affect the site.**
- 5) **Although this is a public meeting, there are circumstances when the committee might have to move into closed session to consider exempt or confidential information. For agenda items that are exempt, the public are excluded and for any such items the live stream will be suspended and that part of the meeting will not be recorded.**

- 6) Late circulation of additional papers is not advised and is subject to the Chair's agreement. The submission of any significant new information might lead to a delay in reaching a decision. The deadline for papers to be received by Planning Officers is 4.00 p.m. on the Friday before the meeting.**

# Planning

COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 14th July, 2021

7.00 pm

Council Chamber Town Hall

## Agenda

### Membership:

Cllrs:	Michael Chalk (Chair)	Imran Altaf
	Julian Grubb (Vice-Chair)	Aled Evans
	Gemma Monaco	Karen Ashley
	Tom Baker-Price	Timothy Pearman
	Andrew Fry	

### 1. Apologies

### 2. Declarations of Interest

To invite Councillors to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and / or Other Disclosable Interests they may have in items on the agenda, and to confirm the nature of those interests.

### 3. Confirmation of Minutes of Planning Committee meetings held on 14th April and 28th April 2021 (Pages 1 - 14)

### 4. Update Reports

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

### 5. Application 21/00631/FUL - Abbey Stadium Sports Centre Birmingham Road Redditch B97 6EJ - Mr Scott Brinkworth on behalf of Rubicon Leisure Limited (Pages 15 - 20)

### 6. Application 21/00810/FUL - Pitcheroak Municipal Golf Course Plymouth Road Redditch B97 4PB - Mr Paul Hawkes on behalf of Rubicon Leisure Limited (Pages 21 - 24)

### 7. Planning Appeal Outcomes (Pages 25 - 30)



**Planning  
Committee**

Wednesday, 14 April 2021

**Virutal Meeting**

**MINUTES**

**Present:**

Councillor Gemma Monaco (Chair), and Councillors Tom Baker-Price, Roger Bennett, Michael Chalk, Andrew Fry, Julian Grubb, Bill Hartnett, Jennifer Wheeler and Mike Rouse

**Officers:**

Helena Plant, David Edmonds, Amar Hussain and Pauline Ross

**Democratic Services Officer:**

Sarah Sellers

**107. CHAIR'S WELCOME**

The Chair welcomed the Committee members and officers to the virtual Planning Committee meeting being held via Microsoft Teams. The Chair explained that the meeting was being live streamed on the Council's YouTube channel to enable members of the public to observe the committee.

**108. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Salman Akbar. Councillor Michael Rouse attended as substitute for Councillor Akbar.

**109. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

In relation to agenda item 6 (Application reference 20/00178/FUL), Members were advised that one of the registered speakers was fellow Councillor Joanne Beecham, participating in a private capacity as a local resident.

Accordingly, all Members sitting on the Committee declared an Other Disclosable Interest in that Cllr Beecham was known to them in her capacity as a fellow Borough Councillor. All Members remained in the meeting during the deliberation of agenda item 6 and participated in the debate and the vote.

.....  
Chair

# Planning

## Committee

Wednesday, 14 April 2021

---

In relation to agenda item 8, regarding Morton Stanley Park, Councillor Rouse declared that for reasons of transparency he would not be participating as he was the portfolio holder responsible for Leisure and the application was being made by the Council in relation to one of the Borough's parks. Councillor Rouse left the meeting prior to the commencement of Agenda item 8 and played no part in the debate or the vote.

**110. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON 10TH MARCH 2021**

**RESOLVED that**

**The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2021 be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.**

**111. UPDATE REPORTS**

The Update Report was noted.

**112. NON-DETERMINATION APPEAL : SALTWAYS CHESHIRE HOME CHURCH ROAD WEBHEATH REDDITCH PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE APP/Q1825/W/21/3269496 REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL PLANNING APPLICATION REFERENCE 20/00178/FUL**

Construction of 3 single-storey extensions, security fence and alterations for a proposed Tier 4, Low Security, Non-Forensic, CAMHS (Children and Mental Health Services) Unit

Officers presented the report and in doing so explained that the application was not for determination by the Committee. The background was that the applicant had submitted a valid appeal for non-determination of the application to the Planning Inspectorate. As such, the power to determine the application now rested with the Planning Inspectorate. Members were being asked to indicate how they "would" have decided the application had it come before them, and this indication would then inform the Council's position in responding to the appeal.

Officers clarified that the specific elements for consideration by the Members related to operational development at the site and that this consisted of the construction of three single -storey extensions, the installation of security fences and other minor alteration works. An earlier version of the application had also included a Change of Use element. However, based upon legal opinions obtained by both the applicant and the Council, it was now common ground that a Change of Use application was not needed. The reason for this



# Planning

## Committee

Wednesday, 14 April 2021

---

was that it was accepted that the proposed use as a low secure hospital for patients classed as “non-forensic” would fall within the same use class as the previous use as a nursing home, namely the category “C2 Residential Use”.

Officers took Members through the slides, plans and photographs contained in the Site Plans and Presentations Pack, and in doing so described the lay out of the site, the levels of the land and the relationship of the site with the residential dwellings to the north west, north and south eastern boundaries. The position of the three metre and two metre proposed security fencing was noted and Members were reminded that planning permission was not required for fences up to two metres in height. The location of the proposed fencing set back from the site boundary and close to the perimeter of the buildings was noted.

The location and scale of the proposed extensions were also highlighted for Members and officers advised that there would be a condition to retain and add to the existing planting on site.

Members were referred to the additional information contained in the Update Report.

Officers summarised the main issues for Members to consider as being fear of crime, whether the security fence was unduly dominant and its effect on the character of the area. Officers felt the impact of the fence from public vantage points was limited as it would be located mostly at the side and rear. Other issues to take into account were noise and disturbance and privacy. There was likely to be little impact as to parking and highways issues.

Members were referred to the detailed conditions set out on pages 30 to 34 of the agenda.

Members were advised that the recommendation would have been minded to approve the granting of planning permission.

As referred to in the opening of the meeting, the Chair reminded Members that the times for public speaking had been extended.

The following speakers addressed the Committee at the invitation of the Chair: -

Local residents in objection to the application (up to 21 minutes)

- Mr Peter Hill
- Mrs Joanne Archer
- Dr Praveen Kumar
- Mrs Joanne Beecham

# Planning

## Committee

Wednesday, 14 April 2021

---

Ward Member (3 minutes)

Councillor David Thain – Councillor for West Ward

In support of the application (up to 21 minutes)

Mr Avinash Parmar – agent for the applicant

The first five speakers were opposed to the application and raised various issues including choice of location close to residential properties and far from a paediatric emergency unit, fear of crime, the overbearing nature of the security fence, noise disturbance, privacy of patients and local residents, the potential impact of behaviour of patients on the ability of residents to enjoy their properties and risk of patients absconding.

In response to questions from Members officers confirmed that:-

- The function of a CAMHS unit was to provide care; the need for security was incidental to the giving of care and as such the appropriate use category was class C2. Members were referred to the definition on page 22.
- Patients at the unit would not be free to leave as they would be detained under the Mental Health Act.
- The reference to the security fences as “anti-climb” was based on the small size of the mesh designed to inhibit hand or footholds.
- Fear of crime could be considered as a material planning consideration if linked to the presence of the security fences.
- No works had been commenced on site in relation to the proposed extensions or security fencing.

In debating the application Members commented on the closeness of the security fence to nearby residential dwellings, and the height of the fence which was felt to be intimidating, obstructive and out of character for the area. It was noted that the usual height of a fence in a household location would be 1.8 metres, but the application sought sections of fencing of 3 metres in height. Comments were also made in relation to the changes in levels creating the ability of residents to look into the site, the consequential loss of privacy for patients in the unit and possible issues with noise.

Members referred to the issues raised in public speaking around the suitability of the use of the building for the area, and what could be perceived as the contradiction between the classification of the unit as “low secure” when security measures would be required for the protection of the patients, including the 3 metre high security fence.

# Planning

## Committee

Wednesday, 14 April 2021

---

Officers re-iterated to Members that the use of the building was not for decision based on the legal opinions that the use was C2. Officers also advised that it was a requirement of the Royal College of Physicians, as set out on page 24 of the report, that a “low secure” unit should have a 3 metre security fence.

Whilst Members indicated that the single storey extension elements and the 2 metre high areas of fencing were acceptable, in further discussion more concerns were raised in relation to the 3 metre high sections of fencing including that it would be out of character with the street scene and overbearing. Members were of the view that the proposals for the fencing had given rise to a genuine fear of crime on the part of nearby residents and there was clearly a high level of concern as evidenced by the number of representations received regarding the application.

Following further discussion as to the scope of reasons for refusal, an alternative recommendation was moved and seconded. The mover of the recommendation summarised the grounds for refusal as arising from the bulk and appearance of the 3 metre security fence, that it would be a means of creating fear of crime, that the fence would not reduce noise and that it would be inconsistent with the location for which it was proposed. The recommendation also proposed a delegation to officers to finalise the exact wording of the refusal reasons.

### **RESOLVED that :-**

- 1. Having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, that the Local Planning Authority would have been minded to REFUSE full planning permission in the event that an Appeal against non-determination had not been lodged and it had been able to determine the application for the reasons set out below: -**

**The extent and height of the proposed 3 metre high anti-climb security fence and its bulky solid appearance would be an inappropriate design for a means of enclosure and would also unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the locality. Moreover, its scale, appearance and its close alignment to some of the fencing to adjacent dwellings, would be unacceptably overbearing for occupants and thus harmful to their residential amenity. The dominance of the fence would be compounded where stretches of the fence would be set at a substantially higher level than the ground floors of surrounding houses, particularly those adjoining residential properties fronting Shirehampton Close. Furthermore, the dominant extent, scale and appearance of the fence, designed**

# Planning

## Committee

Wednesday, 14 April 2021

---

to be anti-climb and highly secure, would unacceptably reinforce and accentuate the fear of crime inherent to the use of the site as a CAMHS Tier 4, inpatients low secure hospital. These aspects of the proposed development would thereby conflict with the Borough of Redditch High Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document particularly paragraphs 4.4.48 and 6.2.18 which discourages aggressive boundary treatments. The development would also conflict with Policies 39 and 40 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 since it would not reflect or compliment the local surrounding, would not contribute positively to the character of the locality, would not assist in reducing the fear of crime and would not protect and safeguard the amenity of adjoining residents.

2. That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Leisure Services to finalise the full wording of the refusal reason based on the issues referred to by Members during the debate and as summarised by the mover of the alternative recommendation.
3. That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Leisure Services to agree to the proposed method for determining the non-determination appeal.

[In relation to this agenda item, all Members sitting on the Committee declared an Other Disclosable Interest that Cllr Beecham who was speaking in a personal capacity on this application, was known to them as a fellow Borough Councillor. All Members remained in the meeting during the deliberation of agenda item 6 and participated in the debate and the vote.]

### 113. APPLICATION 21/00139/FUL - LAND AT TORRS CLOSE REDDITCH - DR S ANANTHRAM

Development of six two bedroomed apartments and three 1 bedroom apartment, with associated external works and parking arrangements

Officers outlined the application with reference to the plans and photographs in the Site Plans and Presentations Pack.

The proposed scheme was similar to one for 10 units under reference 18/00784/FUL which Members had approved previously in March 2019. Officers clarified that the decision on that

application had not been issued as the Section 106 agreement had not been completed.

As with the previous application, an objection had been made by Worcestershire Wildlife Trust regarding loss of biodiversity. Officers had considered the issue of ecology carefully. On balance and taking into account the conditions to be imposed around wildlife and biodiversity, officers were satisfied that the issues identified by Worcestershire Wildlife Trust had been sufficiently mitigated.

Members were referred to the additional public comments received as set out on page 7 of the Update Report and were advised that these matters had been addressed in the main body of the report, and that appropriate consultation had taken place.

At the invitation of the Chair, Dr Joseph Uhiara, local resident, addressed the committee in objection to the application.

In debating the application, whilst acknowledging the loss of woodland, Members referred to the fact that the scheme was similar to the one previously approved under reference 18/00784/FUL.

**RESOLVED that**

**Having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions set out on pages 45 to 52 of the main agenda.**

**114. APPLICATION 21/00228/FUL - MORTON STANLEY PARK WINDMILL DRIVE REDDITCH - REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

Proposed Café, toilets, additional car parking and ancillary works

Officers presented the application which related to the construction of a café building with toilet facilities and outdoor seating area at the park, and the extension of the existing parking area off Windmill Drive to create 50 new parking spaces.

Officers took Members through the slides in the presentation pack and advised Members of the additional condition being sought as to construction materials, as set out on page 8 of the Update Report.

The following public speakers addressed the committee under the Council's Public Speaking Rules:-

- Mr Guy Stabler – local resident - in objection
- Mr Alan Newton-Coombs - local resident - in support

# Planning

## Committee

Wednesday, 14 April 2021

---

In addition to the above, officers read out the statement of local resident Mrs Margaret Hughes, who was in support of the scheme but raised concerns over parking and access at the rear of the park from Green Lane.

In debating the application, Members commented positively on the addition of the new facilities at the park, in particular the café and toilets. As noted in public speaking, these new facilities would be very much welcomed by visitors to the park and represent a significant improvement, especially for families with children and those with disabilities.

Following on from the comments of the first speaker, Members discussed road safety issues regarding the extension of the existing semi-circular parking area to form a circle, and the resultant enclosure of the circular paved area in the middle of the semi-circle. Officers clarified that Members were not able to alter the plans that had been presented as they formed part of the application.

It was clarified however that officers had made the applicant aware of safety issues around risk and conflict between car drivers and the pedestrians and children on cycles who currently used the paved area. Further work by the applicant to address the safety of the proposed parking configuration would be carried out prior to construction, including a road safety audit which would address risk and conflict and ways in which any risks identified could be mitigated.

Officers confirmed that the public speaking comments in relation to Green Lane were not relevant to the specific application before the Committee.

### **RESOLVED that**

**Having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions set out on pages 59 to 60 of the main agenda, and additional condition 7 set out on page 8 of the Update Report.**

[In relation to this agenda item 8 Councillor Rouse declared that for reasons of transparency he would not be participating as he was the portfolio holder responsible for Leisure and the application was being made by the Council in relation to one of the Borough's parks. Councillor Rouse left the meeting prior to the commencement of Agenda item 8 and played no part in the debate or the vote]



# Planning Committee

---

Wednesday, 28 April 2021

## MINUTES

### Present:

Councillor Gemma Monaco (Chair), Councillor Salman Akbar (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Tom Baker-Price, Michael Chalk, Julian Grubb, Mark Shurmer and Anthony Lovell

### Also Present:

Karen Hanchett - County Highways

### Officers:

Helena Plant, Mary Worsfold, Steve Edden, Amar Hussain and Charlotte Wood

### Democratic Services Officer:

Sarah Sellers

### 115. CHAIR'S WELCOME

The Chair welcomed the Committee members and officers to the virtual Planning Committee meeting being held via Microsoft Teams. The Chair explained that the meeting was being live streamed on the Council's YouTube channel to enable members of the public to observe the committee.

### 116. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Bill Hartnett and Councillor Roger Bennett. Councillor Anthony Lovell attended as substitute for Councillor Bennett, and Councillor Mark Shurmer attended as substitute for Councillor Hartnett.

### 117. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

### 118. UPDATE REPORTS

The Update Reports were noted.

.....  
Chair

# Planning

## Committee

Wednesday, 28 April 2021

---

**119. APPLICATION 20/00599/FUL - LAND OPPOSITE 24 DROITWICH ROAD, DROITWICH ROAD, FECKENHAM, WORCESTERSHIRE, B98 8JE - H2LAND**

Development of 2 no. Dwellings

Officers presented the application for the construction of two residential dwellings on a plot of overgrown land located on the opposite side of the road to number 24 Droitwich Road, Feckenham, and took Members through the plans and photographs in the Site Plans and Presentations Pack.

Members were referred to the Update Report and the fact that a satisfactory Badger Mitigation Survey had now been received, in light of which an additional condition was being sought.

Officers explained that the application site had been subject to two previous applications for dwellings (under reference numbers 19/01588/FUL and 19/00716/FUL) which had been refused by the Local Planning Authority and appealed to the Planning Inspectorate. The appeals on both applications had been dismissed and copies of the decisions were attached to the Committee report and summarised on page 5 of the agenda pack.

Officers referred Members to the main issues in relation to the application, including the location of the site within the Feckenham Conservation Area, the relevance of Policy 9 (Open Countryside), the fact that the proposed dwellings would align with existing dwellings on either side of the plot and not impose on the Manor House opposite, and the fact that officers, following consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, deemed the vernacular design of the two dwellings to be acceptable.

Notwithstanding the past use of the site in connection with the Manor House, as a historic kitchen garden, when looking at the weight to be attached to the competing considerations, and taking into account the improvements in design specifications compared to the two previous applications, the conclusion reached by officers was that the proposals were acceptable and the application was recommended for approval.

At the invitation of the Chair the public speakers listed below addressed the Committee, the first three in objection to the application and the fourth in support : -

- Dr Hugo Hammersley - local resident
- Mr John Fisher – local resident
- Mr Alan Smith - Chair of Feckenham Parish Councillor
- Mr Neil Pearce - Planning Agent for the Applicant



# Planning

## Committee

Wednesday, 28 April 2021

---

In response to questions from Members, officers confirmed that: -

- In the context of the two appeals, the Planning Inspector had placed weight on the poor design of the proposed dwellings, rather than rejecting the principle of development at the site. One of the designs (for two dwellings) had been in the style of a barn that was out of character for the setting, and the other design for a single dwelling was considered to be poor.
- There had been no objections to the application from County Highways and the use of the existing access onto the B4090 was suitable.
- The Planning Inspector had considered the past use as a kitchen garden and in that context had regarded the site as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset, although a low amount of weight had been attached to this factor, and it was found by the Inspector to be outweighed by arguments in favour of use of the land for housing.

In debating the application Members referred to a number of the issues raised during public speaking and pointed to the difficulties in balancing the potential loss of the land of historic interest as against the other relevant factors, including the re-use of the site to provide dwellings given the absence of a five year land supply.

Views were expressed in support of granting the application based on the improved design of the proposed dwellings which were felt to be appropriate for the Conservation Area, the separation of the site from the Manor House by the road, the un-used and overgrown state of the land and the limited infilling in the gap in the existing street scene that would result.

Other views were expressed in opposition to the application and an alternative recommendation to refuse the application was moved but not seconded.

Following further debate, the recommendation to grant the application as set out in the officer's report (as amended in the Update Report) was moved and seconded and put to the vote.

### **RESOLVED that**

**Having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be GRANTED subject to:-**

- 1. the conditions and informatives set out on pages 20 to 25 of the main agenda;**

# Planning

## Committee

Wednesday, 28 April 2021

---

2. additional condition number 19 as set out on page 1 of the Update Report; and
3. amended condition number 17 which is replaced by the following wording appearing on the Update Report:

### Condition 17

Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved a licence from Natural England shall be obtained to close off the on-site badger setts. The details of this approved licence, confirmation of successful badger exclusion/destruction and a full mitigation plan shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The works on site shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: For the adequate protection of badgers.

### 120. APPLICATION 20/01638/FUL - LAND TO THE SOUTH OF ALFRICK CLOSE, ENFIELD, REDDITCH - LNT CARE DEVELOPMENTS

Erection of a three story 66 bed care home for the elderly with associated works

Officers outlined the application and described the location of the site and the proposed layout of the residential home with reference to the plans and photographs in the Site Plans and Presentations Pack.

The use class would be C2 (nursing home) and the site would be accessed from Alfrick Close. The application had been assessed as complying with the relevant policies and would not affect the amenity of other nearby dwellings. There were no objections on highways grounds and Members were referred to the updated information regarding provision of 24 onsite parking spaces as set out in the Update Report.

At the invitation of the Chair, Mrs Tracy Spencer addressed the committee on behalf of the Applicant.

In debating the application Members welcomed the proposal for the land to be used to provide a nursing home which Members felt was a suitable use for that particular location and would provide a benefit to the town and local residents.

### RESOLVED that

**Having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, authority be delegated to the Head of Planning,**

# Planning

## Committee

Wednesday, 28 April 2021

---

**Regeneration and Leisure to GRANT planning permission  
subject to: -**

- a. The satisfactory completion of a planning obligation (unilateral undertaking) ensuring that:**
  - Contributions are paid to the NHS Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) towards GP Surgeries.**
  - A section 106 monitoring fee is paid to the Borough Council**

**And**

- b. The conditions and informatives listed on pages 43 to 49 of the main agenda**

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm  
and closed at 8.40 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**14th July 2021

---

**Planning Application 21/00631/FUL****Creation of an outdoor functional fitness area and associated fencing and lighting works****Abbey Stadium Sports Centre, Birmingham Road, Riverside, Redditch, B97 6EJ****Applicant: Mr Scott Brinkworth (Rubicon Leisure)**  
**Ward: Abbey Ward****(see additional papers for site plan)**

The case officer of this application is Steven Edden, Principal Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on Tel: 01527 64252 Ext. 3206 Email: [steve.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:steve.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) for more information.

**Site Description**

The site relates to land which is located between the northern face of the Abbey Stadium Sports Centre and the associated running track.

The Abbey Stadium is situated to the eastern side of Birmingham Road and is accessed via Bordesley Lane.

**Proposal Description**

This application seeks planning permission to create an outdoor functional fitness area with fencing, and lighting. The applicant states that the development would contribute to the improvement of sporting facilities at Abbey Stadium.

The proposed outdoor sports fitness area would include 2 no. insulated containers with roller shutter doors to house sports / cardio equipment; a surfaced and tiled area; the installation of 3m high perimeter security fencing in a dark green colour; 2no 6m high lighting columns with LED fittings; a roofed canopy to cover a cross-fit style training rig. The training area would measure 10 x 6m in area.

The wider development area would be 25m x 9.1m with a total area measuring approximately 228 sqm.

The 2no. storage containers would be 2.59m high and would have an anthracite grey, powder coated finish. The arched roof system between the two containers would reach a maximum height of 5.62m. The roof would be constructed in a durable PVC coated fabric tensioned across a steel frame. This would be light grey in colour.

The surfacing within the area used for gym and circuit training activities would be predominantly in a sprung heavy rubber material. A small sprint straight area for speed training would have a porous polyeric material similar to that of the adjacent running track.

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**14th July 2021

---

The facility is proposed to be operational between the hours of 0600 to 2200 seven days a week.

**Relevant Policies:****Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4**

Policy 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy 39: Built Environment

Policy 40: High Quality Design and Safer Communities

Policy 43: Leisure, Tourism and Abbey Stadium

**Others**

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

NPPG National Planning Practice Guidance

**Relevant Planning History**

None

**Consultations****Worcestershire County Council (WCC) Highways**

No objection

**North Worcestershire Water Management (NWWM)**

Comments summarised as follows:

The proposed development site is situated in the catchment of the River Arrow. The site falls within flood zone 1 and it is not considered that there is any significant fluvial flood risk to the site. Risk to the site from surface water flooding is indicated as low.

Having reviewed the details there is no reason to withhold approval of this application on flood risk grounds and I do not deem it necessary to recommend attaching a drainage condition.

**Arboricultural Officer**

No objections to the removal of Tree 4 and Tree 5 as shown in order to facilitate the proposed development. These are trees of medium/low quality. Suitable mitigation for their loss should be provided via a landscape plan showing the locations for the plants. Hornbeam, Field Maple, or Cherry would be suitable species.

**Police Crime Risk Manager**

No objection

**Worcestershire Regulatory Services: Light Pollution**

No objection to the application in terms of light nuisance

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

14th July 2021

---

### Public Consultation Response

None received

### Assessment of Proposal

Policy 43 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan no. 4 (BoRLP4), at 43.5 comments that *The Borough Council will safeguard land within the curtilage and land adjacent to the Abbey Stadium Complex for development which is for leisure and leisure-related uses.* As a proposal relating to sports and leisure facility which is in an accessible and sustainable location, the principle of the proposed development is acceptable.

Policy 39 of the BoRLP4 requires development to contribute positively to the local character of the area. Paragraph 39.5 states that areas should be designed to ensure they make places better for people. Policy 40 of the BoRLP seeks development of a good design including that which contributes to both public and private spaces. In order to achieve this, Policy 40 expects proposals to be of a high-quality design which reflects or complements the local surroundings.

Views of the proposed development would be partially screened by existing trees which are situated between the site of the facility and the A441 Birmingham Road, which is located approximately 85 metres to the west.

Notwithstanding this, the proposed scale and design of the development including material and colour choices are considered to reflect and enhance that of the modern Abbey Stadium building and are thus considered to be acceptable.

Two small trees would need to be removed to accommodate the proposals which is regrettable although the Councils Tree Officer has raised no objection to the development subject to suitable mitigation for their loss.

A planning condition is considered to be an appropriate method of securing appropriate new planting (recommended Condition 3 below).

No objections have been raised by consultees, which in this case include WCC Highways, NWWM and the Police Crime Risk Manager. Further, Worcestershire Regulatory Services: Light Pollution have examined the lighting proposals which include downlighting within the main fitness / training area and include the provision of two new 6m high lighting columns with LED fittings and raise no objections in terms of light nuisance having regard to the location of the nearest residential occupiers (those residing in Alfrick, Farndon and Linthurst close) beyond, and to the west of the A441 Birmingham Road.

There have been no third party representations received as a result of public consultation and no technical concerns have been raised and as such it is recommended that planning permission is granted subject to conditions.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

14th July 2021

---

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

**That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:**

### **Conditions:**

- 1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of the grant of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and drawings:

SSL2863 01 Site Location Plan dated 20 April 2021  
SSL2863 02 Tree Locations Plan dated 20 April 2021  
SSL2863 03 Proposed Plans dated 20 April 2021  
SSL2863 04 Proposed Elevations dated 20 April 2021  
Appendix A Lighting design document SSL2863 dated 20 April 2021  
Fencing to be powder coated steel weld mesh finished in Dark Green RAL6005  
Roof to be finished in light grey: RAL 7035  
Containers to be powder coated with an Anthracite Grey RAL 7016 finish

Reason: To provide certainty to the extent of the development hereby approved in the interests of proper planning and in the interests of visual amenity.

- 3) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until full details of soft landscape works including details of new planting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

All soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the development being brought into use. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar sizes or species unless the local planning authority gives written approval to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area



**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**14th July 2021

---

**Informatives**

- 1) Proactive engagement by the local planning authority was not necessary in this case as the proposed development was considered acceptable as initially submitted.

**Procedural matters**

This application is being reported to the Planning Committee because the application site relates to land belonging to Redditch Borough Council. As such the application falls outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**14th July 2021

---

**Planning Application 21/00810/FUL****Proposed Gazebo to provide shelter from the sun or rain for the patrons of the Pitcheroak Municipal Golf Course****Pitcheroak Municipal Golf Course, Plymouth Road, Southcrest, Redditch, B97 4PB****Applicant: Mr Paul Hawkes (Rubicon Leisure)  
Ward: Central Ward****(see additional papers for site plan)**

The case officer of this application is Steven Edden, Principal Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on Tel: 01527 64252 Ext. 3206 Email: [steve.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:steve.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) for more information.

**Site Description**

The site of the proposed Gazebo structure is immediately to the rear (to the north-west) of the existing Pitcheroak Municipal Golf Club House building which itself is set back approximately 40 metres (to the west) of Plymouth Road. Vehicular access to the Golf Course is via Plymouth Road.

**Proposal Description**

The proposal is to erect a Gazebo in order to provide shelter from the sun or rain for the patrons of the Golf Course.

The Gazebo would measure 5.9 metres in length and would have a width of 3.4 metres. Its height to eaves would be 2.14 metres and its height to ridge would be 3.1 metres.

The Gazebo would have a hipped pitched roof, clad in timber shingles. The roof would be supported on impregnated pine posts each having a diameter of 115mm.

**Relevant Policies:****Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4**

Policy 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy 13: Primarily Open Space

Policy 16: Natural Environment

Policy 39: Built Environment

Policy 40: High Quality Design and Safer Communities

Policy 43: Leisure, Tourism and Abbey Stadium

**Others**

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

NPPG National Planning Practice Guidance

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

14th July 2021

---

### Relevant Planning History

None

### Public Consultation Response

None

### Assessment of Proposal

The site for the proposed building together with the existing clubhouse are undesignated ('White land') within the Local Plan, whereas the Pitcheroak Golf Course itself falls within land designated as Primarily Open Space (Policy 13 applies). The Golf course is also designated as a Local Wildlife Site (Policy 16 applies).

Policy 13 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan no. 4 (BoRLP4) aims to ensure that designated POS is protected, and where appropriate, enhanced to improve its quality, value, multifunctionality and accessibility. Policy 16 aims to conserve and enhance biodiversity.

The proposal to site a new building immediately behind the clubhouse building on 'white land' would comply with the provisions of Policy 16 and the proposals would contribute towards an enhancement to the adjacent open space, increasing its value and functionality to its users, meeting the aims of Policy 13. Furthermore, Policy 43 of the BoRLP4 supports proposals relating to leisure facilities provided they are located within a sustainable location, which are accessible by a choice of transport. In view of this, the site is an established leisure facility which is located in an accessible and sustainable location, within walking distance of many residents.

Policy 39 of the BoRLP4 requires development to contribute positively to the local character of the area. Paragraph 39.5 states that areas should be designed to ensure they make places better for people. Policy 40 of the BoRLP seeks development of a good design including that which contributes to both public and private spaces. In order to achieve this, Policy 40 expects proposals to be of a high quality design which reflects or complements the local surroundings.

With regards to the above, the proposed gazebo structure would be located behind the existing clubhouse and as such public views of the development would be limited.

Notwithstanding this, the proposed design of the development, its size and choice of materials (timber) are considered to be appropriate in its context and therefore the siting and appearance of the development is considered to be acceptable.

In view of location of the site, the development is not considered to cause any adverse impact to residential amenity. There have been no third party representations received as a result of public consultation.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

14th July 2021

---

### Conclusion

No objections are raised to the principle of the proposed development and the siting, design and appearance of the development is considered acceptable. No technical concerns have been raised and as such it is recommended that planning permission is granted subject to conditions.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

**That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:**

### **Conditions:**

- 1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of the grant of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and drawings:

Layout and location Drg No P2247/3 dated 19 May 2021

Proposed elevations Drg No P2237/3 dated 19 May 2021

Materials for use as per planning application form: Timber 115mm diameter posts with timber shingle roof

Reason: To provide certainty to the extent of the development hereby approved in the interests of proper planning.

### **Informatives**

- 1) Proactive engagement by the local planning authority was not necessary in this case as the proposed development was considered acceptable as initially submitted.

### **Procedural matters**

This application is being reported to the Planning Committee because the application site relates to land belonging to Redditch Borough Council. As such the application falls outside the scheme of delegation to Officers.

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**14<sup>th</sup> July 2021**APPEAL OUTCOMES – INFORMATION REPORT**

Responsible Portfolio Holder	Cllr Dormer
Responsible Head of Services	Ruth Bamford

**1. Purpose of Report**

To receive an item of information in relation to the outcomes of recent planning appeal decisions. Officers will answer any related questions at the meeting as necessary.

**2. Recommendation**

**The Committee is asked to RESOLVE that the item of information be noted.**

**Report****3. Financial, Legal, Policy and Risk Implications**

There are no financial, legal, policy or risk implications for the Council arising from these decisions.

**4. Background**

Relevant planning application files and decisions.

**5. Consultation**

There has been no consultation other than with relevant Borough Council Officers.

**6. Author of Report**

The author of this report is Helena Plant (Development Management Manager) who can be contacted on 01527 881335 (e-mail [h.plant@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:h.plant@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)) for more information.

**7. Appendices**

Appendix 1 - Outcomes of Planning Appeals

This page is intentionally left blank



**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

---

**APPENDIX 1: OUTCOMES OF PLANNING APPEALS; November 2019 – July 2021**

Reference	Site location	Proposal	Ward	RBC Decision type	Type of appeal	Appeal type	Appeal outcome
19/00716/FUL  Case Officer: Charlotte Wood	Land Opposite 24 Droitwich Road Droitwich Road Feckenham Worcestershire B96 6JE	Development of 2 No Dwellings	Astwood Bank And Feckenham Ward	Application Refusal	Appeal Against Refusal	Written Representation	Appeal Dismissed 02/10/2020
19/00896/CUP RIO  Case Officer: Emily Farmer	Land Adjacent To Rookery Cottage Droitwich Road Feckenham Worcestershire	Notification of Prior Approval for a Proposed Change of Use of Agricultural Building to a Dwellinghouse	Astwood Bank And Feckenham Ward	Prior Approval Required But Not Granted	Appeal Against Refusal	Written Representation	Appeal Dismissed 18/05/2020

**REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

---

19/01410/FUL  Case Officer: Tara Ussher	21 Crumpfields Lane Redditch Worcestershire B97 5PN	First floor side extension	West Ward	Householder Refusal	Fast Track Appeal	Fast Track Appeal	Appeal Dismissed 01/10/2020
19/01547/ADV  Case Officer: Steve Edden	12 Market Place Redditch Worcestershire B98 8AA	Installation of replacement Illuminated and Non Illuminated Signs to the exterior of the building (retrospective application)	Abbey Ward	Advertisement Consent Refusal	Appeal Against Refusal	Written Representation	Appeal Allowed 17/06/2020
19/01588/FUL  Case Officer: Charlotte Wood	Land Opposite 24 Droitwich Road Droitwich Road Feckenham Worcestershire B96 6JE	Development of 1 No Dwelling	Astwood Bank And Feckenham Ward	Application Refusal	Appeal Against Refusal	Written Representation	Appeal Dismissed 02/10/2020
20/00236/FUL  Case Officer: Nina Chana	Mutton Hall Farm Astwood Lane Astwood Bank Redditch Worcestershire B96 6HJ	Creation of new access to highway and reinstatement of wall	Astwood Bank And Feckenham Ward	Application Refusal	Appeal Against Refusal	Fast Track Appeal	Part Allowed/Part Refused 20/07/2020

**REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

---

20/00453/FUL Case Officer: Steve Edden	1 Alcester Street Redditch Worcestershire	Demolition of existing storage building and construction of new storage building	Abbey Ward	Application Refusal	Appeal Against Refusal	Written Representation	Appeal Dismissed 15/12/2020
20/00603/FUL Case Officer: Tara Ussher	2 Edenfield Close Redditch Worcestershire B97 6TP	Two storey rear extension and a first-floor side extension	Batchley And Brockhill Ward	Household er Refusal	Fast Track Appeal	Fast Track Appeal	Appeal Allowed 09/04/2021
20/00794/OUT Case Officer: Emily Farmer	340 Birchfield Road Redditch Worcestershire B97 4NG	Outline application for demolition of existing house and erection of 1 x two-bedroom and 2 x 4/5 bedroom houses with new access.	West Ward	Application Refusal	Appeal Against Refusal	Written Representation	Appeal Dismissed 23/02/2021

This page is intentionally left blank